United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2021 No. 19

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 2, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIMMY GOMEZ to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Blessed are those whose strength is in You, O God, whose hearts are set on a pilgrimage.

Speak into the innermost chambers of our hearts, God, and into the heart of these Chambers. Bless our pilgrimage as we labor to preserve democracy, uphold liberty, and serve the American people faithfully. Grant us the insight of Your wisdom and the shield of Your truth and righteousness.

Strengthen our resolve to serve responsibly in the courts of Your kingdom.

Strengthen our will that our service to You will not falter.

Strengthen our hearts that we will show forbearance to each other.

Remind us then that our strength is found only in You, and may we go from strength to strength as Your people and as a country.

We offer this prayer to You in Your strong and holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a)(1)(A) of House Resolution 8, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FOSTER 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.

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 2, 2021.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 2, 2021, at 9:47 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 10.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING MARIA MANZO

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Maria Manzo for 10 years of service to our office, to the communities that we represent in Illinois, and to our country.

Maria was one of the first people who we hired back in the spring of 2008 when I left the crazy business of science to enter the sane and steady business of the United States Congress.

Maria began as our ambassador to the Hispanic communities in Aurora, the second largest city of Illinois, and she now coordinates outreach to all citizens of Illinois' 11th District.

Maria was with me during the terror of the economic collapse, the historic victories of ObamaCare, and the political firestorm that accompanied it. She was with us during the electoral defeats of the Tea Party wave and the electoral victories of our subsequent return to office. Maria is now a steady and trusted voice in our community as we navigate the coronavirus crisis.

During those 10 years, I had the chance to watch Maria's wonderful children, Elijah and Sophia, progress from early childhood to becoming enchanting adults.

Maria Manzo, it has been a great 10 years.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 5 p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 447, NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MORELLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117–3) on the resolution (H. Res. 85) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 447) to amend the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly referred to as the ''National Apprenticeship Act'') and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 447, NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 85 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 85

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 447) to amend the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly referred to as the ''National Apprenticeship Act'') and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except three hours of debate, with two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour, on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by Representative Beyer of Virginia and Representative Schweikert of Arizona or their respective designees.

SEC. 6. Rule XXVIII shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the House of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 7. House Resolution 73 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 8. (a) Clause 3(g)(3)(C) of rule II is amended to read as follows:

''(C) Upon receipt of an appeal pursuant to subdivision (B), the Committee on Ethics shall have a period of 30 calendar days or five legislative days, whichever is later, to consider the appeal. The fine will be upheld unless the appeal is agreed to by a majority of the Committee. Upon a determination regarding the appeal or if no appeal has been filed at the expiration of the period specified in subdivision (B), the chair of the Committee on Ethics shall promptly notify the Member, Delegate, or the Resident Commissioner, the Speaker, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Chief Administrative Officer, and shall make such notification publicly available. The Speaker shall promptly lay such notification before the House.''.

(b) Section 4(a)(2) of House Resolution 38 is amended to read as follows:

''(2) a fine imposed pursuant to this section shall be treated as though imposed under clause 3(g) of rule II, and shall be administered as though pursuant to clause 4(d) of rule II, except that if a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner files an appeal under clause 3(g)(3)(B) of rule II prior to the date on which the Committee on Ethics has adopted written rules, the period for the Committee's consideration of the appeal under clause 3(g)(3)(C) of rule II shall begin on the date on which the chair of the Committee notifies the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner that the Committee has adopted such rules.''.

SEC. 9. Section 5 of House Resolution 8, agreed to January 4, 2021 (as amended by House Resolution 41, agreed to January 13, 2021), is amended by striking ''February 11'' each place that it appears and inserting ''March 12''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, today the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 85, providing for consideration of H.R. 447, the National Apprenticeship Act of 2021, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment by Chairman SCOTT, makes in order 26 amendments, provides en bloc authority to Chairman SCOTT, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 11 under a closed rule. It self-executes a manager's amendment by Chairman YARMUTH. It also provides 3 hours of debate with 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and 1 hour equally divided and controlled by Representatives BEYER of Virginia and SCHWEIKERT of Arizona, or their respective designees.

The rule also provides that H. Res. 73 is hereby adopted. The rule updates the process by which Members can appeal fines for refusing to wear a mask or for taking photographs or recording audio or video on the House floor to align with the Ethics Committee appeal procedures established in H. Res. 73.

Finally, the rule extends standard district work period instructions, same day, and suspension authority through March 12, 2021.

Mr. Speaker, the National Apprenticeship Act is critical workforce development legislation that will invest $3.5 billion to create nearly 1 million new apprenticeship opportunities over the next 5 years. This is a history investment in workforce training, and I am so pleased to support this effort.

Skilled workers are the backbone of our economy. And apprenticeships provide a unique opportunity to grow and expand access to this workforce.

Not only do apprenticeship programs provide pathways to meaningful and sustainable careers, they are critical to expanding our Nation's skilled workforce. When I meet with local businesses in my district in Rochester, New York, I regularly hear that their greatest challenge is finding skilled labor to fill positions and keep their businesses thriving.

Apprenticeships provide an invaluable pathway to engage workers, establish connections with high-demand industries, and set workers on a path to a rewarding and sustainable career.

I note that as the son of an individual who dropped out of high school at the age of 16, my dad, after service in Korea in the United States Army, came home and got involved in an apprenticeship for the Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 13 Union and had a long, long career where he retired at the age of 70 after having supported a family of seven. What was directly responsible for that was the apprenticeship program and his ability to build that sustained career.

I am particularly proud that a bill I introduced with my colleague, Congresswoman TRAHAN, has been included in the text of the National Apprenticeship Act. Our bill helps scale up participation among populations not typically engaged in apprenticeships, particularly small- and medium-sized businesses, and together we can create new opportunities in high-demand industries.

Now, more than ever, these programs are critical to grapple with the long-term economic impacts of COVID–19.

This week we will also begin the next phase of addressing the ongoing COVID–19 pandemic through H. Con. Res. 11, a budget resolution for fiscal year 2021. Passing this budget resolution is a necessary step to fast-track essential COVID relief, the American Rescue Plan.

This plan will deliver the direct support the American public needs, including a national vaccination program, direct aid to individuals and families, housing and nutrition assistance, and expansion and extension of unemployment insurance, small business assistance, and resources to protect first responders and frontline workers.

Our Nation has endured an unprecedented health and economic crisis which has now claimed the lives of nearly half a million Americans. After 11 months, far too many Americans are still barely scraping by or falling further behind, through no fault of their own, as they lose jobs or see smaller paychecks. We need immediate, bold action to change the course of the virus and stabilize our economy.

Beginning the budget reconciliation process does not preclude a strong bipartisan agreement on a relief package that can gain wide support in both the House and the Senate. Let me repeat that. It does not preclude a strong, bipartisan agreement on a relief package that can gain wide support in our House and across the building in the Senate. But it does ensure that Congress will be able to move forward without becoming delayed by partisan gridlock at a time when so many lives and livelihoods are at stake.

The budget resolution before us provides a framework for reconciliation with a target of up to $1.9 trillion, allocated across 12 congressional committees. The resolution instructs these committees to report legislation consistent with their targets to the Budget Committee by February 16. The Budget Committee will then combine the legislation—without substantive revision—and prepare it for floor consideration.

The 2021 budget resolution is not a comprehensive blueprint for the next 10 years. It is designed solely to respond to the ongoing crisis and to deliver critical relief as quickly as possible.

Once we have finished the work of passing a complete COVID response package, I look forward to continuing our work on the Budget Committee to craft a complete forward-looking budget resolution for fiscal year 2022.

□ 1715

We have already lost so much time. Passing this resolution ensures that relief can get to Americans in need, who cannot wait another minute for help.

Mr. Speaker, I would also take a moment to recognize that, less than 1 month ago, this Chamber was besieged by antidemocracy extremists who intended to harm this institution and even kill some of our colleagues.

The rule provides penalties for any Member of the House who endangers colleagues by violating the rules of this Chamber. Members are not, under any circumstances, permitted to bring firearms on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. That has been in law and regulation since 1967.

As President Ronald Reagan said: ''Trust, but verify.''

Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, there should be no problem with requiring Members to walk through metal detectors into the Chamber, ensuring that everyone is following the same rules, ensuring the safety of each and every Member of this body, and ensuring that many members of our staff who work here day in and day out are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and H. Con. Res. 11 and the National Apprenticeship Act.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MORELLE for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of two pieces of legislation. The first, H.R. 447, is the National Apprenticeship Act. The bill seeks to improve and streamline access to apprenticeships. These goals are broadly supported by Members on both sides of the political aisle, in the House and in the Senate.

We considered an almost identical bill in the 116th Congress, which was the previous Congress. At that time, Republicans expressed a desire to work together to achieve the goal of modernizing the National Apprenticeship Program. Since then, the Democrats have pushed through their bill that did nothing to streamline the program, nothing for flexibility for employer-driven apprenticeships.

The bill before us today is largely the same. Rather than work with Republicans in a meaningful way, the majority remains committed to codifying decades of rigid regulations and red tape. The Committee on Education and Labor did not even have a hearing or a markup on this bill before it came before the Committee on Rules, essentially shutting out committee Republicans from the negotiation process entirely—many of whom were new members on the Committee on Education and Labor and did not participate in the discussion in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, between 2009 and 2019, America saw a 128 percent growth in apprenticeships. In September of 2020, the Department of Labor reported that 94 percent of all apprentices who completed their apprenticeship received an average annual salary of $70,000. Today's registered apprenticeship system is an important tool for job seekers and employers.

It does have some flaws, however. In 2019, 252,000 individuals began an apprenticeship. Good for them, but only 81,000 graduated.

This bill would make the apprenticeship system the only registered and Department of Labor-supported apprenticeship option, shutting the door on opportunities for those who participate in nonregistered earn-and-learn programs. While so many in the Nation have lost work due to the economic toll of the pandemic, now is not the time to make it harder to find adequate training by reducing an individual's apprenticeship options.

Mr. Speaker, the National Apprenticeship Act would make this system even less receptive to innovation and create prescriptive requirements on apprenticeships. It also makes it difficult for small and medium-sized businesses to participate, as they do not always have the resources to navigate the lengthy and Byzantine Department of Labor registration process.

America desperately needs more lab technicians. We need more medical assistants. We need more pharmacy technicians. In the middle of a global public health crisis, we cannot afford to stymie motivated future employees.

Republicans agree that this 80-year-old system can and must be improved, but the solutions must be targeted and effective. The majority claims that the increased funding in this legislation will create 1 million apprenticeships. While it is true that the legislation provides significantly more funding, unfortunately, more money alone doesn't guarantee better outcomes if the underlying systems don't work in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of this rule provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 11, establishing a budget for fiscal year 2021, and providing the budget reconciliation instructions for fiscal years 2021 through 2030. Budget reconciliation is a fast-track, budgetary tool used to implement policy changes into law. This procedure requires only 51 votes in the Senate—not the normal 60 votes to break the filibuster, but only 51 votes in the Senate—which, unfortunately, can turn this into a partisan exercise, which is what happened here today.

President Biden has proposed a $1.9 trillion coronavirus relief package, but under the reconciliation instructions included in the resolution, the deficit would increase to between $2 trillion and $3 trillion.

Look, on the west front of the Capitol 2 weeks ago, the President called for unity—his first move. And, today, we see the Democrats employing a partisan process to jam through their wish list of policy priorities.

The Budget Committee has not yet even organized as a committee, but the Committee on Rules adopted a rule to consider budget reconciliation without any prior hearings or markups. This will be the first time since 1974 that Congress has bypassed the Budget Committee and gone straight to the floor with a budget resolution.

In addition, the Democrats did not pass a budget resolution at all for fiscal year 2021. So the budget resolution before us today is exactly 290 days late.

Barely 1 month ago, Congress passed—and President Trump signed into law—a $900 billion coronavirus relief package. Combined with previous relief packages—and there were many—there remains $1 trillion in unspent funding. To my knowledge, there have been very few, if any, authorizing and oversight hearings to account for what funds are needed and how these funds have been spent and ensure they are being used in a way that best benefits the American people.

With all of that as background, then you have to ask yourself: ''Why is it now so urgent to pass another $2 trillion bill?''

Well, the answer lies in the progressive, partisan policy priorities that the majority wants to push through, including raising taxes, increasing the minimum wage, implementing the Green New Deal, providing a path to citizenship for illegal aliens, lowering Medicare eligibility, providing universal basic income, and canceling student loan debt.

But these policies do not address the immediate needs of Americans who are trying to survive the pandemic. Now is not the time to push partisan priorities.

Look, Republicans do stand ready to work with Democrats to provide the needed resources for the American people. Yesterday's visit by 10 Republican senators to the Oval Office and the time that President Biden spent with them certainly should be indicative to people that there is a willingness to work together to solve the problems of the country, but we also are obligated to ensure that the proposals are thoroughly vetted and will be implemented in a way that actually helps rather than further harms our recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I would add that Mr. MORELLE referenced some of the other things contained in the rule. I think it is important that Members understand the threats under which we operate. As such, I, frankly, do not understand why we have not been provided a classified briefing by the Speaker of the House as to what the threats were prior to January 6 and what the threats are going forward. Suffice it to say, that the people's House—the House of Representatives—now is completely on lockdown. There are no people in the people's House other than the Representatives, and that is not the way it was intended.

I think we are owed an explanation for what the level of threat is so that we may adequately prepare ourselves in our personal lives, as well as our work in our districts. I would call upon the Speaker to make such a bipartisan Member briefing available as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I first want to say to the distinguished gentleman, my friend: These are not partisan priorities; these are American priorities.

I doubt very much that most Americans care about the process we use as they struggle to feed their families or as they struggle to pay their rent each month, when they face unemployment that could be extended. But here is an opportunity for us to work together. This is the beginning of the process, and we will continue to encourage bipartisan discussion on a budget resolution that provides meaningful relief for millions of Americans affected by this virus.

As it relates to the National Apprenticeship Act, I would also suggest that this is a bipartisan bill. I can name the Members of my colleagues across the aisle: Mr. FITZPATRICK; Mr. MCKINLEY; Members Bacon and Bost; my friend, RODNEY DAVIS, from Illinois; JOHN KATKO, whose district abuts mine; ANDY GARBARINO, my friend from New York; Representatives STAUBER, KINZINGER, STIVERS—all Republicans who support and sponsor the National Apprenticeship Act. So this is a bipartisan bill, and I will continue to advocate for its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I support the underlying measures before us today, but I take a moment to discuss something else included here.

Mr. Speaker, just outside these doors is something students walk through every day to prevent gun violence in their schools, something travelers pass through every time they board an airplane, and something the public goes through every time they enter a Federal building:

Magnetometers. Metal detectors.

They are a modern-day inconvenience that we are all used to, and, frankly, they are a small price to pay to keep Americans safe.

Metal detectors were installed outside this Chamber following the recent deadly insurrection at the Capitol. Although these machines are new, the policy they are enforcing is not. That has been on the books for more than 50 years.

President Lyndon Johnson signed a law outlawing weapons on Capitol grounds back in 1967. The Capitol Police Board, the entity that oversees security regulations in the complex, then issued regulations soon after. They prohibited firearms from being carried into the Chamber and in the connected rooms and galleries.

Mr. Speaker, now some Members, like myself, want to see these regulations go further. Representatives HUFFMAN and SPEIER have been instrumental on this front, and I hope that we act. Others want no prohibitions at all.

Mr. Speaker, regardless, the rules are the rules. I thought that was clear, but apparently some of my friends on the other side think differently. Some are acting as though, by being elected to Congress, they have been anointed to some sort of special club, one that gets to pick and choose what rules to follow.

A Member on the other side ran an ad depicting her walking around our Nation's Capital with a loaded firearm,

tweeting: ''Let me tell you why I will carry my Glock to Congress.''

Another Republican recently bragged that he was armed during the recent riots, and another was stopped by Capitol Police bringing a gun into this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on. We have people in this Chamber who have posted disturbing and threatening rhetoric against Members of this body. And there is speculation that maybe some Members were complicit with those who attacked the Capitol on January 6. You know, these words and actions raise serious safety concerns.

Mr. Speaker, these metal detectors are manned by the same police officers who saved our lives during the insurrection while risking their own, yet some Members on the other side have disrespected these Capitol Police Officers, verbally abused them, pushed them aside, and disregarded their orders, all to avoid this basic safety measure. That is no way to treat our heroes.

Some of these very same Members have been quick to send press releases and cut advertisements about the need to respect the police; but here in these Halls, when they think no one is watching, apparently their message is different. It is: ''Do as I say, not as I do.''

Mr. Speaker, that is why we must act today. This isn't a messaging bill. This is as serious as it gets. This elitist mentality must end.

□ 1730

Apparently, it will take a rules change to ensure that all Members follow the rules just like everyone else.

Included in this measure is language to change the rules to fine Members who interfere with the Capitol Police's ability to do their jobs at the magnetometers outside this Chamber: $5,000 for the first offense, $10,000 for each one thereafter.

This is modeled after a change my Republican friends made in the 115th Congress, which fined Members for taking photos or videos on the floor.

We are taking steps to make sure this process is transparent and fair. Violations will be posted online, and Members will have the chance to have their appeal considered by the bipartisan Ethics Committee.

And let me assure all Americans that these fines will be paid directly by Members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not a mind reader, but I have been here long enough to know how this debate will go. Some on the other side will act like this is some grand inconvenience. Tell that to the millions of Americans who go through metal detectors every day in this country.

Why are you any different? Give me a break.

We need to protect not just Members but staff and all the people who work up here. We need to protect our constituents and the public who visit the people's House.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support this change. The rules apply to us, too, and it is time all of us acted like it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the distinguished Member from Texas, for yielding.

Today's rule sets in motion a process for considering H. Con. Res. 11, a shell budget for fiscal year 2021. I understand that the majority's stated intent in bringing forward this resolution is to pave the way for using budget reconciliation to push through a partisan COVID–19 relief package. Unfortunately, I think the majority's intent is misguided.

I want to remind us all that the only reason we are here today is that the majority failed to pass a budget last year. As of today, we are nearly 9½ months overdue for the passage of the budget for fiscal year 2021, and fiscal year 2021 is already a third of the way over. Hardly an auspicious start for an item as serious as the annual budget for the United States Government.

But the lack of expeditiousness that characterized the budget in the 116th Congress has been replaced by hastiness. The majority is now, in the 117th Congress, rushing forward with a new budget despite never bothering to convene the Budget Committee. Indeed, the Budget Committee has yet to meet in this Congress, much less conduct normal hearings that pave the way for the markup of the annual budget.

Rather than undertake the normal process through the Budget Committee, the majority is instead airdropping a budget straight from leadership offices directly onto the floor. This is hardly the kind of process considered to be regular order, and it fails to give Members a chance to have their ideas considered in committee or to offer amendments on the floor.

Indeed, as a longtime member of the Budget Committee myself, I looked forward to our hearings on the budget and the markup. Through this process, Members had the opportunity to consider the budget, consider expert testimony, offer ideas, and propose amendments to be considered by the whole committee. That the majority is failing to do so makes a mockery out of the entire budgeting process.

Over the past year, Congress has shown it can work together to produce bipartisan legislation. In the last Congress, we actually passed five COVID–19 relief bills that appropriated nearly $4 trillion in relief funds. Not all of these funds have yet been spent. Not even close, Mr. Speaker. And the $4 trillion number is right around the annual budgetary outlays of the Federal Government in a normal year, covering both mandatory and discretionary spending.

Yet, the majority is moving forward with yet another bill and seems determined to ensure that this bill enshrines as many partisan policy priorities as possible.

To make matters worse, from looking at the actual budget before us, we do not know what these partisan priorities are. We know the budget includes instructions to committees to increase spending by certain amounts, but it does not offer any guidance on how they should do so.

Will it encompass only COVID relief matters, or will they enact progressive policy goals like Medicare for All or the Green New Deal? We have no way of knowing.

We do know that Senator BERNIE SANDERS, the socialist leader of the Senate Budget Committee, wants to use reconciliation to ram through a $15 minimum wage, a measure that would be a disaster for workers and businesses alike in my home State of Oklahoma. But what else may be included in the bill is a mystery.

Mr. Speaker, this process hardly befits the bipartisanship that we were promised by President Biden. It has been less than 2 weeks since the new President was inaugurated, and already we are seeing the majority abandoning any pretense at bipartisanship.

The House majority has failed to even propose a bipartisan COVID relief bill or to engage Republicans in serious negotiations. Instead, they have simply predetermined the outcome and are moving forward with their own partisan bill without even pretending to try to work with those of us on my side of the aisle.

This is hardly what we were promised, Mr. Speaker. It is hardly what the institution was promised. And on a matter as important as the annual budget of the United States, and during a pandemic as deadly and serious as the one we are currently living through, I know the institution can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this course and work together and pass real bipartisan legislation that will benefit all Americans.

Today's rule also adds a change in the House rules, imposing serious fines on Members who fail to go through the new magnetometers around the Chamber. Mr. Speaker, as I told my colleagues on the Rules Committee a short time ago, I don't disagree with the additional security measures to keep Members and staff safe. However, I do have concerns over how the new measures are being implemented.

Earlier this afternoon, I offered an amendment to this rule which would have instructed the House Committee on Administration to review the matter and make appropriate recommendations. I have no issue whatsoever with Members being subjected to the same requirements as staff and our constituents when they enter the Capitol, but I have serious concerns that the majority's proposed solution is untenable.

Requiring Members to pass through a magnetometer each time they enter

the House Chamber, even if they haven't left the area, is a sure recipe for chaos. It is impossible for Members to socially distance when they are stacked up in a line to await their turn at passing through the metal detectors.

When Members need to leave the Chamber to make a phone call right outside the doorway, they have to reenter and pass through security again. And there are hardworking staff members who work just a few feet away from the House Chamber but must pass through these same magnetometers every time they need to run to their offices and then back to the floor. This is a clear recipe for disorganization and gridlock.

But this need not be the only option, Mr. Speaker. There are already existing metal detectors and X-ray machines at entrances to the building. Why can't Members be screened at those entrances instead? Why must it be right on the way to the very cusp of the Chamber in a location guaranteed to stack up Members outside the door waiting to get in?

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, we have better alternatives, and I urge that we empower the Committee on House Administration to look at that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the rejection of the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will admit that there are few people I respect more than my distinguished colleague and friend from the Rules Committee, the ranking member, Mr. COLE.

But I think as it relates to the budget, as I understand it, the Budget Committee chair, Mr. YARMUTH, has continued to extend an invitation to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work together.

And we do want to work together. We want to forge a bipartisan agreement. This today begins a process, however, that can move us toward reconciliation because we understand that the American people are in crisis. America is in crisis.

So while we need to move ahead, and we would like to move ahead with a bipartisan agreement, we cannot sit idly by in the instance that progress is not made.

I think it was President Kennedy in his inauguration, nearly 60 years ago, who said, ''Sincerity is always subject to proof.'' So prove to us your sincerity. Let's work together. And in the interim, we are going to move ahead with this resolution with the support of the Members, and I certainly hope that they will do that.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), my new favorite ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and we are thrilled that he is on the Budget Committee.

The rule puts in motion a process to spend trillions of dollars on a progressive wish list, all under the appearance of pandemic relief. And for what?

We know all five of the last COVID-related pieces of legislation were done on a bipartisan basis. In the last few days, we have seen a framework from 10 Republican Senators laid out to get to a solution.

The fact that we are moving forward with this process just goes to show that yesterday's White House meeting was just a photo-op for the President.

Sadly, the Democrat majority seems to want to go a partisan route in both the House and Senate because they know there is not a bipartisan consensus in this country for the socialist policies they want to include, giveaways to their base, the far left and the coastal elite.

Just look at what is being discussed by Democrats on how they plan to use the budgeting process known as reconciliation, a mechanism traditionally used to control spending and address the debt. They now talk openly about granting mass amnesty; growing the control government has over your healthcare; adding new burdens, rules, and costs on the very small businesses that they have shut down; and bailing out their political allies whose policies destroyed local economies.

All of this they want to somehow hide from the American people with the label of essential items for pandemic relief.

And the rule we are debating right now rewards this process. It is the first step in allowing Washington Democrats to jam this radical agenda through Congress at lightning speed.

I ask the Chair, where was the rush to help American families when the Speaker was holding up support for direct aid to working-class families all spring, all summer, and all fall, eventually dropping her price tag and objections only after the first Tuesday in November? The first Tuesday in November happens to be election day.

I have always kept one motto in my heart as I approach this job: Put people before politics. Unfortunately, what we are seeing from the Democrats is the exact opposite; it is all politics.

In more than 30 years, a budget has not originated in the House that has not first gone through the committee process. This is truly a first. The Budget Committee has yet to even meet, to organize, to set our rules, and to ratify an agenda of oversight of the new administration.

So why are we standing here right now? Why are we moving ahead like this when the President, in his inaugural address, called for unity and spoke about the power of our example? The answer is simple: So that Democrat leaders can spend more on a bunch of programs, ideas, and systems, which they have dreamed about throwing taxpayer money at since they took control of this Chamber 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this. The Democrats talk about unification, the need to unify as a Congress and work together, the need to unify as a country and learn to respect one another again for the good of America. But when their actions don't match their words, the value of every word they say from that point forward becomes meaningless.

The actions of the Democrat majority, to start a process which will only end in more divisive partisanship, is the exact opposite of what our country is asking for right now.

□ 1745

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

Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman's point, I appreciate the passion with which the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee makes his argument, but why are we moving ahead, he asked.

Why we are moving ahead today?

The President ran on this very relief agenda and won the popular vote in the United States by more than 8 million votes. We are moving ahead because elections do matter, and the argument that President Biden made is that this country needed swift, significant, and robust relief. That is why we are moving ahead.

Now, I will continue to say—and I am sure my colleagues will continue to say—that the Democrat majority invites bipartisan conversation. We would invite all the Members on the other side to come together in a meaningful way to talk about unemployment insurance for the millions of Americans who are out of work, through no fault of their own—millions.

Hundreds of thousands are filing every week for the first time. Millions of Americans don't have enough food on the table. One out of every eight Americans are saying they don't have enough money for food to put on the table.

This is for the millions of Americans who don't have enough money to pay their rent or pay their mortgage, and for the millions of small businesses—or the tens of thousands of small businesses struggling every single week, again, through no fault of their own.

Why are we moving ahead today?

Because there is no more time left on the clock. We need to move ahead in order to provide the substantial relief.

I would also suggest that those who will say that this is too expensive, you only look to find economists all over this country beginning with the head of the Federal Reserve, Jerome Powell, who was appointed by the President to his position, who has consistently said that the worst thing we can do is make too small of an investment. We must

make a robust investment. It is what President Bident talked about repeatedly through this campaign.

There is no hidden agenda here. This is, in fact, the agenda that was talked about repeatedly throughout the campaign. The American public resoundingly responded to the package that the President has now put forward, the package which we would like to take up. We would certainly like to do it with our brothers and sisters on the other side of the aisle, but we are prepared, if not, to respond to the needs of millions of Americans who are in crisis.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA), who is a new, freshman member of the Republican Conference, to give what I believe is his first speech on the House floor.

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this proposed rule, which begins laying the framework for one of the largest spending bills in the history of this institution. It is nearly $2 trillion being dishonestly sold to the people as COVID relief.

With a price tag this big, Mr. Speaker, you would think that the House Democrats would want this bill to go through the committee process where Congress and the public can digest this information. But no. They are attempting to fast-track this bill to make decisions with no committee, no bipartisanship, no oversight, and no discussion.

Mr. Speaker, this is American taxpayers' money, not government's, and it is being spent with no accountability and no transparency.

The bottom line is that the hardworking, taxpaying Americans deserve to have a voice in this process, and I will fight against attempts to fast-track this bloated bill every step of the way.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to encourage local educational agencies to resume in-person instruction in elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of my amendment, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON), who is here to explain the amendment.

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the previous question, and I do so in support of our students.

Our amendment would ensure that students get back in schools safely and soon. Students have been out of the classroom for far too long, and the costs of at-home learning are far greater than we could have ever imagined, especially when it comes to mental health for our kids.

My bill, the Reopen Schools Act, would prioritize State COVID relief grants for education for schools that are reopening. It would require schools to offer at least partial in-person learning in order to receive these Federal pandemic relief funds. These funds were intended to help students get back into the classroom safely, taking important precautions.

Congress sent States this money so we could reopen schools safely, yet this hasn't happened in so many communities across our country.

I am so proud of our home State of Iowa for already taking a stand for students and requiring schools to offer an in-person learning option. But The Washington Post found that roughly one-third of all K–12 school districts in the United States right now are only offering virtual learning. So this means one-third of our classrooms are closed and one-third of our school playgrounds are still roped off.

The cost of this goes well beyond academics. Child depression, anxiety, and other mental health challenges are surging. The science shows kids need to be back in school.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa.

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, even the CDC has confirmed that young kids have an extremely low infection rate right now, a low transmission rate, and a low rate of serious illness from COVID–19. Yet they are forced to stay home and learn from behind a computer screen, that is if these kids have access to computers and broadband internet.

For many students, especially those in rural Iowa, virtual learning is not easy. It is not just going downstairs and logging onto the family computer. It is sitting in the parking lot of the Cedar Rapids Public Library, logging onto the WiFi to finish homework or take a test.

So it is no surprise that our most vulnerable students are the ones who will suffer the most and are suffering the most. Isolation, lack of social support, added stress, and environmental strain of this lockdown have gone on far too long. Kids and families are suffering.

As a mom of two school-age kids, this issue is personal to me. This issue is personal to all parents, and it is personal to all families who care about their kids' well-being. Kids need to be in school. We can get them back behind a desk instead of in front of a screen, and we can do so safely. That is exactly why we allocated funds for this purpose.

It is past time for States and local school districts to stop hoarding these resources and use them for their intended purpose: To pay for science-based safety measures that get students and teachers back in the classroom with less risk.

That is why my bill would condition a portion of the $54 billion Congress sent to States for K–12 schools in December on reopening their doors. One-third of the education funds provided would be immediately available right now with the remaining two-thirds available to schools in increasing amounts as they move to reopen. Schools with at least 50 percent of students attending in person at least 50 percent of the time would receive the full amount of funding. Parents and students want to return to the classroom. My bill will help make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting our students by defeating the previous question, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans agree that apprenticeships are vital to American livelihoods and our national interests. We agree that reforms to these programs are necessary and prudent. It is time to update the apprenticeship program to better reflect the needs of employers and the needs of our Nation. Republicans stand ready to negotiate. Now is the time to give Americans opportunities to succeed, and I sincerely hope that we will do just that.

To recover from this pandemic, we must also not push through policies that do not address the immediate needs of the American people. The budget reconciliation resolution provided for in this rule will drastically increase the deficit and seek to implement nonessential partisan policy priorities without first conducting the necessary authorization hearings and conducting the necessary oversight to ensure that current funding is spent effectively and efficiently.

After the multiple calls for unity, it is disappointing that the first move that we are seeing from the majority in this Congress is to employ this partisan procedural process. I do hope they reconsider and come back to the negotiating table through regular order.

Let me just also ask again that the Speaker allow Members to be briefed by the appropriate law enforcement agencies as to exactly what the threats are here in the Nation's Capital. I think we would all benefit from that not just in our work here in Washington, D.C., but also when we work with constituents and staff back in our districts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question, a ''no'' vote on the rule, and a ''no'' vote on the underlying measures.

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

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

Once again, I just say that those Americans who are watching what we do here today and over the next several days, they are going to be asking the question: What are you doing in Washington that will help the average man or woman and child who suffers the ravages of this disease and the economic fallout?

When I talk to people in Rochester, New York—and I am sure when each of us goes back to our home districts—people aren't asking about the nuance of legislative procedures. They are asking about what the government is going to do for them as we face the greatest pandemic in a century and the greatest economic challenge in nearly a century both at the same time. We have so many other challenges as well, but the House of Representatives is going to move forward. This resolution does that. It says that we will certainly encourage bipartisan agreements, bipartisan conversations, and bipartisan action.

The President's conversations with members of the Senate yesterday indicate his willingness to do that. But we cannot wait. We have waited far too long. Too many Americans have died and too many families have faced the crisis of their lifetimes because of the inaction here in Washington. So we must move ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their support of the rule before us today. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and a ''yes'' vote on the previous question.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary, on Homeland Security, on the Budget, and as the Member of Congress for a congressional district that has experienced the worst of COVID–19 as a public health emergency and economic catastrophe, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate on H.R. 447, the National Appenticeship Act of 2121, and H. Con. Res. 11, 447, as well as the underlying legislation.

The National Apprenticeship Act has the potential to yield $10.6 billion in net benefits to U.S. taxpayers in the form of increased workers productivity and decreased spending on public-assistance programs and unemployment insurance and which bring America's investments in apprenticeship more in line with countries around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation could not be more timely because during a time of record unemployment, the National Apprenticeship Act of 2021 creates an additional 1 million new apprenticeship opportunities and invests more than $3.5 billion over 5 years in expanding opportunities and access to Registered Apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeships.

I also strongly support H. Con. Res. 11 because it reorders budgetary priorities to provide $1.9 trillion to allow Congress to take immediate and decisive action to crush the virus and vaccinate our people, build the economy back better, reopen schools, and provide needed support and assistance to state and local governments that have been asked to do too much with too little for far too long.

Let me make clear at the outset Mr. Speaker, that nothing in this resolution precludes the reaching of a bipartisan and bicameral agreement to pass and fund the President's America Rescue Plan, which in nearly all material respects mirrors the Heroes Act passed by the House Democratic majority on May 15, 2020, nearly nine months ago, only to languish on the Republican Senate Majority Leader's desk while hundreds of thousands of our fellow Americans succumbed to the virus and millions of others lost their livelihoods and businesses, and everyone faced an uncertain future.

So if our Republican colleagues are amenable to reaching an agreement on a legislative response that is commensurate to the challenge facing Americans, nothing in the legislation before will preclude that from happening.

But have no doubt, if they refuse to be part of the solution, the unified and bicameral Democratic congressional majority, in coordination with the new Democratic Administration, will take the lead and act boldly to address and overcome the present crisis.

I would urge my Republican colleagues to heed the words of Republican Governor of West Virginia who said colorfully just a few days ago, "At this point in time in this nation, we need to go big. We need to quit counting the egg-sucking legs on the cows and count the cows and just move. And move forward and move right now."

The same sentiment was expressed more eloquently by Abraham Lincoln in 1862 when he memorably wrote:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan action we took last December was a step in the right direction but only a long-delayed down payment; we cannot afford any more delays, especially since Republican stalling already caused a painful lapse in critical unemployment assistance last year, and additional unemployment assistance is set to expire in March.

That why this resolution, which creates a failsafe alternative to debating, voting, and passing the American Rescue Act, is absolutely crucial and the right thing to do, right now.

The American Rescue Plan proposed by President Biden takes a multiprong approach to tackling the public health and economic crises stemming from the COVID–19 pandemic.

To beat the virus and safely reopen schools, the plan will mount a national vaccination program that includes setting up community vaccination sites nationwide and makes the investments necessary to safely reopen schools.

It will also take complementary measures to combat the virus, including scaling up testing and tracing, addressing shortages of personal protective equipment and other critical supplies, investing in high-quality treatments, and addressing health care disparities.

The American Rescue Plan delivers immediate relief to working families bearing the brunt of the crisis by providing $1,400 per person in direct cash assistance to households across America, bringing the total (including the $600 down payment enacted in December) to $2,000.

Additionally, the plan will also provide direct housing and nutrition assistance to families struggling to get by, expand access to safe and reliable child care and affordable health care, extend and expand unemployment insurance so American workers can pay their bills, and give families with children as well as childless workers a boost through enhanced tax credits.

Mr. Speaker, the American Rescue Plan provides much needed support for communities struggling with the economic fallout, including hard-hit small businesses, especially those owned by entrepreneurs from racial and ethnic backgrounds that have experienced systemic discrimination.

Finally, the plan also provides crucial resources to protect the jobs of first responders, frontline public health workers, teachers, transit workers, and other essential workers that all Americans depend on.

The 2021 budget resolution is not a comprehensive fiscal blueprint for the next 10 years; it is designed solely to provide the option of using reconciliation to deliver critical relief and achieve the goals of the American Rescue Plan.

As such, the total spending and revenue levels in the resolution simply reflect current-law projections adjusted for the estimated costs of the American Rescue Plan.

Once the American Rescue Plan becomes law, Congress will begin its work on a forward-looking, comprehensive budget resolution for 2022 that will provide urgently needed economic support and address longstanding deficits in our communities and underlying inequities in our society, which have been so starkly revealed and exacerbated by COVID–19.

I strongly support this legislation and urge all Members to join me in voting for its passage.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BURGESS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 85

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 682) to encourage local educational agencies to resume in-person instruction at elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 682.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 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. CUELLAR) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 447, NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 85) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 447) to amend the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly referred to as the ''National Apprenticeship Act'') and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 207, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—207

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—5

Gosar
Obernolte
Ryan
Westerman
Wright

□ 1922

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Stevens)
Barragán (Beyer)
Bowman (Clark (MA))
Buchanan (Arrington)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carson (Butterfield)
Cartwright (Doyle, Michael F.)
Cohen (Beyer)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
DesJarlais (Kustoff)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Dingell (Stevens)
Fallon (Nehls)
Fleischmann (Kustoff)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gallego (Gomez)
Gonzalez, Vicente (Gomez)
Gottheimer (Panetta)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Hayes (Courtney)
Houlahan (Wild)
Jayapal (Clark (MA))
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Jones (Jacobs (CA))
Keating (Clark (MA))
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Kuster (Clark (MA))
Langevin (Courtney)
Larson (CT) (Courtney)
Lawrence (Kildee)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Long (Wagner)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Lynch (Clark (MA))
Maloney, Carolyn B. (Jeffries)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meeks (Jeffries)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Brown)
Moulton (Beyer)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano (Correa)
Ocasio-Cortez (García (IL))
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Speier (Scanlon)
Suozzi (Panetta)

Titus (Connolly)
Tonko (Pallone)
Torres (NY) (Auchincloss)
Trahan (McGovern)
Vargas (Correa)
Vela (Gomez)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Adams)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 210, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—216

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—210

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Beatty
Gosar
Obernolte
Ryan
Westerman
Wright

□ 2004

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for missing the votes on February 2, 2021, regarding the passage of the previous question and rule providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 11 and H.R. 447. I missed these votes because I was with my son as he signed his offer to play collegiate football. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 19, and "nay" on rollcall No. 20.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Stevens)
Barragán (Beyer)
Bowman (Clark (MA))
Buchanan (Arrington)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carson (Butterfield)
Cartwright (Doyle, Michael F.)
Cohen (Beyer)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
DesJarlais (Kustoff)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Dingell (Stevens)
Fallon (Nehls)
Fleischmann (Kustoff)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gallego (Gomez)
Gonzalez, Vicente (Gomez)
Gottheimer (Panetta)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Hayes (Courtney)
Houlahan (Wild)
Jayapal (Clark (MA))
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Jones (Jacobs (CA))
Keating (Clark (MA))
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Kuster (Clark (MA))
Langevin (Courtney)
Larson (CT) (Courtney)
Lawrence (Kildee)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Long (Wagner)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Lynch (Clark (MA))
Maloney, Carolyn B. (Jeffries)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meeks (Jeffries)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Brown)
Moulton (Beyer)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano (Correa)
Ocasio-Cortez (García (IL))
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Speier (Scanlon)
Suozzi (Panetta)
Titus (Connolly)
Tonko (Pallone)
Torres (NY) (Auchincloss)
Trahan (McGovern)
Vargas (Correa)
Vela (Gomez)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Adams)

PROVIDING THE SERGEANT-AT-ARMS WITH THE AUTHORITY TO FINE MEMBERS, DELEGATES, OR THE RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FOR FAILURE TO COMPLETE SECURITY SCREENING FOR ENTRANCE TO THE HOUSE CHAMBER, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 85, House Resolution 73 is hereby adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 73

Resolved,

SECTION 1. IMPOSITION OF FINES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLETE SECURITY SCREENING FOR ENTRANCE TO HOUSE CHAMBER.

(a) IMPOSITION BY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.—(1) The Sergeant-at-Arms is authorized and directed to impose a fine against a Member, Delegate, or the Resident Commissioner for failure to complete security screening for entrance to the House Chamber.

(2) A fine imposed pursuant to this resolution shall be $5,000 for a first offense and $10,000 for any subsequent offense.

(3) The Sergeant-at-Arms shall promptly notify in writing the Member, Delegate, or the Resident Commissioner, the Speaker, the Committee on Ethics, and the Chief Administrative Officer of any fine under this subsection. Such notification shall include findings detailing the violation and shall also be made publicly available by the chair of the Committee on Ethics.

(b) APPEAL TO COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—(1) The Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may appeal the fine imposed under subsection (a) in writing to the Committee on Ethics not later than 30 calendar days or five legislative days, whichever is later, after notification pursuant to subsection (a)(3). Such appeal shall include a response to the findings issued by the Sergeant-at-Arms pursuant to such paragraph.

(2) Upon receipt of an appeal pursuant to paragraph (1), the Committee on Ethics shall

have a period of 30 calendar days or five legislative days, whichever is later, to consider the appeal. The fine will be upheld unless the appeal is agreed to by a majority of the Committee. Upon a determination regarding the appeal or if no appeal has been filed at the expiration of the period specified in paragraph (1), the chair of the Committee on Ethics shall promptly notify the Member, Delegate, or the Resident Commissioner, the Speaker, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Chief Administrative Officer, and shall make such notification publicly available. The Speaker shall promptly lay such notification before the House.

(3) If a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner files an appeal under paragraph (1) prior to the date on which the Committee on Ethics has adopted written rules, the period for the Committee's consideration of the appeal under paragraph (2) shall begin on the date on which the chair of the Committee notifies the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner that the Committee has adopted such rules.

(c) DEDUCTING FINE FROM PAY.—(1) If a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner against whom a fine is imposed by the Sergeant-at-Arms under subsection (a) has not paid the fine prior to the expiration of the 90-calendar day period which begins on the date described in paragraph (2), the Chief Administrative Officer shall deduct the amount of the fine from the net salary otherwise due the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in accordance with timetables and procedures established by the Committee on House Administration for purposes of carrying out this subsection.

(2) The date described in this paragraph is, with respect to a fine imposed on a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner—

(A) the date of the determination of the Committee on Ethics under subsection (b)(2); or

(B) if the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner does not file an appeal with the Committee on Ethics prior to the expiration of the period specified in subsection (b)(1), the first day after the expiration of such period.

(d) PROHIBITING USE OF CAMPAIGN OR OFFICIAL FUNDS TO PAY FINES.—A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not use campaign funds or official funds, including amounts in the Members' Representational Allowance, to pay a fine imposed under this resolution.

(e) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Sergeant-at-Arms, Committee on Ethics, Committee on House Administration, and Chief Administrative Officer are authorized to establish policies and procedures for the implementation of this resolution.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 366

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 366.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is accepted.

REGULATIONS FOR SUPPORTING SENATE MEASURES PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2021.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 3(x) of House Resolution 8, 117th Congress, I hereby submit the following regulations regarding Member support for Senate measures for printing in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules.

SUPPORT FOR SENATE MEASURES REGULATIONS PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8

A. SENATE MEASURES AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT

1. A Member may indicate support only for a Senate measure (S., S.J. Res., or S. Con. Res.) that has been received in the House until adjournment of the legislative day on which the first of the following occurs:

i. The measure has been reported from all committees it was referred to in the House;

ii. The measure has passed the House; or

iii. The House has begun consideration of the measure pursuant to a Rule.

B. SUBMISSION OF SUPPORT FOR SENATE MEASURE FORM

1. A Member seeking to indicate support for a Senate measure may use the House Member Support for Senate Measure form made available by the Clerk.

i. Members must submit one form per supported Senate measure. Forms with more than one measure number will not be processed.

ii. Members may only indicate their own support for a Senate measure. Forms with more names than that of the Member submitting the form will not be processed.

2. The Member's signature is required. Any form submitted without the Member's signature will not be processed. Signatures may be submitted by:

i. Affixing the Member's signature on each form; or

ii. Completing an accompanying Staff Authorization Form.

3. A completed form can be submitted while the House is in session by:

i. Submitting the form via email to the inbox designated by the Clerk for this purpose; or

ii. Placing the form in the hopper on the rostrum.

C. WITHDRAWAL OF SUPPORT FOR SENATE MEASURE

1. A Member may indicate withdrawal of support for a Senate measure only when the House is in session until adjournment of the legislative day on which the first of the following occurs:

i. The measure has been reported from all committees it was referred to in the House;

ii. The measure has passed the House; or

iii. The House has begun consideration of the measure pursuant to a Rule.

2. A Member may indicate withdrawal of support for a Senate measure by submitting their withdrawal of support in writing as if pursuant to regulation B.3.

D. PUBLICLY AVAILABLE LIST

1. A list of individual Members indicating support for a specific Senate measure will be made publicly available on that measure's page on Congress.gov. Updates will be visible beginning on the day following receipt of the House Member Support (or Withdrawal) for Senate Measure form.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a)(1)(B) of House Resolution 8, the House stands adjourned until 1 p.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 2021, at 1 p.m.

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. MORELLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 85. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 447) to amend the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly referred to as the ''National Apprenticeship Act'') and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; and for other purposes (Rept. 117–3). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 682. A bill to encourage local educational agencies to resume in-person instruction at elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 683. A bill to promote diversity in the national apprenticeship system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. CHENEY, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. STEIL, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. NORMAN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. DUNN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BRADY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. EMMER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BANKS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MANN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HERN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. LONG, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ESTES, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HILL, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. CLINE, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 684. A bill to authorize the Keystone XL Pipeline; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to

the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, 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. AXNE (for herself, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 685. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt a portion of unemployment compensation received during 2020 from income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. LIEU):

H.R. 686. A bill to amend the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 to authorize the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make security clearance determinations and access determinations for political appointees in the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. BUCK (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STEUBE, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 687. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, by increasing the maximum term of imprisonment for the offense of rioting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 688. A bill to permit a licensed health care provider to provide health care services to individuals in one or more States in which the provider is not licensed; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 689. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Patient and State Stability Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 690. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the maximum penalty for mail theft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 691. A bill to expand opportunities for pre-apprenticeships programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. CHENEY (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ESTES, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 692. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide a rule to determine venue for a proceeding for judicial review of certain agency actions; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. PORTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. KHANNA, and Mrs. TORRES of California):

H.R. 693. A bill to establish as a unit of the National Park System the San Gabriel National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEYER, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 694. A bill to amend the Passenger Rail Investment Improvement Act of 2008 to prohibit certain funding to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority until certain conditions are met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. REED, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STANTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DEAN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. BOST, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. WEXTON, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. PINGREE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. KIND, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CASE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. WILD, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KATKO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CROW, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. PORTER, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. BASS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAMB, Mr. VELA, Ms. OMAR, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. TURNER, Ms. ROSS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BERA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. EMMER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LIEU, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BACON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. MANNING, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CORREA, Mr. GARBARINO, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 695. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to repeal the requirement that the United States Postal Service prepay future retirement benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LIEU, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 696. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a limitation on excess business losses of non-corporate taxpayers and to modify the carryback of net operating losses for certain taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 697. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CHU, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 698. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the alternative

fuel refueling property credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 699. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to provide complaint and burden of proof requirements for certain actions for breach of fiduciary duty; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 700. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 303 East Mississippi Avenue in Elwood, Illinois, as the ''Lawrence M. 'Larry' Walsh Sr. Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 701. A bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 to provide for regulatory impact analyses for certain rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 702. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to award grants to develop, administer, and evaluate early childhood education apprenticeships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 703. A bill to ensure access to apprenticeships for underrepresented groups, eliminate barriers and ensure completion of apprenticeships, and invest in successful apprenticeship intermediaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Ms. MACE):

H.R. 704. A bill to amend section 708 of title 17, United States Code, to permit the Register of Copyrights to waive fees for filing an application for registration of a copyright claim in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LONG, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DUNN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. COLE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BANKS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. BACON, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 705. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit abortion in cases where a fetal heartbeat is detectable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 706. A bill to authorize grants to address substance use during COVID-19; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mr. STEWART, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOST, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COLE, Mr. COMER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DUNN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUEST, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mrs. HINSON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LONG, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. MENG, Mr. MEUSER, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIFFANY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. WILD, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. BACON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GIBBS, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MAST, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POSEY, Ms. PRESSLEY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 707. 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 highly distinguished service as a ''Ghost Army'' that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 708. A bill to provide temporary licensing reciprocity for telehealth and interstate health care treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 709. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform certain asylum procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. DEAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIEU, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 710. A bill to create a Coronavirus Containment Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Natural Resources, 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. LIEU:

H.R. 711. A bill to amend the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016 to authorize the use of certain funds received pursuant to leases entered into under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 712. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to provide for a report on the health impacts of air traffic noise and pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 713. A bill to promote accountability and transparency in future executive orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 714. A bill to promote accountability and transparency in future executive orders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 715. A bill to promote accountability and transparency in future executive orders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 716. A bill to promote accountability and transparency in future executive orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 717. A bill to promote accountability and transparency in future executive orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 718. A bill to promote accountability and transparency in future executive orders; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself, Mr. ROY, and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 719. A bill to allow States to approve the use of diagnostic tests during a public health emergency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LAMB, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SUOZZI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 720. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to enter into contracts with industry intermediaries for purposes of promoting the development of and access to apprenticeships in the technology sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. DEAN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SABLAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RYAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CROW, Ms. PORTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LIEU, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. WILD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. CHU, Mr. MAST, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 721. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 722. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to require coverage under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program for vaccines and treatment for COVID-19 without the imposition of cost sharing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 723. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to require States to compare information regarding Federal inmates for purposes of combating fraud in unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 724. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for reciprocal marketing approval of certain drugs, biological products, and devices that are authorized to be lawfully marketed abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BANKS, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. CURTIS, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and improve health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 726. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to eligible entities to conduct diagnostic testing for COVID-19, and related activities such as contact tracing, through mobile health units and, as necessary, at individuals' residences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:

H.R. 727. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure communications accessibility for residents of skilled nursing facilities during the COVID-19 emergency period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 728. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Emergency Office of Manufacturing for Public Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. MENG, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. COOPER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RYAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. VELA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. ROSS, Ms. WILD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. OMAR, Ms. DEAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 729. A bill to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. STEVENS):

H.R. 730. A bill to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore the right to individual civil actions in cases involving disparate impact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 731. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to make grants to eligible applicants to provide stipends to individuals enrolled in a pre-apprenticeship program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JONES, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 732. A bill to prohibit unconscionable pricing of emergency supplies for responders during a Federal emergency period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEIL (for himself, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. HILL, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 733. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to require special measures for domestic financial institutions in connection with INSTEX, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 734. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his contributions to civil rights, his loyalty and patriotism to the Nation, and his dedication to justice and equality; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. BERA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CHU, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 735. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 502 East Cotati Avenue in Cotati, California, as the ''Arthur Luis Ibleto Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 736. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to covered health departments to increase the rate of recommended immunizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OBERNOLTE, and Mrs. STEEL):

H.R. 737. A bill to extend the authorities under the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act of 2016 providing operational flexibility, drought relief, and other benefits to the State of California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 738. A bill to require employers to pay essential pay to health care employees during public health emergencies, and to provide a tax credit for the cost of such pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. COLE:

H. Res. 84. A resolution authorizing and directing Committee on House Administration to report recommendations to the House to enhance House Chamber security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. HILL, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. VARGAS):

H. Res. 86. A resolution expressing support for frontline workers of the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. MANNING):

H. Res. 87. A resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in; to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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 Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BOST, Mr. POSEY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. ADAMS):

H. Res. 88. A resolution recognizing women's cardiovascular health as a critical health care priority that affects every State and contributes to increased health care costs, and promoting the necessity of increased awareness of and education on the symptoms for heart disease among women, gender-specific cardiovascular disease research, and policy action to alleviate the risks of heart disease among women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MFUME, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JONES, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CASE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. MEEKS):

H. Res. 89. A resolution expressing support for a national day of mourning in recognition of the lives lost as a result of COVID-19; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. FALLON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H. Res. 90. A resolution supporting an international investigation into the handling by the Government of the People's Republic of China of COVID-19 and the impact thereof on the people of the United States and other nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. TLAIB introduced a bill (H.R. 739) for the relief of Median El-Moustrah; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause, 18

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises'' in order to ''provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H.R. 684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign nations and among the several States).

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 686.

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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 690.

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, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

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. CHU:

H.R. 693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8 ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. constitution

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 clause 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has authority to extend protection to unborn children with a detectable heartbeat under the Constitution's grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''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 . . . ''

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LIEU:

H.R. 711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 3 of the United States Consitution, which states that the President ''. . . shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.''

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 3 of the United States Consitution, which states that the President '' . . . shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.''

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 3 of the United States Consitution, which states that the President ''. . . shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.''

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 3 of the United States Consitution, which states that the President ''. . . shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.''

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 3 of the United States Consitution, which states that the President ''. . . shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.''

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 3 of the United States Consitution, which states that the President ''. . . shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.''

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment X: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 provides Congress with 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.'' Article I Section 8 Clause 18 provides Congress with 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 Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws ''which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution'' any of Congress's enumerated powers, including Congress's powers over appropriations.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—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 any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—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 any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STEIL:

H.R. 733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United Sates Constitution, ''To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes''

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. CLYDE, Mrs. CAMMACK, and Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 55: Mr. VELA and Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 87: Mr. BABIN, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 95: Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ESTES, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 97: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 140: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 174: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 175: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 188: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARL, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GUEST, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 217: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 222: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 239: Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 262: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 275: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MEIJER, and Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 305: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 310: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 315: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 344: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 345: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. CHU, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr.JONES.

H.R. 347: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 348: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 349: Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. SEWELL.

H.R. 395: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 399: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 409: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 420: Mr. STAUBER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 431: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BEYER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. STEWART, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. MOORE of Utah, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 432: Mr. RYAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 433: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 447: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 448: Mr. SAN NICOLAS and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.

H.R. 454: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 455: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 465: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 475: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 498: Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 501: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 512: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 519: Mr. CARL, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. GOODEN of Texas.

H.R. 520: Mr. CARL, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. GOODEN of Texas.

H.R. 534: Mr. MAST, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. KELLER, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. PFLUGER.

H.R. 535: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 541: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 542: Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 543: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. BANKS, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 544: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 545: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 551: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 558: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KELLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 567: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 576: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 581: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 582: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 586: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 620: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 622: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 635: Ms. SEWELL and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 646: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LAMB, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 666: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 679: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. WILD, Ms. SCANLON, Mrs. AXNE, and Mrs. HAYES.

H. J. Res. 12: Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. BURGESS.

H. Con. Res. 9: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. CARSON.

H. Res. 33: Mr. GALLEGO.

H. Res. 47: Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 49: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. CHU, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. KHANNA.

H. Res. 50: Mr. KHANNA.

H. Res. 51: Mr. BEYER.

H. Res. 54: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 64: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LIEU, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H. Res. 71: Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. MANN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CARL, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H. Res. 72: Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H. Res. 75: Mr. CARSON.

H. Res. 76: Mr. CARSON.

H. Res. 81: Mr. PERRY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. CARL, Mr. DUNN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H. Res. 82: Mr. COSTA, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. FOSTER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The provisions in H.R. 447 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and Labor do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 366: Mr. CURTIS.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2021 No. 19

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

All-powerful God, who lives above the highest Stars, we borrow our heartbeats from You. Each day Your power enables us to live and breathe and have our being. When our hopes are uprooted, You comfort us with Your presence.

Lord, guide our lawmakers on a road that leads to a clear conscience. Inspire them to refuse to think, say, or do anything that would disappoint You. Help them to hear, even in the beauty of falling snow, whispers of Your power.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

HONORING OFFICER BRIAN D. SICKNICK

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Capitol attack on January 6 unleashed many, many horrors, but it also revealed many heroes. One such hero was Capitol Police Officer Brian Sicknick, a New Jersey native, an Air Force National Guard veteran, and a 12-year member of the Capitol Police Force who tragically lost his life during the attack.

This evening, the body of Officer Sicknick will arrive at the Capitol, and he will lie in honor beneath the Capitol Rotunda. We will formally pay our respects to Officer Sicknick with a service on Wednesday.

I join with my colleagues and members of the Capitol Police Force in grieving the loss of one of their fellow officers. May his memory live forever as a model of service to our Nation, selflessness in the line of duty, and courage in the face of danger.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on another matter entirely, the Senate, this week, will continue confirming President Biden's Cabinet nominees, closing the book today on the nomination of Alexander Mayorkas to be the Secretary of Homeland Security.

Mr. Mayorkas's qualifications are unassailable. He is a 7-year veteran of the DHS and has already been confirmed by this Chamber three—three—times. Like most of President Biden's Cabinet nominees, his nomination is also history-making: He will be the first Latino and first immigrant to hold the top job at DHS. I look forward to confirming Mr. Mayorkas today.

We have a second outstanding nominee to confirm today as well—Pete Buttigieg for Secretary of Transportation. Mr. Buttigieg—known to many simply as Mayor Pete—has demonstrated an impressive familiarity with the entire Nation's transportation challenges—challenges that are pronounced in States like my own, where projects like the Gateway Tunnel are a top national priority.

I know that Mr. Buttigieg is committed to working with Members from both sides to improve rail and transit, highways, and more in rural communities, urban centers, and everywhere in between. I am excited to call him Secretary Pete by the end of the day and get to work with him immediately on helping the MTA—the Nation's largest transit network in the country—and moving Gateway forward after years of cynical obstruction by the Trump administration.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on COVID–19, even as we continue to confirm President Biden's nominees, the Senate will turn this week to the historic task of preparing a rescue package to lift our country out of the depths of the awful COVID–19 pandemic and set our country back on the path to normalcy. Despite the best efforts of Congress over the past year, the needs in our country are still great and still urgent.

The disease has been with us for nearly a year, and yet this January was officially the worst month to date. Nearly 100,000 Americans died just in the last month. Unemployment insurance claims remain at nearly 1 million a week. Schools remain closed, businesses unvisited, and all the familiar fixtures of daily life still remain on hold.

All of us in this Chamber are tired of seeing our constituents, our friends, our family, our country suffer. It is time to meet the challenges of the moment with boldness, with courage, and with urgency.

When Congress came together to pass an interim emergency relief bill in December, we all knew the job was not complete. Economic experts and the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

President-elect at the time called it an important downpayment because that is what it was—a downpayment, not the final act. No one should be surprised that the first legislative act of the new Democratic majority is to build on that foundation and help the country defeat COVID–19 once and for all. So the Senate is going to move forward this week with the process for producing the next bold rescue package.

Yesterday, Speaker PELOSI and I filed a joint budget resolution for the 2021 fiscal year, totaling $1.9 trillion, which will give us another legislative tool to pass a COVID relief bill quickly and decisively. The Senate will vote to proceed on the budget resolution this afternoon. Time is a luxury our country does not have.

Let me be very clear. We are not going to dilute, to dither, to delay. We are not going to dilute, dither, or delay. The needs of the American people are so demanding, we need to think big, and we need to act quickly. The Senate must move forward today with the vote to begin debate on the budget resolution, and I am optimistic that the motion to proceed will pass.

I would say to my Republican colleagues that we want this important work to be bipartisan. We welcome your ideas, your input, and your revisions. We welcome cooperation. There is nothing about the process—or a budget resolution or reconciliation, for that matter—that forecloses the possibility of bipartisanship.

I would remind this Chamber that since 1980, the budget process has been used 17 times—17 times—to pass serious bipartisan legislation. This process is open to bipartisanship.

So let me be clear to my colleagues this morning. There will be a bipartisan, open amendment process on the budget resolution this week. Democrats eagerly encourage participation from both sides of the aisle on this proposal. Again, there is nothing about the process itself that prevents bipartisanship. What has made recent reconciliation efforts by Senate Republicans so partisan was not the process but the legislation they sought to pass.

The former Senate majority—I heard the Senator from Texas crying crocodile tears about using reconciliation, but just a few years ago, he was an active participant in using it twice to pursue expressly partisan and deeply unpopular legislation—first, to repeal our Nation's healthcare law and kick millions of Americans off of their healthcare coverage, and second, to slash taxes for big corporations and the wealthy to the tune of a $1.7 trillion bill and hole in our deficit. Of course, Democrats opposed those efforts on the merits.

At the moment, however, we are talking about using the budget process to help small business—something we all support. We are talking about using the budget process to speed the production and distribution of a vaccine that everyone champions and everyone knows is the key to ending the crisis. We are talking about getting our country back on its feet and our economy back on track.

We want this entire effort to be bipartisan. We do. But helping the American people with the big, bold relief they need—that is job No. 1. That is job No. 1, which is so, so important. So, again, we are not going to dilute, dither, or delay because the demands of the American people are so real and so large. We need to think big and think quickly.

Helping millions of Americans who are still without work by extending the enhanced unemployment benefits that are now slated to expire in March. Helping parents waiting for the day their kids can finally go back to school safely. Helping teachers, firefighters, busdrivers, and other essential public employees at the State and local levels, preventing them from the risk of layoffs. Helping restaurants and bars and theaters, which were the first to close and may be the last to open. Helping every American struggling to make ends meet, to pay the rent, pay the mortgage, pay for groceries, keep up with that utility bill, by sending them direct assistance in the form of a check. That is job No. 1—helping the American people survive the toughest months of this crisis while hastening the end of the crisis itself.

In the months to come, millions of Americans will be vaccinated, and slowly but surely, life will return to normal once again. The rescue plan proposed by President Biden—the rescue plan that we begin to work on this week—will lay the foundation for our country's long-awaited comeback, while giving Americans a helping hand to stay safe and stay financially secure in the meantime.

I look forward to proceeding with this budget resolution and on the work of making this historic and vital rescue package a reality so it works for the American people.

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. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on Alejandro Mayorkas, President Biden's nominee to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

Up to this point, I have voted in favor of the President's mainstream nominees to key posts. I will have my differences with Secretaries Austin, Yellen, and Blinken on policy, but they were mainstream choices from the President.

Mr. Mayorkas is something else. He does not deserve Senate confirmation to lead Homeland Security. Frankly, his record should foreclose confirmation even to a lower post. The problem isn't experience—not exactly. Mr. Mayorkas is all too familiar with the levers of power that control U.S. immigration law. The problem is when he is chosen to pull those levers—and for whose benefit.

As a high-ranking official in the Obama administration, Mr. Mayorkas did his best to turn U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services into an unethical favor factory for Democratic Party royalty. Governors, a DNC chair, Hollywood executives, a Senate majority leader from Nevada—they all received special treatment to a degree that stunned and disturbed the Obama administration's own inspector general over at that Department. His independent report blasted the ''appearance of favoritism and special access.'' We are talking about shoving through green cards as political favors and intervening to overturn denials. The IG confirmed this wasn't just about speed; Mr. Mayorkas's improper influence actually changed outcomes.

This wasn't the first time this nominee abused an office for political purposes. Before his tenure at DHS, while U.S. attorney, the nominee had helped his fellow California Democrats get a well-connected L.A. drug kingpin onto President Clinton's infamous eleventh-hour pardons list. The drug dealer's father was a Democratic Party donor. Mysteriously, several notable California Democrats took an extremely keen interest in the case. Both Mr. Mayorkas and yet another one of President Biden's nominees, Mr. Becerra, came under scrutiny for their personal roles in the special treatment that was dished out to this donor's son.

When questioned about these actions, Mr. Mayorkas responded with false and conflicting statements, including while under oath. Reviews of USCIS under Mr. Mayorkas found intimidation and retaliation against employees when they were too focused on rooting out fraud instead of merely rubberstamping applications. According to some of his own employees, his leadership led to ''a culture of fear and disrespect.''

Does this sound like somebody who deserves a promotion?

Employees reported Mr. Mayorkas viewed the people applying to live here as the Agency's ''customers,'' whom it was their job to please and satisfy. They said the crucial goal that defined his approach was not enforcing American laws, protecting American jobs, or defending the American homeland, but rather ensuring there were ''zero complaints'' from the customers.

I will close with one observation. Last week, I heard the Democratic leader compare the confirmation timelines for Mr. Mayorkas versus Gen. John Kelly—an ethically compromised partisan lawyer versus a retired four-star general whom the Senate confirmed 88 to 11. The contrast could not be sharper. For one thing, I would say Secretary Kelly understood that our customers, first and foremost, are always the American people. It is, frankly, remarkable that someone with his record is even up for a Cabinet appointment.

I will be voting against this confirmation and urge our colleagues to do the same.

BURMA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, on another matter, the United States and democratic countries around the world are anxiously watching events in Burma. I have had an interest in Burma for many years, since I chaired the Appropriations Subcommittee for State and Foreign Operations.

Just last November, here on the floor, I cautiously celebrated Burma's recent elections. I warned that its military remained a toxic influence and an obstacle to democratic progress.

Sure enough, the world was horrified over the weekend when Burma's military rounded up the country's civilian political leadership, including Aung San Suu Kyi and civil society leaders. The military was afraid the popular support of the new government would yield the constitutional economic reforms they long opposed. So they tried to simply claim control for themselves.

I spoke with President Biden and Secretary Blinken yesterday about the situation in Burma. The new administration deserves credit for approaching the situation in a way that is bipartisan and coordinated with Congress.

The world is watching. I hope and expect the United States will quickly make the obvious legal determination that this is a military coup and impose significant costs on the military for its attack on democracy. We already have sanctions in place against key military officials in that country, and Congress has already given the executive branch the authorities it actually needs to swiftly apply even more sanctions to the military and its infiltration into Burma's economy.

But we will also need the help of our friends and allies to effectively pressure the junta. It is time for freedom-loving nations to stand up for democracy and impose their own meaningful costs on the military junta.

The Chinese Communist Party's state news organ dismissively called the events in Burma a ''major cabinet reshuffle.'' A ''cabinet reshuffle''? That is a joke and the free world knows it. This is a military coup and an attack on democracy—plain and simple.

There are two paths before Burma. It can continue to grow into a modern, democratic country connected to the global economy or remain a corrupt, impoverished authoritarian backwater in the shadow of the People's Republic of China.

The people of Burma have said which they prefer. They have spoken at the ballot box. The threat of force must not be allowed to silence their choice.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter Paul Montgomery Buttigieg, of Indiana, to be Secretary of Transportation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Democratic whip.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise this morning, of course, to support the nominations of Pete Buttigieg to be Secretary of Transportation and Alejandro Mayorkas to head the Department of Homeland Security. They are both exceptional choices by the administration to fill critical positions.

This afternoon when we vote on Mr. Mayorkas, it will be the completion of three of the four national security elements of the Cabinet for President Biden, having previously voted for the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense.

The post remaining, of course, after today's actions—if they are favorable, and I believe they will be—is the office of Attorney General, and I would like to address that directly.

First, let me say this. When you feel that you are the target of terrorists—a personal target of terrorists—you will never forget the moment. It has only happened twice in my life. On 9/11/2001, as a U.S. Senator, I was in a meeting in a room just several feet away from the Senate Chamber when the attack on the World Trade Center took place and the attack on the Pentagon. Those were terrorists at work, killing innocent people.

There was one more plane in the air. We didn't know where it was headed. It was early in the morning on that day that we were told to evacuate the Capitol Building, the first time I had ever faced that as a Member of Congress.

We quickly ran out the doors and down the stairs and stood on the lawn outside of the Capitol, wondering what was next, for fear that this building—this symbol of America and its greatness—was the next target of an attack. It could have been.

We are not sure. We never will be. But thanks to the heroic efforts of passengers on an airplane—they attacked the attackers, went after the terrorists, personally, and brought that plane down in Pennsylvania at the cost of their own lives—in a way, many of us were spared of being targets of terrorism that day.

When we reflect on those 3,000 innocent Americans who lost their lives in New York, Pennsylvania, and at the Pentagon, I will never forget the feeling that I was spared that act of terrorism and the hope that no one in America would ever have that fear again.

Fast forward to January 6, 2021, fewer than 4 weeks ago, here in the U.S. Capitol. Again, I felt I was the target of terrorists. That was the day when an insurrectionist mob stormed the Capitol, broke through the doors, beat down the windows, and came marching toward the Senate Chamber. I will never forget that moment, and I don't think anyone who was here at the time could possibly forget it.

It was 2:15 in the afternoon when the Vice President of the United States was removed from the chair that you are sitting in, Mr. President. He was whisked off the platform to a safe room so he could be spared from anything that might come from this mob.

The rest of us were told to sit at our desk. We would make a safe Chamber—one safe room in the Capitol. We lined the walls with staffers to protect them against this insurrectionist mob, and we waited, but only for a few minutes.

The order was reversed quickly: Leave the Chamber. What had happened, we came to learn, was that the same mob of terrorists continued to advance through the Capitol, despite the valiant efforts of the Capitol Police and other law enforcement.

It was during that period of time when this mob of terrorists was attacking this building, the United States Capitol, when Officer Brian Sicknick of the Capitol Police lost his life.

We honor him tomorrow by bringing his remains to the Capitol for him to lie in repose, a place of honor, for all of us to thank him and his family and to thank all of the men and women who risk their lives—and, certainly, one who gave his life—in the service of our Nation.

These men and women who stand in silent service every single day are often overlooked by visitors, but they are literally risking their lives. In the time I have served in the House and the

Senate, this is at least the third occasion when members of the Capitol Police have given their lives to protect me, and Brian Sicknick will not be forgotten.

For those who want to take this insurrectionist mob and the incitement of this mob as just another political protest, I ask them to reflect for a moment, please, on the graphic video evidence of what happened on that day, as people who were part of this mob took baseball bats, sticks, everything they could get their hands on, and beat up against those law enforcement agents. It was a sad moment.

Yesterday's New York Times spelled out what led up to it: a big lie that the former President of the United States actually won the November 3 election.

He did not. The votes were counted and he lost, but he has never been able to accept that reality, and what he has done in the meantime is to foment a revolt against our government at the grassroots level across America.

That is the reason why a new Attorney General brought to the position of leadership as quickly as possible is so important. I regret that, once again, I need to come to the floor to call on the Senate Republicans to stop blocking Merrick Garland from receiving a hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

We all remember the way Merrick Garland, a judge in the Circuit Court of the DC Circuit, was treated by Senate Republicans in 2016 when he was nominated by President Obama to the Supreme Court. I am not going to recount the entire history today, but I will tell you, it was not a proud moment for the U.S. Senate when Senate leaders on the other side of the aisle announced they would not give him a hearing. They literally would not even meet with him to give him the dignity of such an opportunity to discuss his nomination for the Supreme Court.

But I do want to talk about the urgency of putting President Biden's national security team in place, including Merrick Garland, the President's nominee for Attorney General. Our country faces, as we learned on January 6, challenges of great importance at this moment in our history.

As we faced that mob assault on the Capitol Building for the first time since the War of 1812, our Capitol was breached by attackers, domestic terrorists. Domestic terrorists were part of a coordinated, comprehensive effort to stop the Government of the United States. That situation needs to be carefully reviewed and examined by the Department of Justice and the Attorney General as quickly as possible.

There is no person better qualified to lead this investigation, to bring these perpetrators to justice, and to prevent future domestic terror attacks than Merrick Garland. When he previously served at the Justice Department, Judge Garland oversaw the investigation and prosecution of the largest domestic terrorism attack in recent history—the Oklahoma City bombing. His qualifications and experience are well suited for the moment we face.

As our Nation's top law enforcement officer, the Attorney General is a key part of the President's national security team. The Attorney General oversees our Nation's law enforcement response to threats both foreign and domestic.

My Republican colleagues frequently talked about letting the new President get his national security team in place at the start of his administration. Despite the unresolved nature of the Senate's organizing resolution, other subcommittees have come together on a bipartisan basis to schedule prompt hearings and votes for nominees, including the Secretary of Defense, Director of National Intelligence, Secretary of Homeland Security, and Secretary of State. We need to do the same when it comes to the nomination of Merrick Garland to serve as Attorney General.

Why would we allow partisanship to get in the way of national security?

I have urged my Republican colleagues on the Judiciary Committee—current Chairman GRAHAM and incoming Ranking Member GRASSLEY—to consent to start the hearing for Merrick Garland as soon as possible.

I proposed February 8, next Monday, as a hearing date, in part to accommodate Senator GRAHAM's request to avoid holding a hearing during the impeachment trial. A February 8 hearing date gives the committee sufficient time to review Judge Garland's record. It would follow the same timeline—the very same timeline—that Senator GRAHAM used for Judge Amy Coney Barrett's nomination to the Supreme Court last year.

Remember, the committee has already received the vast majority of Judge Garland's record, including his speeches, interviews, and publications, that less than 5 years ago was presented when he was nominated to the Supreme Court. We have had this material in the committee for years. Senator GRAHAM claims that important paperwork for Judge Garland is still missing. The only thing that has not been filed is Judge Garland's FBI background investigation. As important as it is, the Judiciary Committee has scheduled hearings for previous Attorney General nominees before the FBI background investigations had been submitted. For example, the committee received then-Senator Jeff Sessions' FBI background investigation just 5 days before his hearing, and we are still 6 days away from a proposed hearing date. So what we are asking is not unprecedented or unrealistic.

Senator GRAHAM points out that Attorney General nominees typically have 2-day hearings—1 day to question the nominee and the other day to question outside witnesses. This isn't always the case. For example, the Republicans held a 1-day hearing to consider Alberto Gonzales's nomination to be Attorney General. Yet, if the goal is to ensure there is sufficient time to question the nominee and to hear from outside witnesses, I am willing to do just that—allow for two rounds of questions of the nominee and an outside witness panel.

I also find it surprising that Senator GRAHAM objects to committee business on the eve of an impeachment trial. Just remember the history. On January 16, 2020—the same day that the previous impeachment trial of this President started—Senator GRAHAM held a committee markup during which the committee considered 11 judicial nominees. There was nothing sacred about the day before or day of an impeachment trial then, when Senator GRAHAM was chairman.

Judge Garland is a consensus pick. As even Senator GRAHAM has acknowledged, the Senate should generally be deferential to a President's Cabinet nominees, and that is particularly true for national security positions. There is an even greater urgency to move swiftly to confirm Judge Garland, given the events of January 6 and the Justice Department's role in investigating and responding to those events and other national security threats.

I hope Republicans will consent now to notice a hearing for February 8. It would show real bipartisanship and fairness. Under our committee rules, we can still notice the hearing with less than 7 days if my Republican colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee agree to do so. We need to get the Attorney General confirmed, and there is no justification for any further delay.

NOMINATION OF ALEJANDRO NICHOLAS MAYORKAS

Mr. President, while on the subject of confirmation, the Senate has confirmed Mr. Alejandro Mayorkas three different times. When you listen to the Republican Senate leader this morning, you may not catch that fact. He was second in command of the Agency he is nominated by President Biden to lead. Most recently, he served as the DHS Deputy Secretary, the Agency's second in command, and the Chief Operating Officer, handling counterterrorism, cybersecurity, border security, emergency management, and other critical matters. We need Mr. Mayorkas's deep expertise and experience in place at the DHS starting as quickly as possible, maybe even today.

Perhaps Republicans have forgotten about the last 4 years of chaos at the Department of Homeland Security. Here is a reminder: Under President Trump's administration, the DHS experienced an unprecedented leadership vacuum. The DHS lurched from one Secretary or Acting Secretary to the next—six in total—only two of whom were actually confirmed by the Senate. Those are more Agency heads in the last 4 years than in the 13-year history of the Department of Homeland Security before the Trump administration. For over a year, the Agency was led by

unlawfully appointed Acting Secretary Chad Wolf. Nine days before President Trump left office, Mr. Wolf resigned and was replaced by yet another Acting Secretary.

Four former Secretaries of Homeland Security—two Republicans and two Democrats—every person ever to serve as a Senate-confirmed DHS Secretary prior to the Trump administration, recently endorsed Ali Mayorkas. They said he is ''a man of character, integrity, experience and compassion'' and ''a proven leader to right the ship.'' You would hardly believe that if you listened to some of the things said about him this morning on the floor.

In their endorsement of Mr. Mayorkas, every former Secretary of Homeland Security before the Trump administration went on to note: The leadership vacuum and turmoil at the Department of Homeland Security may have contributed to the failure to anticipate and adequately prepare for the terrorist attack of January 6 on the Capitol. That is the reality. After 4 years of disorder and disarray at the DHS, the security of America, including this very Capitol Building, suffered because of the lack of leadership under the previous administration.

Mr. Mayorkas is the son of a Holocaust survivor and an immigrant from Cuba. Mr. Mayorkas knows firsthand that America can be a beacon of hope to the world and the promise to those who are facing persecution of a place of safe haven. Mr. Mayorkas is an experienced national security leader who can restore integrity and decency to the Department of Homeland Security.

I, personally, appreciated the skill and dedication Mr. Mayorkas showed as the Director of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. It was in that post of 2012 that he implemented DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, which has allowed more than 800,000 young people to contribute to America's future. I won't recount the entire history, but my trek on this particular issue began 20 years ago, when I introduced the DREAM Act. Thanks to my friend, former colleague, and leader of our country, Barack Obama, by Executive order, he created DACA and gave these young people their chance to prove themselves.

As Deputy Secretary, Mr. Mayorkas oversaw a $60 billion budget and led a workforce of nearly 230,000 individuals. He excelled in that role. He received the Department's Distinguished Service Award, its highest civilian honor; the U.S. Coast Guard's Distinguished Service award; and special commendation from the National Security Agency for his achievements in national security and cybersecurity. Among his numerous responsibilities, Mr. Mayorkas led the Department's response to the Ebola and Zika outbreaks—relevant and timely experience that he will bring to the DHS during this COVID–19 pandemic.

Earlier in his career, Mr. Mayorkas served as the Senate-confirmed U.S. attorney in California. The national president of the Fraternal Order of Police enthusiastically endorsed Mr. Mayorkas: ''His professionalism, integrity and commitment to just and fair enforcement of the law makes him an ideal candidate to lead the department. Mr. Mayorkas has pursued criminal wrongdoers and has protected the rights of the innocent with indefatigable vigor. His work reflects all that is right in government.''

Mr. Mayorkas is an outstanding nominee to be the Secretary of Homeland Security. His experience, qualifications, deep expertise, and integrity will serve our Nation well in this important and challenging position.

Steady leadership at the Department of Homeland Security is sorely needed today. I urge my colleagues to expeditiously confirm Mr. Mayorkas so that he can serve as the next Secretary of Homeland Security. Today, we will get a chance to vote on Mr. Mayorkas.

I sincerely hope that the Republican members of the Senate Judiciary Committee will allow us to set the stage for a hearing as quickly as possible for our next Attorney General, Merrick Garland. So much is at stake. The national security of the United States should be a higher priority than any partisan consideration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to talk about two topics today. The first topic I want to address is the issue of immigration. My good friend Senator DURBIN is very articulate—he is almost an expert on this issue—and I appreciate his comments. I want to just give you my perspective on immigration because it is so important. Yet this is not why I came down here today.

I love legal immigration. I think most Americans do. Louisianans love legal immigration, and I say that with great confidence because, every year, the American people invite over a million of our world's neighbors to become American citizens in a legal manner. We are very welcoming in this country. We invite more people to become citizens in America than any other country in the world, and I am flattered that people want to come here. I mean, other than someone living in North Korea, when is the last time you heard of somebody trying to sneak into China? People want to come to America, and I am so proud of that fact.

I don't believe in illegal immigration. Some of my colleagues—not the Chair and Senator DURBIN—think that vetting people at the border is racist. I don't. I think it is prudent. Every country does it. We respect the rule of law in this country, and illegal immigration is illegal. Duh. I mean, if you don't like the immigration laws, one should change them. In the meantime, we have to follow the law. I am not real crazy about traffic cameras. I think, in many cases, they are designed to just raise money, but I obey them, and when I get fined, I pay the fine. It doesn't happen often now, but I do it.

Look, this country needs an immigration system that looks like somebody designed it on purpose. It does. I think the American people deserve that. I would love to work with Senator DURBIN. I am not real interested in nibbling around the edges. I am not real interested in piecemealing. I am not real interested in some sort of widespread amnesty. I think we ought to sit down. We all ought to take our meds and sit down as adults and Senators in good faith, as all Senators are, and try to tackle this problem in a global way.

I just wanted to make it clear—this is speaking for me, personally, and I have learned a lot from listening to Senator DURBIN as I always do—I am a steadfast believer in legal immigration, but I adamantly oppose illegal immigration. I think it is dangerous. I think it is unfair, especially to those people across the world who have waited in line patiently and followed the immigration laws of our country.

TRIBUTE TO PAT SHINGLETON

Mr. President, now let me switch topics. One of the good things about politics and government—and the Presiding Officer has probably had this experience—is that you meet so many interesting people, and everybody is interesting in his own way. I have met people who are more famous than wise. I have met people who are more wise than famous, and I have met people who are both famous and wise. One of the latter is what I would like to talk about today. He is a gentleman by the name of Pat Shingleton. His name may not be famous here—it is back in Louisiana—but I can assure you that his virtues are. I want to honor the work of Pat Shingleton today.

Pat is a Baton Rouge meteorologist, but he is also a longtime fixture in our community. He has retired. I think his last broadcast was Friday night. He had worked for 45 years. That is probably older than the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Almost.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, he had been reporting and trying to predict—and had predicted with great accuracy—the weather in the Baton Rouge metropolitan community for 45 years, but Pat's experience covers a whole lot more than being a meteorologist, though he was one of the best I have ever seen in that regard.

During his nearly half century of reporting the weather, Pat not only covered more than 500 storms and hurricanes but he also hosted ''We Play Baton Rouge,'' a local game show; ''The 5th Quarter,'' a sports show; and ''Hotline After Dark,'' a local talk show, where his guests—and I am going to quote here—''ran the gamut from champion bodybuilders, to beer brewers, to duck callers.'' We are a very diverse people in Louisiana.

Pat has a warm heart, and he cares for the State and the Baton Rouge

community, and that has been on display for a lot of years. I am not telling my people back home anything they don't already know.

Pat is especially well known for being chairman of WBRZ—WBRZ, channel 2 in Baton Rouge, our prominent local station, where Pat has worked for so long.

Pat has worked hard as chairman of that station's Pat's Coats for Kids—Pat's Coats for Kids. This program has—unfortunately, we have children in America and in Louisiana who are hungry and cold. You can't learn when you are hungry; you can't learn when you are cold.

Pat has delivered hundreds of thousands—could be in the millions for all I know—of coats to kids whose parents can't afford to keep them warm in the winter.

He has also created the Fill a Prescription for the Needy project, and he started Baton Rouge's St. Patrick's Day parade—the Wearin' of the Green, it is called—which he continues to coordinate every single year.

Pat's final broadcast took place on Friday night, as I mentioned, January 29. That does not—I can assure you, knowing Pat Shingleton, that does not mark the end of his service to the people in Baton Rouge. I can say that with great confidence.

I predict that Pat will continue to contribute as a community advocate and as a spokesperson at WBRZ. I predict he will continue to champion all of the charity projects that he spearheaded for so many years.

Now, when asked about his retirement, Pat said, and I am going to quote, ''I think we're all given a whole bunch of heartbeats.''

''We're all given a whole bunch of heartbeats,'' Pat said, ''and God gives us these heartbeats to do something good.''

What an eloquent way of putting it. Pat has used his heartbeats pretty well, in my judgment. He has a lot more to go, but he has done it for the good of our State, for the good of the Baton Rouge metropolitan community, and he has done it in the newsroom, and he has done it outside the newsroom.

Pat says he is going to spend the extra time with his family—good for him; he has earned it—especially his 1-year-old grandchild.

Look, we are going to miss his guiding hand through Louisiana's irreverent weather patterns. We may have to draft him back on a few occasions, but I want to wish him a joyful retirement to soak in all the perks of being a grandfather.

Pat, thank you. Thank you for your hard work for the people of Baton Rouge. Thank you for giving so much to the people of Louisiana for all these 45 years.

You are a good person, and you are a fine American. God bless you and your family.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF PETER PAUL MONTGOMERY BUTTIGIEG

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Pete Buttigieg's nomination to lead the Department of Transportation.

Whether it is rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges, maintaining our leadership in the global mobility race, or improving pipeline safety, there is no shortage of challenges facing our incoming Secretary.

As a fellow midwesterner, as a former officer in the U.S. Navy Reserve, I can't think of anyone more equipped to take on this challenge than Pete Buttigieg.

He understands the need to revitalize our infrastructure because he has seen it in our neighborhoods and on our roads each and every day when he served as a mayor.

He has a unique understanding of how the Department can be a resource to State and to local governments and what can be done to ensure that the Federal Government supports those State and local governments and make sure that need gets addressed most effectively.

If we are going to build back better, a partnership at each level of government will be absolutely vital. Having someone at the helm who recognizes that that relationship is so important will be an incredible asset to the Department.

I have also had several conversations with Secretary-Designate Buttigieg on the auto industry, which is the very beating heart of our manufacturing economy. And as the industry advances both toward electrification and self-driving technologies, it will be critical that we support these technologies and make sure that they are safely deployed and that they are deployed here in the United States.

We have an opportunity to save lives but also to create jobs and empower our domestic auto industry to take the moonshot for artificial intelligence and spur technological innovation, and I am pleased that Secretary-Designate Buttigieg has committed to working with us as we craft legislation that establishes a Federal framework around these new technologies.

Finally, I am excited to work with Secretary-Designate Buttigieg on improving pipeline safety, especially around the Great Lakes.

We know that line 5, under the Straits of Mackinac, poses a very serious threat to the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes are not only an economic driver and natural resource for our country, they are literally in the DNA of every Michiganian.

As a midwesterner and as husband to a Michigan native who was born and raised in Traverse City, Secretary-Designate Buttigieg fully recognizes the need to protect the Great Lakes.

I agree with Mayor Pete's belief that, as he says, ''good transportation policy can play no less a role than making possible the American dream.''

I am proud to support Pete Buttigieg's historic nomination, which has already garnered bipartisan support, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, ahead of our votes today, I wanted to echo the concerns that have already been voiced by many of my colleagues in this Chamber regarding the nomination of Alejandro Mayorkas to be the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

At this point, we are all very familiar with his long legacy of service on behalf of people of the United States, so I will just highlight one example of the ''value'' that he will bring to the table should the Senate vote to confirm him.

When he served as USCIS Director during the Obama administration, the inspector general was forced to investigate an ''extraordinary'' number of internal allegations that Mayorkas was granting ''special access and special favors'' to wealthy EB–5 ''investor visa'' applicants linked to influential Democrats.

When the IG took a closer look at the visa applications for three powerful Chinese nationals in particular, they came to the conclusion that if Mayorkas hadn't intervened, and I am quoting, ''the matter would have been decided differently.''

Now, this is something that we know is inappropriate. We know that this is something for which Mr. Mayorkas should be held accountable. We know that this is something for which he has not been held accountable, and here is what he did: He put his thumb on the scale, pressured his DHS colleagues—pressured his DHS colleagues—to break their own rules and turn the law on its head, all because a few powerful friends asked him to do it. He pressured others for the benefit of some powerful friends, and it is all there for everyone to read in the inspector general's report, and he was never held accountable. Yet, here we are, being asked to support his nomination to the President's Cabinet.

There are plenty of policy differences between myself and Mr. Mayorkas that have convinced me I have no choice but to stand in opposition to his confirmation. But the example I just cited, in particular, gives me additional serious concerns about how his influence would affect the integrity of the Agency.

Just last week, I joined several of my colleagues in a letter to the senior Senator from Illinois, asking him to exercise his judgment as the incoming chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and allow for a second hearing so we could examine Mr. Mayorkas's record thoroughly because, while I believe that the President has every right to assemble his Cabinet, I also believe that the American people have every right to understand exactly who is

being put in charge of enforcing our Nation's immigration laws and keeping our border secure, enforcing counterterrorism measures and keeping an eye on the country's cybersecurity. And the current nominee? Never held accountable for showing favor to some friends in high places. That is not the way this is supposed to be.

I would urge my colleagues to consider the American people—the taxpayers who are footing the bill for every salary that is given to every individual working with the Federal Government. What is the standard? What do they expect from their leaders?

Thereby, I oppose the nomination.

I yield my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to support the nomination of Pete Buttigieg to be Secretary of Transportation.

We all know the nominee as Mayor Pete—a man who basically came on to the national stage as a Midwest mayor who had lots of enthusiasm for making investments in America's future. So today we are considering his nomination to be Secretary of Transportation at a time when we need a lot of work done on transportation. In my opinion, he is a young, energetic mayor who is going to help us usher in a new era of transportation. That means there is going to be a lot of bipartisan dialogue about how we get there. But this job should not be underestimated in terms of the importance of the transportation sector and the investments for the future that we need.

Our transportation system serves as a backbone of our economy, and when it is not doing well, the consequential impact of that affects our economy. It affects how our businesses compete in a global economy. It affects how people get to and from work, and it affects their home life as well. So it is a big job that we have, and I know that this mayor and future Secretary of Transportation understands how big this challenge is.

We have underinvested in our infrastructure for decades. In the past 10 years alone, we have underfunded our infrastructure needs by $1.5 trillion. The American Society of Engineers estimates that we need to invest $5.6 trillion in our infrastructure over the next two decades, or the United States stands to lose about $10.3 trillion in GDP. I know this because my State knows this. I think the Presiding Officer knows this as well. If the transportation infrastructure doesn't work, goods and services don't get through your ports, they don't get to their destination, and businesses choose other vehicles or other avenues for the products to be delivered. America needs to be competitive.

The American public also knows that poor infrastructure and the problems they see in their communities have to be addressed, whether that is concrete crumbling off of bridges, delayed trains, buses, congestion, railroads, or any of many issues. Just this week, a highway in California slid into the ocean, disrupting traffic along the famous Highway 1, and this could be a delay for months. I know, again, the Presiding Officer understands this as well as the State of Washington. Mother Nature doesn't always comply with our transportation needs.

So while these investments and numbers may seem huge to people, it is what this investment will enable that we need to keep focused on. We need to focus on the fact that the United States makes and grows things, and we need to get them to their destinations. We need people be able to get to their places of employment. So we need someone at the Department of Transportation who is enthusiastic about taking on these challenges and helping President Biden administer a new era of transportation and the challenges that we face.

Mayor Buttigieg—a Harvard graduate, Rhodes Scholar, former U.S. Reservist who I believe served in Afghanistan—also understands the challenges of smalltown mayors and the impacts that transportation systems can have. He knows the challenges we now face because of COVID–19, that there is a new burden on our transportation system because of the impact of lost revenue.

State departments of transportation estimate $50 billion in lost revenues over the next 5 years. Airports have lost $23 billion because of people no longer flying. Transit agencies will have lost an estimated $50 billion by the end of 2021. These losses will continue to compound until we find the best way to protect our transportation workers, our travelers, and to continue to help with personal protective equipment, testing, vaccines, and clear, health-based protocols to help return safety to our transportation system and to build public confidence. That is one of the reasons why we are fighting so hard for this next package of investments.

President Biden took decisive action by mandating that people wear masks, which is a giant step forward in our transportation system. I think there is more we can do, and hopefully our colleagues can work together on that.

The long-term revenue outlet for transportation also is changing, and so it will be a long time before its recovery.

So I believe that Mayor Pete Buttigieg is the right choice for this job because he was mayor of South Bend. He dealt with infrastructure where the rubber meets the road—managing State, Federal, and local resources to help build infrastructure in his community.

He also helped facilitate public-private partnerships to make the dollars go farther, an important model for future investments in transportation. One of those projects, the South Shore double-track project, whose full funding grant agreement was signed earlier this month, is like many other State and local projects. The South Shore double track demanded impressive coordination between Federal, State, and local governments to bring it to fruition.

Mayor Buttigieg's Smart Streets Initiative also shows he knows how to operate and succeed in the current environment and will be able to help communities around the country replicate the success he had in South Bend.

He won't be the first mayor to be the Secretary of Transportation, but I think we can say that when you have a mayor in that job, they are going to pay attention to local transportation infrastructure investments to help our communities continue to grow and be competitive.

We have a major opportunity, I believe, to now deliver on the infrastructure needs of many of those communities. We should start immediately by talking about infrastructure packages and working on a transportation infrastructure plan for the 21st century because it is clear we have opportunities this year, with the surface transportation programs expiring in September.

Communities everywhere are demanding that we help work on these important issues for their communities, but Mayor Buttigieg will also be called on to think about the new era of transportation and how we maintain our competitiveness. He will have to think about issues of ensuring safety with new autonomous vehicle technologies and unmanned aircraft. He will have to promote stronger emission standards for automobiles, aviation, and the maritime industry. He will have to support the continued growth of electric vehicle infrastructure. He will have to make big investments in game-changing projects that will help us move freight more cost-effectively through our Nation. People will want to know and understand what our reliable passenger rail, transit systems, roads, and investments in bridges are going to be for the future.

So all of this is a big challenge, but I know that this nominee is up to that challenge. He did well at the committee in making sure that people understood that he believes that those challenges need to be addressed in order for America to continue to move forward.

From my perspective, just in the State of Washington, before COVID had really hit, we saw 78 hours per year of delayed traffic; that is, the average commuter spent 78 hours in delayed traffic. A recent study in my State estimated that Washingtonians lost more than $7.4 billion each year in lost time

and wasted fuel due to congestion, deteriorated roads, and safety problems. As America starts to head back to the office, no one wants to spend time back in that world of congestion, and so we need to make critical investments.

People in Puget Sound know that we need to fix the West Seattle Bridge. They know in Southwest Washington that the Columbia River needs a new bridge across I–5. In Eastern Washington, they know that we need a north-south corridor. In Everett, they know that the trestle needs replacement if goods from Eastern Washington are going to get to the Port of Everett and out the door.

All of these things are investments, and with them come the structures of things like at-grade crossings, passenger rail systems, and safety that are huge, I believe, infrastructure investments that have not been quite appreciated. I was very pleased to get Mr. Buttigieg's commitment during our session with him that these things—at-grade crossings, port competitiveness, and moving products safely—should be a big priority for the future.

The Lander Street project in Seattle, which was an investment of the new freight program, is just a few blocks, but literally, congestion for hours had stopped traffic from getting from I–5 to the Port of Seattle. The Lander Street project in a lot of ways represents what it really is: a bridge to the future, a bridge to get people moving where they need to go, and the right investment, being competitive for the future. We are going to face many more delays if America doesn't remain competitive.

So I look forward to working with Mr. Buttigieg on all of these issues. He also, during the committee hearing process, committed that he will continue to work with Senator WICKER and me on important issues of aviation safety. He committed to us that he understood that aviation safety and the FAA need to continue to make reforms. I believe that if you want to be the leaders in aviation, you have to be the leaders in aviation safety. I think Mayor Buttigieg understands that will be a very big job of the Department of Transportation as well.

I enthusiastically support this nominee. I look forward to the type of focus he can give to the Department of Transportation. This area of our government right now needs to address the COVID crisis. It needs to help us plan for a better transportation system of the future. It needs to understand that this transportation infrastructure and investment in these changes in these sectors—cars, planes, and passenger systems are all very dynamic, changing industries, and so our competitiveness will be at stake as well.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this nominee. I am sure we will hear a lot of discussion from him and a lot of bipartisan effort to help get our transportation system fully funded.

I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the nomination of Mayor Pete Buttigieg to be the Secretary of the United States Department of Transportation.

I believe Mayor Buttigieg's experience serving the people of South Bend, IN, as mayor and his service in the U.S. Navy Reserve position him well to lead the Biden administration's ambitious infrastructure and climate-related agenda at the Department of Transportation.

In coordination with Congress, Mayor Buttigieg will face numerous challenges as the Transportation Secretary concerning issues important to Marylanders.

We must reauthorize WMATA to maintain and improve metro rail and bus service to Maryland's DC suburbs, develop transit solutions for Baltimore city and other jurisdictions throughout the State, and provide pandemic relief assistance for Maryland's motor coach and transit industries not included in the CARES Act and for whom the most recent bipartisan package was only a down payment.

We also should focus on repairing and modernizing our infrastructure, investing in local projects, working with other Federal partners to expand access to broadband, addressing environmental concerns such as air and noise pollution plaguing our communities from air traffic, and connecting communities through the removal of aging infrastructure. As Secretary of Transportation, Pete Buttigieg will also play a vital role in implementing Presidents Biden's climate change agenda.

As one of the youngest Cabinet Secretaries in decades and the first openly gay member of a Presidential Cabinet, Mayor Buttigieg's nomination presents an opportunity to bridge the gap between the Federal Government and younger generations of Americans and communities traditionally underrepresented by leadership in government.

I am confident in Mayor Buttigieg's ability to take on these urgent challenges. And I look forward to voting yes on his nomination and working closely with him in the years ahead to tackle the issues facing our national infrastructure and transportation system.

Ms. CANTWELL. 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 (Mr. LUJÁN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON BUTTIGIEG NOMINATION

Mr. REED. 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 yeas and nays are ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Buttigieg nomination?

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SINEMA). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 11 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Baldwin	Grassley	Paul
Barrasso	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Portman
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blunt	Hirono	Risch
Booker	Hoeven	Romney
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Braun	Inhofe	Rounds
Brown	Johnson	Sanders
Burr	Kaine	Sasse
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Capito	Kennedy	Schumer
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Sinema
Casey	Leahy	Smith
Collins	Lee	Stabenow
Coons	Luján	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	Markey	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Van Hollen
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Moran	Warren
Ernst	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker
Fischer	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Young
Graham	Padilla	

NAYS—13

Blackburn	Hawley	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	Rubio	
Hagerty	Scott (FL)	

NOT VOTING—1

Toomey

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 actions.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Mayorkas nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:16 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I have the honor of serving on the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee—a committee you serve on—which oversees, as you know, the Department of Homeland Security since the committee was first formed.

Almost two decades later, I remain convinced that the nominees we confirm to lead that Department must possess sound judgment, integrity, relevant experience, boundless energy, and the leadership skills that will enable them to take on some of the most daunting challenges that we face today as a nation.

The Department of Homeland Security is a Department with a budget of over $50 billion and a staff of over 240,000 men and women. Its Agencies protect our country from ever-evolving domestic and foreign threats; they respond to natural disasters; and they help to secure our critical infrastructure.

Unfortunately, in recent years, the senior leadership ranks of this Department have come to remind many of us as something akin to executive branch Swiss cheese, with critical positions remaining vacant for far too long or without Senate confirmation at all. In fact, the Department of Homeland Security has been without a Senate-confirmed Secretary for 21 months. Think about that—21 months. Meanwhile, there is no shortage of work to be done from the clear and present threat of domestic terrorism to responding to the SolarWinds cyber breach to helping distribute the COVID vaccine.

Now, more than ever, it is crucial for this important Department to be led by men and women who have been vetted and confirmed by Members of this body. The American people deserve a capable leader at the helm of this Department, and I believe that leader is Alejandro Mayorkas.

Ali represents the best of America. Born in Havana, Cuba, Ali knows firsthand what it is like for a family to flee its native land and come to the United States in search of refuge. He is a man of integrity and a person of principle who possesses a truly, truly remarkable work ethic. What is more, he may well be the most qualified nominee we have ever been asked to consider to lead the Department of Homeland Security.

He has previously served admirably as its Deputy Secretary for nearly 4 years, and before that as the head of DHS's largest Agency, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. As Director of this Agency, he worked to combat immigration fraud. He directed and implemented the DACA Program to protect hundreds of thousands of Dreamers and much more.

As Deputy Secretary, he led the Department's successful Unity of Effort initiative to improve morale in an Agency which previously had the lowest morale of any large Agency in our Federal Government. In fact, the Department that reported the greatest improvement in morale in the final year of the Obama administration was the Department of Homeland Security, in large part, due to Ali's leadership and that of former Secretary Jeh Johnson.

As Deputy Secretary, Mr. Mayorkas also shepherded through Congress cyber security legislation to enable the Department of Homeland Security to better protect our dot-gov and private sector networks. I think he may have also had something to do with reining in the Ebola plague.

Those who know Ali well will tell you that he is no ideologue. He has no partisan agenda. Rather, he is a thoughtful, policy-minded public servant who has spent much of his career improving the Department of Homeland Security so that the men and women who serve there can better protect our homeland.

We have seen that he is willing to work with Democrats, Republicans, and their staffs to get things done. That is one of the many reasons that five former Secretaries of Homeland Security, Democratic and Republican alike, have encouraged us to confirm him swiftly.

I know that Ali can do this job. He has already demonstrated that. And I believe that many of our colleagues here today know it as well. After all, Ali Mayorkas has been confirmed three times in the past, including once as U.S. attorney for the Central District of Columbia.

Having said that, though, some of our Republican colleagues are attempting now to use a 2013 IG investigation as a cudgel against his nomination. As it turns out, we have seen this movie before. I should note that a number of those colleagues were not serving in Congress at that time in 2013 and most were not serving on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee when we considered Ali's nomination that year to serve as Deputy Secretary.

I was privileged to serve as chairman of the committee at that time. In fact, I led the fight to confirm him. It was the toughest fight I have had in 20 years here. It is one thing to disagree with the nominee politically, but to continue to question Ali's dedication and integrity on the basis of an IG report, as some of our Republican colleagues have done, flies in the face of available evidence, including his decades of public service. At a time when our Nation faces so many crises, we cannot afford less than full support for this nominee.

So I want to take a few minutes today to set the record straight, if I can. Here are the facts.

In 2013, an IG investigation into Ali Mayorkas's oversight of a program within U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services, known as the EB–5 Program, was conducted in a highly irregular manner, including through false leaks to the media literally on the eve of his confirmation hearing. As a result of the IG's public leaks and his failure to complete a report before the close of Congress, Ali was denied a chance to have any concerns fully litigated ahead of his confirmation in the Senate in 2013.

Ultimately, the IG who initiated the investigation stepped down later that year amid bipartisan calls for his resignation. Last year, that same former IG was charged by the Department of Justice with 16 counts of fraud—16 counts of fraud.

Following Ali's confirmation, my staff and I worked to ensure that the subsequent IG completed the report into any allegations. In 2015, that new IG, John Roth, produced a report building on the work of the 2013 investigation. The report found no evidence of wrongdoing by Ali. None. What it did suggest, however, was that some of his actions as Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services may have created the ''appearance of favoritism.''

In particular, it asserted that Ali met with a number of well-connected individuals over time regarding their concerns over the EB–5 Investor Visa Program. After Ali joined the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services as its Director in 2009, he came to the conclusion that this program was not well run. He was not alone in this conclusion. Ali has testified that as Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, he received more complaints from Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, regarding the EB–5 Program than he did about any other program.

In response to these bipartisan concerns, as Director of the Agency, Ali did what, in my opinion, many of us would expect an Agency head to do. He rolled up his sleeves, and he worked with his employees to gain an understanding of how the program was being run and to find out how they might make it run better. He directed systemic changes that included improving management and administration of the program in order to reduce favoritism and to combat fraud. He also proposed reforms of the program to Congress in an effort to prevent future abuses—reforms which, unfortunately, were not pursued by Congress—our fault, not his.

And yes, as Director, he set a precedent for getting back to Members of Congress quickly in response to their inquiries, even if the answers his Agency came up with was ultimately not what they wanted to hear.

Completing the 2015 IG report was important to clear Ali of any wrongdoing. But these findings and Ali's actions have been mischaracterized by some of our colleagues who assert that he showed favoritism by reaching out personally to the staff of former Senator Harry Reid over an EB–5-related issue they had raised on behalf of a constituent.

As it turns out, though, the report is clear. Ali Mayorkas did reach out to that staff—not to deliver preferential treatment but, rather, to let the staff know that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services would not be able to accommodate the request of that staff and their Senator. And why? If responsiveness to inquiries by Members of Congress and their staff, regardless of whether the response is favorable or not, is a problem for my colleagues—any of my colleagues—that is news to me.

Let me make one more point, if I may. As someone who knows Ali and has known him for years—knows his family, knows his work, knows his ethic—I believe the 2015 IG report was missing some needed context. Let me try to provide it.

Fortunately, though, Ali provided it in a 32-page response. The response was almost as long as the IG report itself. Among other things, it describes how he met not just with Democratic Members but with a number of our Republican colleagues to address issues important to them, including international adoption and fighting fraud in our immigration programs. Following those meetings, just as with the EB–5 Program, Ali took appropriate steps to make improvements based on feedback from his constituents. That is what leaders should do.

Those examples and others included right there in the 2015 IG report serve to further illustrate Ali's commitment to doing what he thought was right, to improving the Department by carrying out the law without fear or favor, and by responding promptly and fully to inquiries from Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle.

If Ali Mayorkas is confirmed today, I am hopeful that many of our colleagues and our staffs will have a chance in the years to come to work with him and his team at the Department of Homeland Security and witness for themselves the kind of leader he truly is. We are fortunate that an individual as well prepared and qualified as Alejandro Mayorkas may soon have the opportunity to lead the Department through the many crises and challenges it faces and which our country faces today.

But you don't have to take my word for it. The late Tom Coburn, a dear friend of mine and former colleague of many of us, led the fight against Ali's confirmation in 2013, when he had been nominated to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security. Tom was then the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, and I was serving as its chairman. Tom, sadly, is deceased. We lost a good man, a really good man, a couple of years ago.

Tom's staff director of the committee, at the time, was a very capable gentleman. His name is Keith Ashdown. I think it is important to note that last week, Keith sent a letter to our committee. In it, he wrote of his strong support today of Ali's nomination to serve as Secretary of DHS.

Mr. Ashdown wrote these words. He said:

> I first came to know Mayorkas when I was the Republican staff director of this committee [the Homeland Security committee]. At that time, I was working to block his nomination to serve as Deputy Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

He went on to say:

> With the benefit of hindsight, I am glad my efforts to block his nomination were ultimately unsuccessful.

How often do you hear that? Mr. Ashdown went on to write:

> As Deputy Secretary, Mayorkas worked in a bipartisan manner to respond to the Committee's requests and concerns.

He added:

> Having been on the other side of this battle, I understand the importance of vetting a [nomination] thoroughly. But no one has been vetted more than has Ali Mayorkas.

Mr. Ashton concluded with these words. He said:

> I urge the [United States] Senate to expeditiously confirm Ali Mayorkas as [Department of Homeland Security] Secretary without delay.

Without delay.

Signed:

> Sincerely, Keith Ashdown.

Let me close today, by saying that I am grateful, and I know that the Mayorkas family is grateful as well, to Keith Ashdown and to the Republican Senators who have broken ranks in committee and on the floor in last week's cloture vote, who have taken the time to fully consider this nomination, and who now support it. We are grateful to you. I sincerely hope that more of our colleagues will join them and us today.

I would say to my colleagues, I don't stake my reputation on a lot of people, but I am more than willing to stake it on Ali Mayorkas, just as I have three times before in this same Chamber. If you are undecided today, colleagues, I hope you will join me this time. Ali Mayorkas will make us and this country proud. In fact, I believe, he already has.

While we are waiting for folks to come onto the floor, I just want to explain to people who ask: What is this EB–5 Program? It is a program that is designed to bring foreign capital into this country to help build businesses and provide jobs in return for the ability to come to this country and eventually have legal residency here. That is what it is about.

I want to say everything I do, I know I can do better. Every program that we have, even the ones that I helped to create, we can make them better. The EB–5 Program, which is a bipartisan program that was created, I think, under partnership with Ted Kennedy and Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, if I am not mistaken, wasn't a perfect program, and it wasn't administered in a perfect manner either.

The Constitution of our country has its Preamble, as we all know. It starts off with these words: ''We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union.'' That is what it says: ''We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union.''

That includes writing more perfect legislation and creating more perfect programs. When we find that they are not and that they are flawed, and that maybe some of the people who are administering them are ill-equipped with their skills and technology and backgrounds to oversee those programs, we have to make some changes. To those people whose feelings were hurt and those people who maybe had to find a different path in their careers, I reach out to you with a heavy heart.

But I want to close by saying: Ali Mayorkas is a good man. He is a great nominee. He served us before, and he will do it again. Let's give him our votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I ask I unanimous consent to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise in support of confirming Alejandro Mayorkas as Secretary of Homeland Security. I appreciate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for advancing this critical nomination so that we can finally provide the Department of Homeland Security with a qualified, experienced, and Senate-confirmed leader that they so desperately need.

Mr. Mayorkas is a proven leader and has the experience to protect the American people from harm. Throughout his confirmation process, Mr. Mayorkas confirmed his commitment to transparency and working on a bipartisan basis to ensure the Department is able to take on persistent and emerging threats.

And right now the threats we face are severe from domestic terrorism, including the rise of White supremacist violence to cyber attacks from foreign adversaries, to tackling a deadly pandemic. DHS continues to face daunting challenges, challenges that have only been made more difficult to address due to the years of chaos during the previous administration.

That is why former Homeland Security Secretaries from both Republican and Democratic administrations, other senior Homeland Security officials, and law enforcement organizations have urged the Senate to quickly confirm Mr. Mayorkas—because they know he is well prepared for the difficult task that lies ahead.

The Department of Homeland Security needs leadership, and it needs it now. By voting to confirm Mr. Mayorkas, this body can show every American that we are committed to ensuring that they are safe and secure

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise to express my support for the nomination of Mr. Alejandro Mayorkas to serve as Secretary of the Department of Homeland Secretary. His long career in public service, first as a prosecutor and later as Director of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services—USCIS—will provide DHS with much needed experience, expertise, and stability.

DHS is the third largest Federal agency, and under the Trump administration, it had six Directors in 4 years, four of whom were never Senate confirmed. This lack of stability at the leadership level, combined with the Trump administration's brutal immigration tactics and confrontational actions against peaceful protesters, sowed chaos and distrust in and about the Department.

Mr. Mayorkas will need to meet the challenges of restoring moral authority and guiding the Department through this difficult time. The challenges are many: executing a nationwide vaccine strategy to combat COVID–19, combating the rise of far-right, anti-government extremism and White supremacy, and strengthening our cyber defenses. I was pleased that he committed to supporting both DACA and TPS and working with Congress to support these communities. Maryland has a vibrant TPS population, with over 6,600 TPS holders working in essential industries during the coronavirus pandemic. Congress must act to extend permanent protections to these individuals and ensure that they have a safe and secure future with their families here in the United States. Unlike the previous administration, which torpedoed bipartisan congressional efforts to pass commonsense immigration reform, I am confident that Mr. Mayorkas will work with Congress to tackle these pressing priorities.

I was dismayed that my Republican colleagues sought to delay Mr. Mayorkas's nomination at such a crucial time. Approximately 4 weeks ago, domestic terrorists attacked Congress in an attempt to overturn the 2020 elections. Last week, for the first time, DHS released its first national bulletin warning about domestic rightwing extremism. The Department will need to work with the FBI and DOJ to combat one of the most lethal and persistent threats against our democracy. We cannot wait a minute longer, and Mr. Mayorkas must be confirmed immediately.

VOTE ON MAYORKAS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Mayorkas nomination?

Mr. PETERS. 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 bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any Senators in the Chamber desiring to change their vote

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted ''nay.''

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Romney
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rosen
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Capito	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Luján	Sinema
Carper	Manchin	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	Menendez	Sullivan
Coons	Merkley	Tester
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Feinstein	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Portman	

NAYS—43

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Rounds
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Thune
Cramer	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Tuberville
Cruz	Lummis	Wicker
Daines	Marshall	Young
Ernst	McConnell	
Fischer	Moran	

NOT VOTING—1

Toomey

The nomination was confirmed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, we all know of the crisis in America—the greatest economic crisis in 75 years since the New Deal, the greatest healthcare crisis in 100 years since the Spanish pandemic flu. Americans are suffering and hurting, losing jobs, businesses closing, can't feed their families, being evicted from their homes.

We are in a very, very difficult situation. We cannot afford to dither, delay, or dilute. We need a big, bold package along the lines of what President Biden has proposed, the American relief plan.

We hope our Republican colleagues will join us in offering amendments. Of course, as you know, as the reconciliation process moves forward, it is open to amendments and suggestions. We want it to be a bipartisan proposal, but we also know that we must move forward with the crisis in America. That is why today's vote is a very good vote, because it sets us on the process of moving forward and solving this—one of the greatest crises America has ever had.

I move to proceed to Calendar No. 4, S. Con. Res. 5, the concurrent resolution on the budget.

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 legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Luján	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—49

Barrasso	Cassidy	Daines
Blackburn	Collins	Ernst
Blunt	Cornyn	Fischer
Boozman	Cotton	Graham
Braun	Cramer	Grassley
Burr	Crapo	Hagerty
Capito	Cruz	Hawley

Hoeven	Moran	Scott (SC)
Hyde-Smith	Murkowski	Shelby
Inhofe	Paul	Sullivan
Johnson	Portman	Thune
Kennedy	Risch	Tillis
Lankford	Romney	Tuberville
Lee	Rounds	Wicker
Lummis	Rubio	Young
Marshall	Sasse	
McConnell	Scott (FL)	

NOT VOTING—1

Toomey

The motion was agreed to.

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the duration of the Senate's consideration of S. Con. Res. 5, the majority and Republican managers of the concurrent resolution, while seated or standing at the managers' desks, be permitted to deliver floor remarks, retrieve, review, and edit documents, and send email and other data communications from text displayed on wireless personal digital assistant devices and tablet devices. I further ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the budget resolution; further, that the staff be permitted to make technical and conforming changes to the resolution, if necessary, consistent with the amendments adopted during Senate consideration, including calculating the associated change in the net interest function, and incorporating the effect of such adopted amendments on the budgetary aggregates for Federal revenues, the amount by which the Federal revenues should be changed, new budget authority, budget outlays, deficits, public debt, and debt held by the public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the budget resolution that was introduced today.

Mr. President, let us be clear and let us in the Senate understand what the American people know all too well, and that is that our country is currently experiencing the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression and the worst public health emergency in over 100 years.

January marked the deadliest month of the pandemic, with over 90,000 Americans losing their lives as a result of COVID–19—90,000 Americans in 1 month.

In the midst of all of this, over 90 million Americans are uninsured or underinsured and are unable to afford to go to a doctor when they become ill.

The isolation and the anxiety caused by this pandemic have resulted in a horrible increase in mental illness, in depression, in anxiety, and in suicidal ideation.

Today, as we speak, over half of our people are living paycheck-to-paycheck, including millions of essential workers who put their lives on the line each and every day. More than 24 million Americans are unemployed, underemployed, or have given up looking for work, while hunger in this country—hunger in the richest country in the history of the world—is at the highest level that we have seen in decades.

Because of lack of income, over 14 million Americans are behind on their rent, averaging some $5,800 per family, and many of those families face eviction all across this country. People are worried that when the moratorium on eviction ends, they are going to be thrown out of their homes, put out on the streets. Americans who worry about eviction understand that they must not join the half a million Americans who are already homeless.

That is some of what we are experiencing today. That is what the American people understand.

Meanwhile, in the midst of this devastation to the working class and middle class of our country, the wealthiest people in America are becoming much wealthier, and income and wealth inequality—a longtime problem—is now soaring. Incredibly, while families throughout the country are struggling to put food on the table to feed their kids during this pandemic, 660 billionaires—not a whole lot of people—have increased their wealth by over $1 trillion.

As a result of this pandemic, education in our country, from childcare to graduate school, is in chaos. The majority of young people in our Nation have seen their education disrupted. Kids are not getting the learning that they need, falling further and further behind. On top of that, it is likely that hundreds of colleges will soon cease to exist.

In this moment of unprecedented crises, the Senate must respond through unprecedented action. The budget resolution we are debating today is simple, and it is straightforward. It will enable us to pass President Biden's $1.9 trillion emergency COVID relief plan through reconciliation with 51 votes instead of 60.

Now, I have heard from some of my Republican colleagues who tell us: Well, this reconciliation concept, that is a radical idea. Why are you using reconciliation?

They are telling us that it is absolutely imperative that we go forward in a bipartisan way and require 60 votes for passage. But I must say that when Republicans used this same reconciliation process, I didn't hear much about bipartisanship at that point. In fact, Republicans used the reconciliation process to provide trillions of dollars in tax breaks to the top 1 percent and large, profitable corporations by a simple majority vote. The only people who voted for that bill were Republicans—no bipartisanship in that bill.

My Republican colleagues used reconciliation to open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for the drilling of oil—once again by a simple majority. The only people who supported that were Republicans—not one Democrat.

As we all remember, painfully, my Republican colleagues used the reconciliation process to try to repeal the Affordable Care Act and throw up to 32 million Americans off of the healthcare they currently have. As you will recall, that was a 100-percent partisan vote, which fortunately lost by one vote.

Further, weeks—weeks—before a Presidential election, the last election, my Republican colleagues pushed through their nominee for the Supreme Court with 50 votes. That was a few weeks before the election. Not one Democrat supported that nominee—a totally partisan vote.

Well, as the incoming chair of the Senate Budget Committee, this is what I believe: If Republicans can use reconciliation to help the wealthy and the powerful and pass legislation strongly opposed by the American people, we can and must use reconciliation to help Americans recover from the worst economic and public health crisis in the modern history of our country. In other words, now is the time for this Congress to stand with the working class and the middle class of this country and do what the overwhelming majority of the American people want us to do.

It is worth pointing out that poll after poll shows that an overwhelming majority of Americans—over 70 percent—support what President Biden and what we are trying to do. They know we have to act boldly.

So I hope we will not hear much more about bipartisanship, given my Republican colleagues' record on that issue.

Let us be clear. The working class of this country and the middle class are facing more economic desperation than at any time since the Great Depression. I have to tell you that to me, emotionally, it was a painful sight to see in my own city of Burlington, VT, hundreds of cars lined up so that families could get the food they needed to feed their kids. What happened in Burlington is happening in every State of this country. People—many of whom have never had any public assistance at all—are lining up to get emergency supplies of food in order to keep their families alive.

Whether it is the pandemic, which is killing 3,000 people a day; whether it is

the economic collapse, which is leaving millions of our people destitute; whether it is the disruption of education in this country, which means that kids are falling further and further behind, this Congress must act and act boldly.

For too long Congress has responded to the needs of the wealthy and the powerful and big-money campaign contributors. Now is the time, in this unprecedented set of crises, for us to respond to the needs of working families, whether they are Black or White, Latino, Native American, or Asian American.

It is no secret that millions of our fellow Americans are literally giving up on democracy—giving up on democracy. They think that the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Government does not care a whit about the needs of working people. The people who go to work every day, who keep our country going, who put their lives on the line during this pandemic, they look at us, and they say: Does anybody there in Washington—all you rich guys, do you understand what is going on in our lives?

Well, this week, during this debate, we are not only going to begin addressing the health and economic and educational crises we face, but maybe, even more importantly, we are going to begin the process of restoring faith in the U.S. Government. Maybe, just maybe, we can do what Abraham Lincoln talked about in the midst of the terrible Civil War, and that is, be a government and act like a government of the people, by the people, and for the people and not just powerful special interests and their lobbyists.

What will this budget resolution mean for the average American? I know we are throwing out a lot of numbers; $1.9 trillion is a lot of money. What does it actually mean? How is it going to impact the lives of ordinary people? Let me just say a few words on that.

Everybody is concerned about the pandemic, which has taken so many lives and caused so much illness and suffering. What this legislation is about is an effort to aggressively crush the pandemic and enable the American people to return to their jobs and schools by providing the funding necessary to establish a national emergency program to produce the quantity of vaccines that we need. We need to increase vaccine production, and, equally important, we need to significantly improve the distribution of vaccines so that we get them into the arms of people as quickly as we can.

What this legislation means is that during this severe economic downturn, we must make sure that all Americans—low-income people, working-class people, middle-class people—have the financial resources that they need to live with dignity. This budget resolution will allow us to keep the promises that we made to the American people and increase the $600 in direct payments for working-class adults and their kids up to $2,000—another $1,400.

I want you just to think—whether it is Connecticut or Vermont or South Carolina or anyplace else—think about, during this terrible crisis, what it will mean to an average family to suddenly get a check for $5,600 for a family of four on top of the $600 per person that they received a few weeks ago. Think about what that will mean to people who are losing hope right now.

Passing this budget resolution will give us the tools we need to raise the minimum wage to a living wage of $15 an hour, expand unemployment benefits, expand the child tax credit, and prevent eviction, homelessness, and hunger.

Passing this budget resolution means that during this raging pandemic, we will be able to provide healthcare to millions of Americans who are uninsured and underinsured by expanding Medicaid, improving the Affordable Care Act, and other approaches.

Passing this budget resolution means that we will go a long, long way forward to addressing the long-term problem of childhood poverty in America, and that is that by expanding the child tax credit, we have the opportunity to cut childhood poverty in this country in half and no longer be the major country on Earth which has one of the highest rates of childhood poverty.

Let me very briefly mention a few of the specific provisions in the budget resolution that will enable the Senate to pass this budget under reconciliation.

First, as I just mentioned, the overwhelming majority of the American people have told us very loudly and clearly that the $600 direct payment that Congress passed in December was a good start but is not enough. In this bill, we are going to increase that $600 by another $1,400.

We cannot continue to allow workers in America to work at jobs that pay them a starvation wage. A United States of America job should lift you out of poverty and not keep you in it. So let us be clear: When we increase that minimum wage to $15 an hour, not only will we be providing a much needed raise for tens of millions of American workers, we will also, by the way, save taxpayers many billions of dollars each and every year.

Moreover, this pandemic has caused tens of millions of American workers to lose their jobs through no fault of their own. For 45 consecutive weeks, unemployment claims have been higher than during the worst week of the great recession in 2008. This budget resolution that we are considering now will provide the funding necessary to provide 18 million Americans with $400 a week in supplemental unemployment benefits until the end of September.

So, if you are watching us—if you are watching TV now because you are unemployed when you would rather be at work—understand that this bill will extend unemployment $400 on top of the normal unemployment your State provides until the end of September. We have not forgotten the unemployed.

Further, all of us know that we have a childcare crisis in America. It was severe before the pandemic. It is even worse now. This budget resolution would begin to provide the resources necessary to provide childcare to 875,000 children in America, and it would expand the child tax credit from $2,000 to $3,000 and $3,600 for kids under the age of 6. In other words, we hear what working families are going through, especially those who are struggling and have children. This will be a major, major step in improving lives and easing anxiety for young couples with kids.

In addition, let us not forget this pandemic has had a horrific toll on the finances of State and local governments, many of which are literally on the verge of bankruptcy. Over the past 10 months, State and local governments have laid off some 1.4 million workers, including 50,000 in December alone. These are teachers, firemen, cops, and other municipal and State employees. The budget resolution that we are debating today will provide $350 billion to prevent mass layoffs of public sector workers in State and local governments. The Congressional Budget Office has said that the best bang for the buck of all the money Congress has passed so far for COVID relief is to aid State and local governments.

Further, if there is one thing this horrific pandemic should have taught all of us, it is that we must no longer consider healthcare as simply an employee benefit. Healthcare must be a human right. It is unacceptable to my mind that over 14 million Americans have lost their employer-provided health benefits over the past 10 months. Over 14 million workers have lost their health coverage, impacting even more people because there are wives and husbands and children involved as well.

This budget resolution, will, among other healthcare provisions, enable the Senate to expand Medicaid. It will allow more Americans to receive the primary care that they need through community health centers. It will address the serious shortage of doctors and nurses in rural areas and inner cities by expanding the National Health Service Corps and will make sure that our veterans receive the healthcare that they have earned and deserve by increasing funding at the VA by $17 billion.

In addition, in the wealthiest country on Earth, we can no longer tolerate hunger in America, and this budget resolution will enable the Senate to provide nutrition assistance to tens of millions of families struggling to get the food that they need—and that includes the disabled and the elderly—by expanding SNAP, WIC, and the Pandemic EBT Program.

In America today, some 14 million Americans owe an average of $5,800 in back rent. If we do not get our act together, tens of millions of Americans will soon face the possibility of being

thrown out of their apartments and homes and onto the streets. This budget resolution that we are debating will provide the funding for rent relief, utility assistance, and mortgage relief to millions of tenants and homeowners who are in danger of eviction or foreclosure.

It also deals with the shame of homelessness in America. Today, in the midst of the dead of winter, we cannot have hundreds of thousands of Americans sleeping in homeless shelters, in their cars, or out on the streets. And right here, in walking distance from this Capitol, there are tents located in parks where Americans are sleeping in the middle of the winter.

This resolution provides investments in appropriate housing that will protect the health of our people and help decrease COVID–19 transmissions with safe and socially distant housing.

Further, all of us must acknowledge that there is a pension crisis in America today. As a result of the greed on Wall Street, workers and retirees and multiemployer pension plans are in danger of seeing their retirement benefits cut by as much as 65 percent. That is unacceptable. Promises were made to those workers, and the U.S. Congress cannot renege on those promises.

Not only is this $1.9 trillion emergency COVID-relief package the right thing to do from a moral perspective and a public policy perspective, it is exactly what the overwhelming majority of the American people want us to do. According to a recent poll from Change Research, nearly 70 percent of the American people support President Biden's $1.9 trillion COVID–19 plan; 83 percent support boosting direct payments from $600 to $2,000; 64 percent support raising the Federal minimum wage to 15 bucks an hour; and 62 percent of voters support additional unemployment benefits.

We are living in an unprecedented moment in American history. The last year has been a year the likes of which none of us have experienced in our lifetime. And the American people, who are living in pain, in anxiety, in isolation—they are looking to the U.S. Senate, and they are saying: Are you going to hear and understand what we are going through? Are you going to do something to address the terrible problems in terms of healthcare, the economy, and education that we are experiencing?

It is no great secret that, for many years, the Congress has listened very attentively to the needs of billionaires, to the needs of campaign contributors, and to the needs of lobbyists. Now is the time for us to listen to the needs of working families, the elderly, the children, the sick, the disabled, and the poor. Now is the time to restore confidence that the American Government works for all of us and not just the few.

I urge passage of this important, important piece of legislation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will be responding to my good friend Senator SANDERS. Apparently, I will be the ranking member on Budget; he will be the chairman. And I look forward to finding some common ground where we can. Today is not that day, but hope springs eternal. There are things I think we can do on the Budget Committee that will be good for the country.

Here is the other side of the story. About a year ago—a little over a year ago—the pandemic coming out of China was detected, COVID, on the west coast of the United States. It has just done a number on us as a nation. Over 440,000 people have died from COVID-related infections. We finally got vaccines. They are in the pipeline. We need to get them out quicker, but I do believe that the vaccines are going to help us a lot.

To the American people who have been suffering, I think better days lie ahead, but we are not there yet.

But here is what is different. February 2, 2021, things changed. Up until now, we have been able, as a Congress and with the White House, to pass things together regarding COVID. We passed over $4 trillion of COVID relief in a bipartisan fashion up until today. Now, how was that done?

You had a Republican President—President Trump—working with a Democratic-controlled House and a Republican-controlled Senate beginning of January—I guess, March of last year. Here is what we were able to do together. Phase 1, we approved 96 to 1 the Coronavirus Preparedness and Response Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2020. It was $8 billion. That was early on last year when we really didn't know what we were dealing with.

Then, we did $355 billion, 90 to 8. Then, the next was $1.9 trillion. Listen to this: We spent $1.9 trillion, 96 to nothing. So it is not like we don't see a need to spend money. Ninety-six to nothing, this body agreed to spend $1.9 trillion last year.

After that, we did the paycheck protection enhancement of $355 billion by voice vote. It is not like people on this side don't see a need.

We had a continuing resolution where we added another $8 billion, 84 to 10.

In the omnibus, we did another $1.04 trillion, 92 to 6.

So when you add all this up, we have appropriated $4 trillion to deal with the problems associated with COVID—money for people who have been struggling, money for hospitals and doctors, money for vaccine development and distribution, direct payments, the PPP program to keep small businesses from going under that can't operate at full capacity. It has been a great program. It was bipartisan until now.

Here is what I want the American people to know: We have done a lot together, and of the $4 trillion we have appropriated, to date, we have spent $2.7 trillion.

Of the Federal Reserve actions we took allowing the Federal Reserve to help business, we had a $5.7 trillion market cap, for lack of a better term, and we have allocated $2.6 trillion.

The bottom line is, of the $900 billion that we passed recently—a little over $900 billion—we have only spent 20 percent of the money. And here we are being asked for another $1.9 trillion.

What is different between the first $1.9 trillion and this request? When it was first offered, the $1.9 trillion, it was the largest single appropriation, I think, maybe in the history of the country since World War II. And the fact that 96 Senators would come together and pass it 96 to nothing tells you about the way we saw the problem. And we have been adding and adding and adding.

Now we are to a point where the Biden administration is proposing $1.9 trillion of additional spending. We haven't spent the money we have allocated—nowhere near the money we have allocated. And you have a bipartisan group of Republicans—10—who went to the White House yesterday and said: What about a little over $600 billion? See if that is enough.

I am afraid the answer is going to be no.

So what has happened here? Democratic colleagues have won the White House. And Biden is President; he won. It is a 50–50 Senate. The Vice President makes it a Democratic-controlled body, to the extent that the Vice President breaks ties. And you have a smaller majority in the House than we have had in the last 20 years. But the consequence of what I have just described is that my Democratic colleagues are now in charge of everything.

When it was divided government—when you had a Republican President, a Republican Senate, and a Democratic House—we were able to come together with overwhelming votes to help the American people. Now we find ourselves at a crossroads. Our Democratic colleagues are using a process called budget reconciliation that begins today that would allow them to pass the $1.9 trillion basically on a party-line vote—a simple majority, not reaching the 60-vote milestone.

The 60-vote problem was never a problem up until now because Republicans and Democrats were able to work together up until now. What changed? They have got it all. Everything we told you would happen in the election is coming true. You have one party in control of Washington, and they are seizing the moment.

What a $15-an-hour minimum wage has to do with fighting COVID, I don't know. But I do know this, now is the worst possible time to increase the cost on small businesses in South Carolina in the restaurant-hospitality industry. You are about to hit them with two government mandates that are going to put them out of business. They are all struggling.

A lot of States have reduced capability in terms of indoor dining. DC, I

think last week, for the first time, you could dine indoors at 25-percent capacity. States all over the country have different rules about how small business operates.

The tourist industry is just about squashed. So people in the hospitality industry, in the restaurant business, and in the service industry, if this bill passes the way it has been proposed, are going to have a $15-per-hour per-employee mandate. That is going to sink them. They are going to have to lay a lot of people off because they are barely making it as it is.

Here is what we are doing to those businesses. State and local governments are mandating a reduction in revenue. Why? Because you reduce the capability to earn money by reducing seating capacity and the other things associated with fighting COVID. So what does the Congress do? Do we relieve that burden by having more PPP? No. We increase your cost of doing business.

This $15-an-hour minimum wage increase will dramatically increase the cost of doing business to small businesses at a time they can afford it the least. There are people out there working today that will be out of work tomorrow if this bill passes.

My Democratic colleagues have taken the energy sector head-on. They stopped the Keystone Pipeline. I don't know how many thousands of jobs would be affected by that. But all of these mandates and all of these changes in policies are making it really hard right now to employ people.

So count me in for more COVID relief once I understand how the money we have previously allocated has been spent.

I think continuing to spend at this level, without understanding what the money in the past has done, is not very responsible. We have only spent 20 percent of the $900 billion we passed just a few weeks ago. Now we are going to do $1.9 trillion more?

Of the $4 trillion we did together, $2.7 trillion has been spent. Over $1 trillion is sitting there not spent yet.

So I guess the point I am trying to make, and my Republican colleagues, is that this $1.9 trillion package, there has been no effort to make it bipartisan. We are spending a lot more money before we understand how the money we spent actually works. And some of the policy provisions in this package, I think, are going to do more damage to the economy that is struggling to get back on its feet than good. But they have the power, and they are using it.

He is right, Senator SANDERS. When we had this authority, we cut your taxes through budget reconciliation. That is what we did, so it is not like Republicans haven't used this process. Democrats used it pretty much to pass ObamaCare. But this is one area where there has been pretty much a common view of things.

Taxes are different between Republicans and Democrats. Who decides what healthcare you get—there are some people like my good friend from Vermont who wants single-payer healthcare. That is one way of doing it. I just disagree. Everything is about trying to help people. I don't doubt the motives; I just doubt where we are headed is a good outcome for the American people.

So the bottom line is, up until now, we have had bipartisanship when it comes to COVID relief. The reason that bipartisanship has stopped is because we have one party in control of the U.S. Senate, the House, and the White House.

Here is what I think: That is going to end not well because it is not like we don't want to help people; we just have a different view of how to help. And we would like to let some of the money we have already appropriated go to work and see how well it works and fill in gaps where you need to fill in gaps.

Count me in for more payments, direct payments, beyond $600. Count me out for giving $2,000 payments to people who make almost $200,000 a year. I think it needs to be more targeted. I don't mind having more direct payments; I would like to make it more targeted. And I don't mind discussing raising the minimum wage when the COVID problem passes and we get back on our feet; I do mind doubling it in the middle of a pandemic.

And I do believe that this $1.9 trillion package is going to do more harm than good to the American economy.

The reason we are having this debate the way we are having this debate is because they have unlimited power, my Democratic colleagues.

You have chosen to do this. The 10 Republicans who went down to the White House—I appreciate their effort. Maybe some good will come from that. But this process we are engaged in today makes me wonder if it was worth their time. Maybe we can pull a rabbit out of the hat and find a bipartisan compromise consistent with what we have done over the last year. If not, we are going to march down the reconciliation road. We are going to take $1.9 trillion of spending and let one party spend it. We are going to have one point of view about this money. We are going to let people spend $1.9 trillion without any input from the other side of the aisle, in a 50–50 divided Senate.

I don't know what you got from the last election. Here is what I got: We did better in the House than I thought we would do; President Trump lost, but it was still a close election from an electoral college point of view; and the Senate is 50–50. I don't think the message from the last election was ''We want Democrats to spend $1.9 trillion and deal Republicans out.'' That is exactly what you are doing.

It would be different if we had had a history over here of trying not to help. We were able, 96 to 0, to spend $1.9 trillion less than a year ago. And now we want to spend $1.9 trillion again—after the money previously allocated hasn't been spent?

All I am suggesting to my Democratic colleagues is, we are going to have a different view on taxes, and we are going to have a different view on healthcare, but this is the one area where I really do believe there is a bipartisan middle ground to be had.

To Senator SANDERS, there may come a time where I will work with you to raise the minimum wage.

The PPP program has been highly successful. The $600 billion proposal by Republicans has more money for that. It has more direct payments, but it is more targeted.

Senator MANCHIN said that he wants more direct payments, but he wants it targeted to people on the lower economic end.

MIKE ROUNDS—one of our colleagues from South Dakota—got a check.

The bottom line is, I don't mind helping people, but there has to be some sense that we can't just constantly write checks and hope one day that doesn't come back to bite us.

One thing about a $15-an-hour minimum wage now—I think what it does is put pressure on businesses that can't stand any more pressure. It is going to cost people jobs that have a job. It is going to do more harm than good in this environment.

When you combine the mandate of increasing wages where the $15 an hour is the least wage and add what we are doing in terms of restricting income generation, that is a formula for disaster for small businesses.

This is it. If this bill passes the way it is written, there are going to be thousands of people out of work who were previously working in a small business that is going to fold. How does that help COVID?

If you don't believe that, you are not really walking and talking to the people out there on the frontlines of this economy. The tourism industry in Myrtle Beach, SC, has been decimated. You can't fly from one State to the other without a 2-week quarantine. Hopefully, that will begin to pass when we get vaccine distribution at a higher level. But people along the coast of South Carolina in the hospitality tourism business are hanging by a thread.

The PPP program has been a lifeline. The last $900 billion package had a new round of PPP money. If we need more money, count me in. Again, I would like to have a higher direct payment but not to people who make $150,000, $200,000 in combined income.

This package is going to be devastating to the hospitality service industry. It is going to take us down a path we haven't gone before, which is a partisan approach to COVID. And I do believe—and maybe I am wrong—that with some effort on our part, we can reconcile the difference between what our Republican colleagues proposed and what President Biden has proposed and find some middle ground like we have in the past, but there doesn't seem to be a real effort to do that.

All I can say is that the American people want us to work together for

their benefit, and this will be the first time that I can recall where we have spent $1.9 trillion based on one party's view of things. That is not good. That is a lot of money—and it is so unnecessary.

I would encourage Senator SANDERS and my colleagues on the other side to give a chance to this negotiation and see if we can get there. I hope we can, but this is not the right way. What we are doing today is going to set into motion partisanship where there was previous bipartisanship.

President Biden said he wanted to unify the Nation. You have picked the one topic that we have been pretty unified on, and you are going to disrupt that unification.

The first COVID package had a $600 Federal supplement to State unemployment benefits, and I looked at that. My family was in the restaurant business. Senator SANDERS gave statistics about support of the public. You are literally paying people more not to work than work.

I want to help people because they are out of work—no fault of their own because of COVID—but when we went to $600, we were paying people $23 an hour, I think, in South Carolina not to work. That did not go over well with the public at large. We are trying to reduce that Federal supplement down to $300, not $600, to help people who are out of work but not to incentivize people not to go back to work when the economy is beginning to open.

In this package, we go back to $400, and it goes all the way to September, which means it is going to be harder to hire people back when the economy does show signs of reopening. And it is beginning to show signs of coming back. The faster the vaccine is distributed, the more people who get inoculated, the sooner we can go back to business.

I would just say to my Democratic colleagues: You have chosen this path. All of us are going to vote no to $1.9 trillion in spending—not because we don't care; it is because we would like to see what the money we spent in the past is doing before we add another $1.9 trillion.

A lot of the provisions in your proposal, we think, have very little, if anything, to do with COVID, and it would be unfortunate if we go down this road. But we are not in charge.

Now, 2022 will be here before you know it. Hopefully, by 2022, we will have the American people build up immunity to COVID, and our economy will come back the way it was before the COVID pandemic. Before the pandemic, the economy was doing well for all sectors of the American people. I think one of the things that helped was that tax cut that Senator SANDERS opposed. But we can have political debates about that.

The point I am trying to make is, up until this moment in time, we have been able to achieve overwhelming bipartisan support dealing with the COVID problem that we all face. It really is disappointing and disheartening that we are going to abandon that model when I don't think we have to. But that will be up to my Democratic colleagues. That will be up to President Biden.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

And finally, a message to President Biden: You won; we lost. You are the legitimate President of the United States. I want to help you where I can. I just got a briefing about what you are proposing in Afghanistan. I think it is darned good.

There are plenty of things we can do around here together—on foreign policy and domestic policy. It doesn't have to be a fight to the death all the time.

The infrastructure bill is there for the taking. I think most Americans realize our roads and our bridges and our ports need upgrading, and count me in for that. There are things that we can do.

President Biden, you can do something too. You can say: Slow down in the Senate. Slow down in the House. I am going to see if I can find middle ground.

I am telling you right now that $1.9 trillion being spent the way this bill envisions is not responsible. We haven't spent the money we have previously allocated. There is a lot in this bill that will cost jobs at a time we need jobs, and you are not going to help the COVID crisis by putting somebody out of work because of a government mandate that business can't afford to fulfill because they are hanging by a thread.

We will have some time in the next couple of days to talk about what is in the package, what is not, our view of how this thing should all unfold. I will yield back here with a sense of optimism.

To my Republican colleagues who went to talk to the White House, count me in. If you can work something out, I would like to be able to help. It is not like there is not some more money that can be spent, but this approach—the way you are spending the money, the amount of money in this approach, I think, is going to make this place less unified. If you are looking for unity, this is a lousy way to get it.

With that, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we have already begun to hear a little revisionist history with respect to this crucial issue. There was exactly one amendment on the CARES Act, and that amendment, supported by almost every Senator on the other side of the aisle, basically would have blown up the law that I put special focus on because it was deemed the only way to get expanded unemployment benefits out to folks in a timely way.

We were told that there was all this bipartisanship. Yet on the crucial issue, that wasn't the case because that benefit, in particular, is what helped scores and scores of communities all across the country stay afloat because that money was spent locally. It was spent on rent. It was spent on groceries. And most of all, it was weekly. Yet there was exactly one amendment on the original legislation, and that one amendment was to blow up the only way to get checks out to folks relatively quickly—point No. 1.

Point No. 2, these were not folks who didn't want to work. They were told by their government—told by their government—that they really needed to be at home to deal with the virus. These folks want to work; there is no question about it.

We are going to talk about this, I imagine, in this debate, but study after study has shown that the expanded unemployment during this period was not a disincentive to work. There is just no evidence of that. In fact, when we look at crucial periods of time when people might have stayed home, they were rushing to get back to work.

We are going to discuss this, and I am going to start the debate now on where we are at this moment because I think this discussion comes down to a simple proposition; that is, whether millions of workers and their families should have to spend years and years living in the wreckage of the COVID economy. The jobs recovery for millions is going in reverse.

Millions of Americans have lost jobs through no fault of their own. Maybe they were working at the airport. Maybe they were tending bar. Maybe they were teaching our kids when the worst pandemic—the worst pandemic in a century—swept the United States. They didn't do anything wrong.

The question now is whether the U.S. Senate is going to step in with big policies to actually be of help to them or whether it is going to quit on those workers when they need a modest amount of assistance until everybody gets vaccinated.

President Biden has a strong, focused plan that is going to meet the moment, get relief to workers in the middle class, and kick-start the jobs recovery. The plan that was brought forward yesterday by 10 Republican Senators doesn't come close to meeting that bar.

The debate isn't a whole lot more complicated than that. I am glad that there is some agreement on both sides for funding vaccines. Yet the economic divide in this debate is very clear.

Here are the key facts as we start this discussion. The independent experts at the Congressional Budget Office released a new report yesterday that shows how long-lasting this jobs crisis is really going to be. According to the Budget Office, it could be more than 5 years before the unemployment rate even begins to approach where it was a year ago.

Millions of workers could stay stuck on an economic tightrope, worried about eviction, worried about going hungry, wages to flatline for the better part of the decade.

Americans know what happens when Congress takes its foot off the gas, slows down the recovery, because that is what happened a little bit over a decade ago—12 years exactly. The great recession hit, but in early 2009, the Senate decided, we are going to go small. I was around. Everybody was told: You know, not so bad if you go small because the Senate will get a second bite at the apple. Nobody ever got a second bite at the apple, and workers suffered and suffered some more. In my home State, it took 7½ years in Oregon for the unemployment rate to fall back to where it was before the recession.

Recent history tells us you have to go big. We are hearing from economic experts telling the Senate to go big. Treasury Secretary Yellen, fresh off her unanimous, 26-to-0 vote in the Finance Committee, and Fed Chair Powell are saying: Go small and you make a big mistake.

That is why the outline that a group of my Republican colleagues brought forward this week just does not get the job done. It is the same playbook as 2009, and it leaves too many workers on the economic tightrope for years to come.

The budget resolution before the Senate has some big solutions on the economy and for our workers. Right off the top, it makes investments in vaccines and care that is needed to end the pandemic as quickly as possible. This is the No. 1 way to get the lives of Americans back to normal. It is not going to happen overnight.

In the meantime, our economy needs another rescue package. That is what the resolution, the budget resolution, essentially sets up. It is hard to figure, when you are at home, all of the legalese and lingo, but now we are really dealing with the lives and the well-being of the American people, and this is what starts us in the right direction.

Here are three examples of why this resolution is so important.

First, it sends big financial support to jobless Americans. There is not going to be a full jobs recovery as long as it is unsafe to go to restaurants indoors or go to conventions or pack fans in the basketball arenas. Those workers need help.

As I mentioned when we heard a little revisionist history on the expanded unemployment earlier, as the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, I negotiated the $600-per-week boost and expansion of unemployment insurance last year in the CARES Act. It was an economic lifesaver for workers who used that money to pay rent, to buy groceries, and to cover the cost of medicine. I still have those workers come up to me and say: RON, I heard about what was going on in the Senate. You all gave me the money to pay for my car insurance, because if I didn't have that car insurance, life in our family would just fall apart.

So contrary to what we heard earlier—and during the course of this debate, I am going to put several studies into the RECORD. There has never been hard evidence that enhanced, expanded unemployment benefits in any way held back the recovery. In fact, when enhanced unemployment benefits expired last summer, the job recovery actually slowed down.

In December, our colleagues on the other side extended unemployment insurance just to mid-March, and they cut the additional benefit in half. I believe that was also a big mistake. Between the worst economy since World War II and the pandemic entering its second year in America, you couldn't find a worse time for Senators to start nickel-and-diming workers—hard-hit workers—out of the relief they so desperately need.

As I noted, there was just one vote, only one vote in the original CARES package, and that vote was led by my colleagues who would have blown up the only way to get benefits in a relatively quick way out to millions of workers.

In my hometown, the average rent for a two-bedroom apartment is $1,750. Traditional unemployment insurance benefits don't come anywhere near paying that rent. If you are a single parent trying to raise one or two kids, even with the expanded benefit, you are barely making ends meet. If you are a two-income household, it can also be a big struggle. Nobody is going out buying boats with their unemployment insurance benefits. They are spending it at corner stores, local markets, going to the pharmacy, paying for medicine for kids who aren't feeling well.

The budget resolution before the Senate calls for a 6-month extension with an extra boost of $400 per week. It is a proposal that I support. In later packages, I want colleagues to know, I am going to keep pushing for the full $600. And I believe that Congress ought to tie the extension of unemployment benefits to economic conditions in our communities, to economic conditions on the ground. It is just common sense.

Unemployment insurance works best when it covers all workers, when it pays an adequate benefit, and when Members of the U.S. Senate can't politicalize it by setting arbitrary dates and setting up cliffs when people are going to get cut off of those benefits.

Second, the budget resolution helps bring back jobs. The RESTAURANTS Act is a vital jobs program. It will save a lot of jobs in one of the industries hardest hit by the pandemic, and it is particularly important because a lot of restaurants weren't able to take advantage of the PPP, the Paycheck Protection Program.

Another key jobs proposal that is part of this resolution is help for States and localities. I want to make something clear for the record about State and local funding because this has been attacked by our colleagues on the other side since last March. I would bet my last dollar that somebody will come down to the Senate floor this week and rail about the so-called blue State bailout and say it is all waste. That is nonsense.

State and local funding is first and foremost about jobs that are a lifeline. It is about firefighters. It is about road crews. It is about sanitation workers. It is about public health employees. It is about teachers. It has nothing to do with red States or blue States; it is about saving people's jobs in communities across the country, and those are jobs where they are out saving people's lives. Nearly 1.5 million of these essential workers have already lost their jobs since the pandemic began, and unless Congress provides funding to States and localities, even more will be laid off this year.

Third, the budget resolution is going to put money into the pockets of working families and the middle class. The fact is, tens of millions of American families are literally one financial setback away from devastation. That should have been clear before the pandemic. There is certainly no denying it today.

Increasing relief checks to $2,000 is going to help, especially because so many workers have lost hours or taken lower paying jobs than they had a year ago. But the budget resolution also includes fresh ideas from President Biden and colleagues on this side to increase family incomes—first and foremost, expanding the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit. In my view, this is long overdue.

People always ask, well, what is it really going to do? What is it going to do that is meaningful to our country? What we are told is that effort is going to cut child poverty in half. Just try to put your arms around that.

When you go home to talk to folks and they ask, hey, what is going on there, you can say, I am part of an effort—a sensible effort which for many years had some real Republican support—I am supportive of an effort to cut child poverty in half, give millions and millions of families a chance to get ahead. It sure sounds to me that a policy like that is a no-brainer.

I am going to close by briefly addressing arguments I have heard coming from the other side.

First, I heard a number of Members say that the price tag is too high. Well, I will tell you, if you voted for Donald Trump's deficit-financed handouts to multinational corporations and billionaires, you cannot credibly argue that the relief for workers is fiscally reckless. And the fact is, the deficit isn't going to get better until unemployment comes down and the economy gets back to strong and consistent growth.

Second, I have heard some Senators suggest that the budget resolution is bad for unity. My answer to that is, the only place where big, bold economic relief is a divisive proposition is within the four walls of the U.S. Senate. We have seen the polls—overwhelming support for these key positions, the key

policies that are part of this budget resolution. I would submit to my colleagues, the only place where there is really a strong division on the value of this budget resolution is within the four walls of the Senate.

The last point is a little bit personal. The President of the Senate and I have known each other a lot of years. We worked very closely in the other body and here. I, over time, have gotten a fair amount of flak for sometimes being too bipartisan, doing too much to try to bring both sides together. I always will say—always—it is better if you can find common ground.

But calls for unity aren't supposed to be a political baseball bat where you club somebody. They are supposed to be real. They are supposed to be about finding common ground, not about stalling for the sole purpose of stalling.

What you see in this budget resolution is exactly the kind of plan that Americans voted for and the overwhelming majority of Americans support. That is why I am strongly behind this resolution.

As a senior member of our party on the Finance Committee, I am looking forward to a lot of debate on this issue. That is why I felt it was important to step in when we heard some revisionist history from the other side that there hadn't been any partisanship. There sure was on that very first vote on the CARES Act.

This is an important debate. What is really most important is that while we continue to listen to our colleagues on the other side, while we continue to reach out, which I am committed to do, the U.S. Senate get this job done because there is too much economic hurt in America to do otherwise.

We have another unemployment cliff coming in just a few weeks. Technically, the date is March 14. That is when the next round of unemployment expires. I really think we have to get this done by the beginning of March. There is no time to waste.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, as I will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Iowa.

PROTESTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to bring up the point that there must be equal attention to the dangers of extremism, whether it is extremism of the right or extremism of the left.

We have all been horrified by the senseless criminal acts that occurred at the U.S. Capitol on January 6 of this year. A violent mob was able to overrun Capitol Police and quickly gain access to the area where a joint session of Congress was being held. Five people, including a Capitol Police officer, died as a result of this attack.

I hope that together, Republicans and Democrats, we can get to the bottom of what occurred on that day and ensure that it never happens again.

In the spirit of collaboration, I must direct everyone's attention to something that has occurred to me, and that is the need to condemn all political violence regardless of ideology. Like many Americans, I have been deeply troubled by the rioting, looting, anti-police attacks, and deaths that have occurred this summer.

While many very legitimately protested the death of George Floyd in a peaceful manner, consistent with their rights under the First Amendment, thousands of others did not do it in a peaceful manner and probably did it for a lot of other reasons than just George Floyd's death. One of the most upsetting aspects of the violence of this summer has been how it has targeted innocent law enforcement officers. Over 700 officers were injured between May 27 and June 8, 2020. This number is likely underreported as nearly 300 of those injuries occurred only in New York City.

Acting Deputy Homeland Security Secretary Ken Cuccinelli testified at a hearing in front of the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution that there had been 277 Federal officer injuries at the Federal courthouse in Portland, adding further to that total previously given to you. Officers were assaulted nightly there for months—slashed, hard objects thrown at them, struck with objects like hammers and baseball bats, even blinded by lasers.

In another offensive, 60 Secret Service officers were injured during a sustained attack on the White House, which caused then-President Trump to be taken to a secure bunker. The church across the street from the White House was lit on fire as part of that continued assault. Over 300 people were charged federally for their roles in these weeks and months of violence. Eighty of those charges related to the use of arson and explosives. Others involved assaults on officers and the destruction of government property.

However, the nationwide riots, which broke out in nearly every major city in the country, were predominantly State offenses. At least 14,000 people were arrested in 49 cities. At least 25 people died in violence related to the riots. Property Claim Services—a company that tracks insurance claims relating to riots and civil disorders—estimates that the insurance losses from the summer's civil unrest ''far outstrip'' all previous records to possibly exceed $2 billion.

It has been a relatively frequent sight at the summer's violent events to see individuals acting in coordination in all black bloc, holding the ''A'' symbol of antifa. An admitted antifa adherent in Portland murdered a conservative protester. Antifa supporters have been charged federally for promoting riots and using Molotov cocktails. While that violence has slackened now since President Biden's electoral victory was declared, it has far from abated. Antifa rioters attacked the Oregon Democratic Party's headquarters on inauguration day itself. The far left of this country continues to believe violence will get more attention for their causes even after a Democratic victory win for the White House.

Much of the violence of the summer was specifically investigated by the FBI as domestic terrorism. FBI Director Chris Wray provides statistics on domestic terrorism in his annual threats testimony. He has previously testified that 900 to 1,000 domestic terrorism investigations exist at any given time. There are also about 1,000—what they call—homegrown violent extremism investigations. These are cases in which an entirely U.S.-based person without direct contact with a foreign terrorist organization is motivated by the global jihadist movement, and, of course, there are thousands more international terrorism investigations.

Former U.S. Attorney Erin Nealy Cox testified in a subcommittee hearing that over 300 domestic terrorism cases were opened due to the violence just this past summer. This is a significant increase in the ordinary amount of domestic terrorism in the United States. That this violence occurred—and the facts and the figures that surround it—should not be news to anyone. However, I must admit that I have been extremely surprised by the responses of Democratic Members to this violence.

For weeks and months, the most consistent response seemed to be to deny the violence was occurring at all. I saw JERROLD NADLER on TV—the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee—deny that antifa itself was real. In a nationally televised debate with then-President Trump, then-Candidate Joe Biden wrongly stated that antifa was only an ''idea.'' This is even after FBI Director Wray had already testified to Congress that antifa was absolutely a ''real thing'' and that the FBI had cases and investigations against those calling themselves ''antifa.''

It seems that some Democrats are living in a different world than those who have seen businesses boarded up, if not burned out, images of violence in the streets, and terrifying attacks on police officers. When the violence was admitted by those same people, it seemed to have been condoned rather than condemned.

Now, Vice President HARRIS previously said:

> They're not going to stop, and everyone, beware. [. . .] And they should not, and we should not.

You have seen that quote many times on various TV channels. Our new Vice President did not disclaim the rioting and unrest and direct her followers only to lawful action.

Congresswoman PRESSLEY stated: ''There needs to be unrest in the streets for as long as there is unrest in our lives.''

Speaker PELOSI famously said this on the widespread property damage. As you saw, when asked about it, she was quoted as saying: ''People will do what they do.'' That is a direct quote from

her, and you have seen that many times on television.

Now, that indifference that seems to be expressed in those and in a lot of other quotations we could give to the violence that our constituents were enduring was dramatically shattered when a violent riot came to this building itself. After that event, many Members of Congress asked why a more militarized force had not protected them from a group of then-President Trump supporters who had turned violent. Police officers were again considered heroes and protectors unlike last summer when they were attacked. The presence of National Guard members was all of a sudden welcomed rather than decried unlike last summer, in cities like Portland and Seattle, when mayors condemned, maybe, the President or the Federal Government, generally, for interfering and trying to bring peace to those cities.

Many of the people of this country would like to have such resources available to them to ensure their safety, like every weekend in Chicago when there are dozens of people hurt by shootings and a lot of people killed in that same weekend.

Since the day of the attack on the Capitol, I have heard much of a renewed focus among my Democratic colleagues on combating domestic terrorism and political violence, and there is nothing wrong with combating domestic terrorism and political violence. That is why my first words today were that there needs to be equal attention to the danger of terrorism, whether it is of the left or of the right. As I indicated in my words just stated, this is very much welcomed—any attention we can give to domestic terrorism and political violence—and I hope that we will be able to work together to keep Americans safe.

However, any work that we do in this area must be focused on preventing violence no matter what ideology is given to justify that violence. In fact, in a recent Department of Homeland Security bulletin, that bulletin noted the breadth of potential threats we may be facing after the Capitol riot, including domestic violent extremists ''motivated by a range of issues, including anger over COVID–19 restrictions, the 2020 election results, and police use of force'' as well as ''racial and ethnic tension'' and homegrown violent extremists ''inspired by foreign terrorist groups.''

The response that I have seen to the Capitol riot here in Congress has not given me hope that we are in agreement about combating this broad range of threats in the spirit of giving equal attention to the dangers of domestic terrorism or any kind of violation of law, whether it comes from the right or the left. I have seen that many Democratic Members of Congress seem to be discussing the need to combat White supremacism with reference to the Capitol riot. I am not going to find fault with anybody who talks about any race of any kind thinking they are supreme to anybody else because we are all individuals that God loves, and if we were to return that love, we wouldn't have a lot of problems in this country.

We must absolutely combat White supremacism, wherever it occurs, and we have a responsibility to understand the true factors that led to the attack on this building. I hope to learn more from law enforcement over the coming weeks and months about what the involvement of White supremacists or any other extremist was in this attack.

However, I am concerned that the use of the term may have a different purpose: to try to portray any supporters of former President Trump, who garnered over 74 million votes in the most recent election, as White supremacists.

Congresswoman CORI BUSH stated on the House floor that former President Trump was a ''white supremacist president who incited a white supremacist insurrection.'' I hope everyone can agree that such rhetorical and inaccurate characterizations are dangerous.

More concerning seems to be the idea that violence committed by the far left or for left-leaning ideologies is in some way tolerable because of the left's assessment that the purpose of all that violence is somehow noble. However, right-leaning thought, whether accompanied by violence or not, is considered terroristic.

Former CIA Director John Brennan, whose credibility has been questioned, praised incoming President Biden's inaugural reference to defeating ''white supremacy'' and likened libertarians to ''religious extremists, authoritarians, fascists, bigots, racists, nativists.''

It is hard to see how libertarian political philosophy, a mainstream conservative political ideology which is scarcely in any way associated with violence, is related to the other terms that Mr. Brennan lists, unless, of course, Mr. Brennan is simply referring to religious Americans as religious extremists, or those who believe in the rule of law rather than antifa rioting as ''authoritarians'' and ''fascists,'' or those who believe in having a functioning immigration system as somehow they seem to be bigots or racists or nativists.

In short, these are all terms that are applied regularly and unfairly to conservative Americans using peaceful means to argue for their ideas of religious freedom, law and order, and secure borders, and probably a lot of other things that they argue for. Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER was even more direct in a tweet, suggesting that all Republicans be labeled terrorists.

As a body, we may begin looking into domestic terrorism more generally. I look forward to so doing. I am sure all Members will share my commitment that the focus of our inquiry should be on all of the politically motivated violence we have seen in this country and not somehow just a subset of that politically motivated violence. The men and women of this Nation who have been affected by antifa and other left-wing extremists are entitled to much more than a cursory acknowledgment of that fact. Likewise, I hope no part of our effort will focus on demonizing the peaceful expression of ideas with which Democratic Members disagree.

I will be sharing the ideas that I have on this subject and these concerns that I have stated today directly with my friend, the incoming Senate Judiciary chairman, Senator DURBIN. He will get a letter from me, and I look forward to working with Senator DURBIN on the path forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

GUN VIOLENCE SURVIVORS WEEK

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, rightfully, when we talk about the issue of gun violence in this country, we think about it through the prism of those lives that have been lost because the numbers are just stunning. They are hard to get your head wrapped around.

Here are the rough numbers in front of me. On an average year, we have 39,000 people who lose their lives through a gunshot wound. That is a suicide, a homicide, an accidental shooting, domestic violence crimes. If you break it down, that is around 100 people a day, and there is no other high-income nation in the world that comes anywhere close.

We talk about the issue of gun violence through the prism of people whose lives have been lost because it is so morally disrupting, cataclysmic, when you have a loved one—normally, a young loved one, a brother or sister, a child—who is there one instant and then gone the next because of a random shooting.

I always get drawn back to the people whom I have been lucky enough to have had access to and friendships with in Connecticut. One of them is Janet Rice.

Janet lost her son Shane, who was 20 at the time, to a gunshot wound back in 2012. It was actually only a month and a half before the Sandy Hook shooting.

Shane was just selling a car to some acquaintances, and the conversation went off the rails. There was some pushing and shoving. There was a gun fired, and Shane was dead.

It is really hard for Janet to describe how her life changed. She talks a lot about in those early months and years really not being able to even leave the house. She would drive a couple of blocks to the corner grocery store because she just didn't want to walk down the street and encounter friends and have to talk about what happened.

She had this habit of waking up in the middle of the night and driving her car down to where Shane was shot, which is only about two blocks from where I live in Hartford. She would arrive there in the middle of the night, she would pull up in the parking lot,

and she would turn on her high beams, half expecting that Shane was going to show up.

Her life is fundamentally different today than it was when Shane was in her life. And I have no idea what it is like to lose a child. I have no idea what it is like to lose a loved one to gun violence. But we talk about it in these terms because it is absolutely catastrophic when you lose somebody that way.

This week, though, is Gun Violence Survivors Week. This week we focus on those who survived gunshot wounds, and I think I hate to tell you this, but the numbers are much worse. More people survive gunshot wounds than are killed by gunshot wounds, and that wound can change your life as well.

It can inflict you with physical pain that you can never get over, render you unable to walk, and in our colleague Gabby Giffords' case, almost unable to speak. But it can also inflict you with an ongoing, cascading trauma from which you may never recover.

James Harris was shot in Hartford in 2018. He was shot while he and another friend were just hanging out in the hallway of the friend's apartment building, when a man showed up and shot James and his friend. The man was charged with a whole bunch of things, including possession of an illegal firearm. But they were just in the wrong place at the wrong time.

His friend lost his life. James survived and, to this day, he experiences post-traumatic stress disorder, chronic pain, and mental health challenges that I don't think anybody in this Chamber can get their head wrapped around.

Tyrek Marquez was shot in the head a decade earlier, in Hartford, when Tyrek was 7 years old, following a West Indian Day parade in Hartford in the summer of 2008.

Guess what. The three shooters who were arrested were all found to have illegal firearms. One of the guns they found in the perpetuation of that crime had been used in 14 other crimes.

It is a decade later, and Tyrek remains partially paralyzed on the left side of his body. But he is part of the anti-gun violence movement. He survived, and he wants to make sure that this never happens to anybody ever again. ''You've got to overcome obstacles and that's what I have been'' able to do, he says.

There are 100 people a day who die from guns, but there are just as many who survive gunshot wounds, and they are now demanding that something change.

Right now, as we debate a COVID relief package, our focus, rightfully, is squarely on trying to reverse the disturbing trend of this virus expanding all across this country and righting the economic ship of this country. But not coincidental to the pandemic and the economic meltdown, we saw a dramatic increase in homicides. Some cities reported 40, 50 percent increases in homicides in 2020 versus 2019. You saw record numbers of gun sales. Those two things are not coincidental. And those are just the reportable gun sales. Likely, we saw a dramatic spike in illegal gun transfers as well. More weapons equals more gun crimes in this country.

And so knowing that 20, 30 percent of guns get transferred outside of the legal system, knowing that, as in the case of Tyrek and James, it was illegal guns that ended up being used to shoot them, as it was for Shane Oliver in Hartford—that mother I talked about, Janet Rice; Shane was killed with an illegal gun—to honor Gun Violence Survivors Week, we have to make a plan this year. We have to make a plan to work on an issue that can bring us all together.

I hope that Republicans join us in voting for COVID relief funding. The things in President Biden's package are supported by 70 percent of the American public. That is impressive. It is really hard to get the American public to agree on anything at a 70-percent rate. They have actually done polling on things like kittens and baseball and grandmas, and it is hard to get 70 percent support for that stuff. So on Joe Biden's agenda, boy, it must be pretty popular to get 70 percent of the American public supporting it.

Universal background checks, requiring that everybody have to prove you are not a criminal or seriously mentally ill before you buy a gun—that has 90 to 95 percent support. Think about that. That means that the vast majority of gun owners, of NRA members, of Republicans, Democrats, Independents, all support universal background checks. It is something that this body can come together on.

And just like in Tyrek and James's case, every single day we are presented with evidence of what happens when we let these illegal guns flow on to our streets. In Pennsylvania, a man purchased two handguns advertised in a classified ad. He used those guns to kill a person and wound seven others inside a psychiatric institute. He had failed a background check at a gun store just a few months prior.

In Illinois, a man killed a Chicago police commander with a gun he purchased online. He was prohibited from buying a gun because he had a restraining order.

Wisconsin, a man killed his wife and two other women and wounded four others with a gun that he purchased outside the background system. Why? Because he was prohibited from purchasing a gun because of a domestic violence restraining order.

In Texas, a man killed 7 people and injured 22 others after being fired from his job. He had failed a background check but was able to find an unlicensed seller.

I can go on. Over and over and over again, the victims of gun violence are very often put at risk and put in harm's way because there are so many guns being sold illegally or so many guns being sold legally to people who shouldn't have them, like people with serious, violent criminal records and people who have been arrested for things like domestic violence.

So, right now, our priority has to be COVID relief, but as we take part this week in Gun Violence Survivors Week, we have to recognize that the status quo is not acceptable and that there is something fundamentally wrong with democracy if a public policy measure can enjoy 90 percent support amongst the American public, and it can't get passed through the representative bodies that are assembled in the Nation's Capitol.

Thirty-nine thousand people die every year. More are injured and survive. And we owe them, in 2021, to pass legislation that finally starts putting these trajectories downward.

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. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss the urgent need to get our kids back in school. Kids deserve to be back in school.

Last week, the White House Chief of Staff was on television. He was interviewed. The interviewer asked him why so many public schools remain closed. His answer—amazingly, astonishingly—was ''money.''

If I may, the record is very clear. Republicans supported more money for schools since last summer—a full $105 billion to get our kids back to school. In fact, the Senate Republicans' targeted coronavirus bill included more money from schools than Speaker PELOSI included in her bloated, liberal wish list.

For months, Senate Democrats obstructed, delayed, and dragged their feet. For months, Democrats played politics with coronavirus relief. In all that time, families across America suffered.

It wasn't until the end of December that Democrats finally agreed to pass legislation to reopen the schools, and it included $82 billion—less than Republicans had offered the last summer.

Well, the ink is now barely dry on the overall relief bill at the end of last year. It was a $900 billion relief bill. So here we are, just 1 month later, and the new administration says that there is no money to reopen schools.

The White House Chief of Staff goes on television with a supposedly new idea. The idea is that ''we, as a country, should make the investments to make it safe'' to get back to school—astonishing, because we did that.

If the Biden administration really wants their schools to reopen, they ought to be talking to the teachers unions. They should talk to the leaders of the teachers unions based in Fairfax County, VA, just a few miles from here. You know, it is one of the largest school districts in America. Fairfax County teachers demanded a vaccine before they would go back to the classroom. Thanks to Operation Warp Speed, they got the vaccine. Yet they still refused to go back to the classroom, which, of course, means that the students aren't in the classroom either.

In Chicago, the teachers union is threatening to go on strike rather than to go back into the classroom, which, of course, means the students don't get to back into the classroom either.

In Washington, DC, the teachers union would rather go to court than to the classroom, which means that students don't get to go back to the classroom either.

Similar stories are taking place all across America. The union bosses might think this is just a big game. The truth is, this is doing terrible things to our children.

Our teachers do incredible work. Many are working harder than ever in the virtual setting. Many want to go back to the classroom. Yet, because of the union bosses who pull the strings, our kids are being denied access to in-person learning by our amazing teachers.

On Wednesday, the New York Times said it was ''breaking news'' that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention want the kids back in school. That is not breaking news. That is old news. The CDC said it last July.

Experts have been echoing this call for months. One study estimated that because of the lockdown last spring, a typical student entered this school year 35 percent behind schedule in reading and nearly 50 percent behind in math.

The children hurt the most are, of course, the most vulnerable—kids from lower income families, like the millions of kids who receive nutrition assistance, medical care, or counseling in public schools; also, the children of single parents, many of whom—the parents, that is—can't work from home.

According to the National Education Association, a quarter of the families with kids ages 5 to 17 either don't have a computer or don't have wireless internet, so the lockdowns have been especially tough on all of those kids in those settings.

For many children, the lockdown has been far tougher on their health than coronavirus itself would be. That is because serious coronavirus symptoms among healthy children are extremely rare. And Congress has provided funding to prevent kids from spreading the coronavirus. It has done it by improving ventilation, by social distancing, and by disinfecting our classrooms.

So while Democrats were taking their orders from teachers unions, Senate Republicans listened to the science. It is time for Senate Democrats to decide: Are they going to put our kids first or are they going to continue to put the teachers unions ahead of our kids?

Senate Republicans have done our part to reopen our schools with incredible amounts of funding and support. This is no time for excuses, no time for backtracking. The science supports it. We have provided the funding.

Now I would point out that students in Wyoming have been back in school since September. That is where students belong. Kids deserve to be in school. So let's get our kids back in the classroom. It is what is best for kids; certainly, it is what is best for working families; and it is what is best for our future as a nation.

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.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, relations between the United States and Russia are more precarious today than at any other time since the Cold War. From Russian-backed mercenaries fighting in the Middle East to the Kremlin's attempt to poison Putin's critics like Alexei Navalny using a nerve agent, the actions of Russia are growing more and more aggressive. That is especially true when it comes to actions against the United States and our allies.

We know Russia made a clear attempt to interfere with the 2016 election and delegitimize our democratic processes, like our elections. Through everything from highly coordinated disinformation campaigns to targeted attacks on voting systems, it sought to undermine and potentially change the result of a democratic election.

Of course, it is not just our voting systems that have come under attack. Moscow has launched massive cyber attacks against private companies and government agencies alike, the latest being the SolarWinds hack. Last year, Russia attempted to steal coronavirus vaccine research from the United States and our closest allies.

The Biden administration has responded to these mounting threats in an unlikely way—by giving Russia exactly what it wants. Sure, I know there were some press reports about a conversation between President Biden and President Putin, but then again, that is all it was—words, not action.

This Friday is the expiration date for the New START treaty—the only remaining bilateral strategic nuclear agreement between the United States and Russia. Since New START entered force a decade ago, there has been no lack of criticism about its shortcomings. For example, here on the Senate floor last week, I outlined some of the main issues with New START, including the fact that it only placed limits on strategic nuclear weapons, leaving room open for an endless arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons, which were particularly of interest to Russia in a potential land war in Europe. The new Senator from Tennessee and former U.S. Ambassador to Japan, BILL HAGERTY, has echoed that concern as well.

But it is not just Republicans who acknowledge the need for a new approach. Victoria Nuland is an experienced and accomplished diplomat with more than three decades of experience, and she has been nominated by President Biden for a high-ranking position in the State Department. In an opinion piece she wrote last year, she wrote that the United States ''should not grant Moscow what it wants most: a free rollover of New START without any negotiations to address Russia's recent investments in short- and medium-range nuclear weapons systems and new conventional weapons.'' In other words, Russia is building new weapons that will not be included in the New START negotiations, but they should be.

The President didn't take the advice of Ambassador Nuland, obviously. He didn't advocate for new limits on tactical weapons or these new weapons systems or impose any other conditions to combat Russian aggression. In a call with President Putin last week, President Biden agreed to a clean 5-year extension—no conditions, no negotiations; in short, a capitulation. He gave him a green light to keep doing what they have been doing.

Well, it didn't take long for Russian leaders to celebrate this win. The Deputy Foreign Minister of Russia declared that the United States had agreed to extend the treaty on Russia's terms, and both houses of Russia's Parliament unanimously voted in favor of the ratification of the extension within hours of the announcement. In other words, the Biden administration is on exactly the same page as the Duma. That ought to give them some pause. It is fair to say there has been no celebration here in the United States, but the truth is, there has hardly been any attention paid to this issue at all, including here in Congress.

The administration has tried to maintain its focus on the President's long list of executive actions. In his first 2 weeks in office, President Biden has used the power of the pen to cancel the Keystone XL Pipeline, rejoin the Paris Climate Agreement, stop drilling on Federal lands and in Federal waters, and so much more. Why did the President focus on this agenda? Well, because he has called climate change—not nuclear weapons—the existential threat of our time.

Don't get me wrong—I think our country can and should do more to reduce emissions and preserve our land and waters for future generations, but those measures shouldn't come at the cost of thousands of jobs, reduced energy independence, and higher prices for consumers, including seniors on fixed incomes.

I have always been a proponent of the ''all of the above'' energy strategy, which relies on fossil fuels and renewables, as well as innovative technologies to provide our country with reliable, affordable, and lower emissions energy sources. In fact, just about a month ago, I introduced a bill to help spur that innovation, which was signed into law. But based on the emphasis of the Biden administration on climate change and the near silence we are hearing on nuclear treaties, you would think that climate change is a bigger threat to the world than a nuclear war. Only in a fevered imaginary world could that be true.

Our Democratic colleagues in the Senate and many members of the media played along as well, praising the President's efforts to combat one self-proclaimed crisis while ignoring its failure to address a clear and present danger and a threat to the planet.

The fact is, the administration missed a huge opportunity by extending the New START treaty without any other conditions, and it has to do with much more than just the threats posed by Russia. While the United States and Russia are the two biggest nuclear powers in the world, we are not the only ones. There are five nonproliferation treaty states, two of which are Russia and the United States. But there is also the UK and France, both of which provide regular information about the size and makeup of their nuclear arsenals.

The fifth and final power is China, a police state and one of the world's greatest secret keepers, especially when it comes to its nuclear arsenal. China, we think, has quietly been growing its nuclear arsenal for years, and the thick cloak of secrecy surrounding the Chinese Communist Party has made it nearly impossible to verify information about the breadth and depth of its nuclear capabilities. But from the information we have, we know China continues to pursue a nuclear triad, and experts estimate China to have about 300 nuclear weapons. Assuming that figure is correct, it makes China the third most powerful nuclear country in the world, behind the United States and Russia, and we have every reason to believe that the size of its arsenal will continue to grow.

In May of 2019, then-Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Robert Ashley, said China is likely to at least double the size of its nuclear stockpile over the next decade. He referred to this effort as ''the most rapid expansion and diversification of its nuclear arsenal in China's history.''

Here we are, a year and a half after that estimate, and there is no reason to believe that China has changed its course. In fact, it appears the announcement of a New START extension received a warm welcome in Beijing, just as it did in Moscow. The story that ran this weekend in the South China Morning Post said this extension ''means the gap between China and the two nuclear giants. . . . will not widen and Beijing could spend the next five years catching up.'' There you have it. That is the real takeaway of a clean extension of New START.

The Biden administration has agreed to leave in place a framework in which the Russians continue to cheat, the Chinese play catch up, and the United States is left to play by the rules of a bygone era.

Rather than enter into a 5-year extension of New START, the administration should have used its leverage to convene multilateral nuclear talks. America should invite the other nonproliferation states—Russia, China, France, and the UK—to the negotiating table and encourage multilateral talks limiting the growth of nuclear arsenals worldwide.

I understand President Biden's desire to focus on the issues he campaigned on—whether it is climate change, immigration reform, or any other policy area—but in doing so, he should not ignore the larger threats to global security or relinquish the leverage we have to secure a deal that improves global security at large.

Nuclear weapons, not climate change, are the greatest existential threat we face, and the United States cannot sit idly by while Moscow and Beijing pass us by.

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.

Mr. PORTMAN. 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. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor today to talk about the way forward for this new Congress and the new Biden administration.

Specifically, this afternoon, we are talking about the budget resolution that the Democratic side has proposed. There was a vote today to begin to proceed on that. My understanding is that by the end of this week, we will have a number of amendments about the budget, and this all goes toward a process called reconciliation. If the two budgets are agreed upon, that would enable us—with 50 votes rather than the normal 60 votes—to take on a really important issue, which is the issue of how we should address the COVID–19 pandemic.

But, to me, this is an even bigger question. It is a question about how we are going to proceed, as a Congress, working with this new administration. If you recall, the Senate is now a 50–50 split. That is as closely divided as you can possibly be. There are 50 Senators on this side and 50 Senators on that side. The House is more closely divided than it has been in years. And, significantly, the American people are more divided than they have been in years.

I think the American people, as a general matter—not everybody, but I think the American people are looking for us to deal with these divisions here in the country by working together to try to get something done, by working together to help heal the wounds that are out there.

As for me, one Senator, I am very interested in helping President Biden make good on the pledge that he made on the steps of the Capitol. On the west steps, just that way in the U.S. Capitol, on Inauguration Day, January 20, the President said that he wanted to bring our country together. He wanted to help heal those wounds. He wanted us to work across the aisle. He wanted to go back to an era here where we actually sat down, debated things, worked them out together, and, therefore, helped bring our country together.

I hope, with regard to the COVID–19 discussions, that Republicans and Democrats will agree to keep working on charting the Federal response to the ongoing healthcare and economic crisis in a bipartisan way. It is the one area where we have done it.

Yet when you think of all the division in all of the times when we haven't been able to find agreement on things around here, one place we have been able to find agreement has been with regard to COVID–19. Specifically, we have passed five different bills—five bills—with big majorities, bipartisan majorities. One was actually by unanimous consent.

The most recent one was just 5 weeks ago or less, at the end of the year, when Congress passed a $900 billion COVID-relief package in an entirely bipartisan way. And $900 billion, by the way, makes that the second most expensive legislative package that Congress has ever passed—$900 billion. The first one was the CARES Act, which also related to the coronavirus pandemic that we are in. Over $4 trillion—that is trillion with a ''t''—has been spent on this, larger than our typical annual budget for everything in government. And do you know what? It is a crisis, and we needed to step up to the plate.

But now, while the ink is still drying on the bill that we passed at the end of the year, the Biden administration has proposed another $1.9 trillion to deal with the coronavirus pandemic.

My own view is that, again, this is an area where we have been able to come together. Let's do it again.

Is there more need out there? Well, when Congress passed the $900 billion legislation, we all said: This is a bridge to get us to between now and when the vaccines are readily available, which

we all hope happens sooner rather than later.

But there may be some things we need to do in the interim—I think there are—and maybe some things after the March, April time period that we hadn't thought about for the vaccine availability. The vaccines are moving out more slowly than expected.

So I, for one, am willing to sit down with Republicans and Democrats alike, as we have done, again, five different times, to work on how we can come together to provide that bridge to a better time when the economy will improve because the COVID–19 issue will have been addressed.

My concern is that, again, today, we started down a track, by starting on the budget, to end up with budget reconciliation, which would mean a 50-vote rather than a 60-vote margin because the other side of the aisle—Democrats—think it would be better not to try to work out something on a bipartisan basis but to simply use their majority to get something through here that they would like to do that is consistent with where President Biden's $1.9 trillion package is.

We will see. Maybe they could be successful at that, maybe not, because it would require every Member on that side of the aisle to agree with the $1.9 trillion package, which is a comprehensive, complicated package, which includes a number of things addressed to COVID–19 but another number of things that are unrelated to COVID–19, some of which are popular on the other side of the aisle in particular, like changes in tax law that have nothing to do with COVID–19, changes to the Federal minimum wage that have nothing to do with COVID–19. But we will see.

But even if they could pass it by the barest majority, given that it is a 50–50 Senate, it is not the right way to go for our country. I don't think anybody truly believes it is the best thing for our country.

Again, if we can't come together as Republicans and Democrats, as we have proven that we can time and again over the last year, what can we come together on? And wouldn't that poison the well? Wouldn't it make it harder for us, then, to find that common ground on things like infrastructure investments, on things like retirement security? I think it is going to be harder if we start off on the wrong foot, if we start off in a purely partisan way.

I was part of the group of five Democrats and five Republicans who sat down—we call ourselves the 908 Coalition because we put together a bipartisan framework, actual legislation, on COVID–19. This was over the last few months before Christmas. Then, at the end of the year, Congress passed the $900 billion bill. Our framework provided a basis for that. It wasn't exactly the same, but it provided a basis for that.

Frankly, because Republicans and Democrats alike—five and five—were able to agree, it helped get our leadership more focused on how to find a bipartisan result, as we had done previously, because things weren't going very well. They weren't talking to each other. They weren't making the progress that we had hoped. That group has shown that we can, indeed, come together and make tough choices. Not one thing in that legislative effort was not bipartisan.

By the way, there were five of us on the Republican side, five on the Democratic side. None of us agreed with all of it. It was a matter of compromise—a word that maybe isn't too popular anymore, but that is how you get things done around here. You have to figure out: What is that common ground? What is the way in which you can make progress without having everything your way?

We have shown we can do it. The 908 Coalition is ready to go again.

I will say that what we were able to do with that coalition was to help move the process forward in a bipartisan way. And, in the end, we got $69 billion in funding for vaccine development and distribution, $82 billion to support our students in school, $325 billion to restart the highly successful small business program called the Paycheck Protection Program.

At unprecedented deficit times, where we want to be sure every dollar is wisely spent, that $900 billion was about one-seventh of the size of the Democratic proposal that was originally out there and was supported by a lot of Democrats here in the Senate—not one Republican, by the way. That was a $3.5 trillion bill called the Heroes Act. We ended up doing something that was smaller but more targeted and more effective in dealing with the immediate problems with no extraneous provisions that had nothing to do with COVID–19, which was the case of the Heroes Act.

So we have done it time and time again—five different times. Let's do it again.

If we are going to continue responding to this crisis in a smart way that meets the needs of our constituents, it is going to require us having that kind of a good-faith, bipartisan negotiation.

Again, in his inaugural address, President Biden said: ''This is our historic moment of crisis and challenge, and unity is the path forward.''

I don't think he meant just unity with one party or another. Clearly, the context of that speech and his other comments were about outreach to Republicans and Democrats alike to get back to an era where we worked together.

Unfortunately, since that address, the President's team and his party appear to have chosen a different path, introducing this new COVID–19 package I talked about without any input, any consultation with any Republican or, for that matter, I think it is fair to say, any Democrat in this Chamber. I may be wrong. But I know the Democrats who are on the 908 Coalition were not consulted, period.

That is not the way forward. Why would we do that? Why wouldn't we, once again, do what we have proven we can do, particularly following what I thought was an excellent speech, talking about how we can work together.

The $1.9 trillion package that was sent up does have extraneous matters that have nothing to do with COVID–19, as the Heroes Act did. I understand that these are popular proposals, particularly on the Democratic side. We can debate those, and we can have a vote on those, but let's do it outside of the COVID–19 context.

We should have a debate about minimum wage. We should have a debate on changing the child tax credit, the earned-income tax credit, which would not affect COVID–19 at all because no one believes that a year from now that we are going to be in this position, which is when people could take advantage of those tax credits. But they are in the legislation, as an example.

There are provisions in there for clean energy. That is a good debate for us to have but not in the context of this. There are provisions in there for cyber security—$10 billion for improving our cyber security in the Federal Government. The Presiding Officer and I actually like that idea, to have cyber security funds and to set up a new way to push back against these terrible cyber attacks that we have had, particularly recently—a massive one. But that is not appropriate for the COVID–19 bill. As much as I would like to have that debate, let's do it separately. By the way, that can be bipartisan as well.

The $1.9 trillion proposal also has a new round of stimulus checks that are written so that a family with three kids making $290,000 a year can end up getting a check from the Federal Government, even if they have had no negative impact from COVID–19. That seems, to us, to be wrongheaded. And, I think, frankly, a lot of Democrats agree to that, too, and believe it ought to be more targeted toward those who need it the most.

The economic analysis in this is clear, which is that these higher income individuals who have received earlier stimulus checks have ended up not spending them, meaning they don't stimulate the economy, which is the whole idea of the stimulus checks.

There is some recent data out by an economist named Chetty, who is well respected, that says, of the $1,400 that the proposal that the President has laid out going to these families—of that $1,400, if someone makes over $78,000 a year, likely they only spend about $105 of that money. The rest they will save, put in the stock market, do something else with it but not spend.

So let's target it. We are not against stimulus checks, but we are against sending stimulus checks to people who are wealthy, who don't need it. That seems like not an effective use of taxpayer dollars at a time of these unprecedented deficits and debts, with our

debt being the highest it has been, as a percent of our economy, since World War II.

We also have to realize that the $900 billion that was in the package that just passed 5 weeks ago or less has not been fully spent. In fact, most analyses show that less than half of that $900 billion has gone out the door. So we can't know what the impact has been of what we just spent—again, the second largest expenditure of funds ever in the history of this Congress because half of it has not even got out the door, or more. Let's do an analysis there.

Apparently, without taking the time to see if there are 60 Senators willing to move forward with this new idea of a new bipartisan package, this reconciliation approach I talked about earlier is the one that Democrats seem to want to take. It is a rare process. You have to have a budget passed by both sides. It only happens every few years. The reconciliation is in the underlying budget we are voting on over the next couple of days here. It is something that can be used—reconciliation—only for budget-related issues, only for mandatory spending and for revenue, for taxes, and for reducing the debt. So it has to be budget related.

Actually, some of the things in the $1.9 trillion dollar package can't even be done by reconciliation, which would mean we would have to be changing the rules of this body in order to include them in reconciliation. That is another bad idea. First bad idea, not to work on a bipartisan basis. At least try. At least try. The second one is, using reconciliation, which is a mere 50-vote margin for something that is not directly related to the budget that has a direct impact. It can't be merely incidental to the budget, as an example.

There are a number of provisions in there that fit that category. And there is at least discussion, I am told—and we have heard it openly from my colleagues on the other side of saying: Well, we are just going to overrule the Chair—essentially nuke—going the nuclear option, as they say. The nuclear option means that you overrule the Chair—and by a mere 50 votes, change the rules of the Senate.

Please don't do that. That would be, again, setting us down a path of partisanship we don't need to do. It would be poisoning the well. It would be saying—just as getting rid of the filibuster would—we are going to change the rules now that we are in charge.

The rules are there for a reason. And that is to ensure that, to the extent possible, the Senate is a body where you find at least some modicum of bipartisanship to move forward because you have to get those 60 votes, not just 50 votes or 51.

By trying to jam through this $1.9 trillion legislation, it sets exactly the wrong tone for the country and also for the administration. I think President Biden has a real opportunity to help heal our country—I really do. By the way, I think he sincerely wants to. That is why I don't understand this process.

Our 908 Coalition—this bipartisan group, which is now 20 Members, 10 Republicans and 10 Democrats—and we took it up to 10 Republicans because we wanted to show that you can get to 60 votes. If you had 50 Democrats, you would have 10 Republicans willing to work with them. And I am sure there are many, many more than those 10. I know there are. This group is now being tested.

This group was bipartisan under President Trump. I hope it will be bipartisan under President Biden. I hope that that bipartisanship shows up quickly before we go down this path.

We had a meeting last week of our 908 Coalition, and our Democratic colleagues asked us: What can we support? If it is not $1.9 trillion, what is it? Fair question. Again, many of us think we ought to find out what happened to the $900 billion first, hard-earned tax money that hasn't been spent yet. But we said: OK. We will put together a proposal that we could support—not that we support all elements of it but we could support in order to respond to the President's $1.9 trillion package in addressing all of the major issues that he addressed.

Over the weekend, we outlined a $600 billion package that does just that. It addresses the most urgent needs of our country. It does not include any of the unrelated provisions in the Democrats' package that have nothing to do with COVID–19. What it does contain is the same $160 billion that is in the $1.9 trillion package as it relates to healthcare.

What does that mean? It means that if we are going to get out of this crisis we find ourselves in, we have to address the COVID–19 issue, right? We are not just going to have an economy improve immediately to the extent we would like to see it without dealing with the healthcare crisis. That is what is driving the fact that restaurants are closed down, the fact that people are losing jobs through no fault of their own, the fact that we have these economic issues related to COVID. So the sensible thing to do is to be sure we are dealing with the vaccine, development and distribution, dealing with testing, dealing with tracing, making sure we have proper PPE. All of that is in the $160 billion that is in the Biden proposal. It is also in the proposal that we Republicans on the Coalition put forward—$160 billion, the same.

For those issues, we are consistent with President Biden's plan on additional healthcare support. Our proposal also prioritizes getting kids back to the classroom, which we think is really important. Specifically, we have $20 billion toward getting children safely back into classrooms, which is on top of the $82 billion we just spent on schools at the end of year. As a parent, I couldn't feel more strongly about this; we need to get our children back to school, and we need to make sure we it is safe—and we can do both.

We also provide an additional $12 billion for nutrition programs to combat food insecurity and ensure that families, kids have food on the table. This is consistent, again, with the Biden administration plan. These are ones that we agree on.

Our proposal also includes $20 billion for the childcare and development block grants so our childcare facilities across the country can stay open, so the parents can go back to work. Childcare is incredibly expensive. Again, this is where we agree.

We have a new round of $50 billion in financial support for small businesses, but we use it in a program we know works rather than setting up a new program, which would take a long time to put in place.

We help the hardest hit families and individuals through expanding unemployment insurance for those who lose their jobs through no fault of their own. We expand it from where it currently ends now, in mid-March, to the end of June, so June 30.

We extend it at $300 per week, which is the Federal supplement now in place. There, the Biden administration wants $400 rather than $300 and wants to extend it into September, to September 30. There is no economic data that says that that will be necessary. If it is, we can take it up again. So there we have a proposal that is similar but more targeted to meet the real needs of our economy.

Our proposal also provides direct stimulus checks to Americans who really need that extra amount of money to pay their rent or put food on the table or pay their mortgage. By the way, we do it by lowering these limits. Instead of going to families that make 300,000 bucks a year or more—if they have got three or four kids, we say let's cap it at $50,000 for individuals, $100,000 for families, an additional $500 per child.

Again, all the economists say that is what makes sense because those are the folks who are really going to spend it and need it. Let's target this to those who really need the help.

We accomplish all these things at one-third of the cost of the Biden proposal. Much of the difference between our proposal and the Biden administration's is we don't include the extraneous matters, but also it is how we address these two crises: the healthcare crisis to defeat the underlying disease and the work we are trying to do to ensure the economy can recover. Both proposals rightly provide the resources needed to address the healthcare crisis, as I said.

But with regard to the economic crisis, we take a little different approach. Our focus is on getting targeted aid to those who need it the most. In contrast, a large portion of the administration's $1.9 trillion package is about spending taxpayer dollars to stimulate the economy that, based on all the data, is already beginning to recover. And that is something that, frankly, is not an effective use of taxpayer dollars.

Just yesterday, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, reported that the economy is growing quite well right now. They project a 3.7-percent real economic growth in this year we are in, in 2021. That is significant economic growth. That takes into account inflation, real economic growth at 3.7 percent. That just came out yesterday.

By the way, the Wall Street Journal does a survey of a bunch of economists—60 economists—and their consensus for the economic growth in this year is not 3.7 percent, it is 4.3 percent. Even better. So the economy is projected to grow quite well this year.

Importantly, the CBO also said that the economy is expected to recover to prepandemic levels by the middle of the year. They say that by June 30, the economy will be back to where it was before the pandemic, which was a very strong economy. In fact, a year ago February, this month, we had 19 straight months of wage growth of over 3 percent. We had the lowest poverty rate in the history of our country. There was a lot of good things going on in our economy. And they say we are going to get back to that—this is CBO, not me—by the middle of this year.

Meanwhile, after record-high jobless claims we saw last spring when unemployment hit 14.7 percent, the national unemployment rate has fallen to 6.7 percent, which means Americans are able to find work, for the most part. Is it where I would like it to be? No. But the CBO says the unemployment numbers are going to go down, as does everybody else who has projected this over the next year. They say it is going to drop this year to 5.3 percent. Five percent used to be considered full employment. We would like to see it even better than that. But the point is, the economy is improving. And as we get these virus pandemic issues under control, the economy will improve even more. Having the vaccines readily available is going to make a big difference. And, of course, again, that is why we put so much money into that in our proposal.

CBO is basing these projections, by the way, without factoring any of the new $1.9 trillion. They don't assume that there will be any more stimulus than what we just passed several weeks ago. In other words, while the Biden Administration says we need $1.9 trillion in new spending or our economy will tank, CBO says very clearly that is not true.

Instead, we need to help those who are still struggling and cannot find a job because their industry shuttered or their business isn't allowed to reopen, and that is what our targeted proposal will do.

Other respected sources agree with CBO's optimism. I mentioned these 68 economists indicating 4.3 percent economic growth. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget said yesterday that the CBO data underscores the need for a targeted package, saying: ''It shouldn't take $1.9 trillion to fill a $400 billion or $800 billion hole'' in our economy.

We have more data to suggest that the economy is on a path to recovery. For example, we know that household incomes rose slightly—but they rose—in December. This was the first increase in 3 months. The personal savings rate in December rose significantly—13.7 percent—indicating there is a lot of pent-up demand right there for people to get out and start spending money again.

To me, all this points to a pretty clear conclusion that in the immediate aftermath of the $900 billion bipartisan package just passed at year end, there is simply not a strong argument to spend an additional $1.9 trillion on stimulus. Instead, we need to use this next COVID–19 package to focus on the ongoing healthcare challenges of the pandemic—that is the key thing—and on getting targeted economic relief to the hardest hit Americans, which is what our $600 billion proposal does.

I appreciate that, in the last few days, President Biden has expressed more willingness to work with bipartisan Members of Congress on this critical challenge. After we wrote to President Biden on Sunday requesting a meeting to discuss our targeted COVID–19 relief proposal, he quickly accepted, and, yesterday, we had a lengthy and, I thought, very productive discussion at the White House. While we didn't come to an agreement on a proposal—and as you can see today on the floor, Democrats are moving forward with this budget process, regardless—it was a productive discussion and gives me hope that we can follow the bipartisan approach we have taken from the previous five COVID bills. The meeting reaffirmed that there is a lot of common ground for us to build another bill upon and that we share the belief that we need to ensure the hardest hit individuals and families and small businesses get more support they need during this crisis.

My hope is that we can use these two proposals as a starting point for negotiations on a COVID–19 response package that Congress can pass, as we have before, consistently, with bipartisan support, not through partisan parliamentary maneuvers.

This pandemic gives us an opportunity to come together as Republicans and Democrats and show the American people we can put aside the partisanship and the divisions that have become the norm around here and get things done.

If we can't do it on COVID–19, as we have five times already, where can we do it?

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and with President Biden to follow his desire to make good on his pledge in the inaugural address to work together to respond to this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to compliment my good friend and colleague Senator PORTMAN, the great Senator from the State of Ohio, who has done so much in this Chamber on so many issues—COVID–19 relief is just one—to help our great Nation.

Some of you may have heard the news that Senator PORTMAN—I am still very distraught about it—has announced that he is not going to be running for reelection in 2 years, and I think that is going to be a huge loss, not just to the State of Ohio but to our great Nation.

I want to commend Senator PORTMAN for all his phenomenal work. He is proving, again, his leadership and his statesmanship here as we are trying to attack and take on big challenges for our Nation.

CHINA

Mr. President, I also want to talk about another big challenge for our Nation, something that I have come down on the floor since I was elected 6 years ago to the Senate to talk about, and that is the challenge that we have with regard to the rise of China. As a matter of fact, this is an area I talk frequently about because there is a lot more bipartisan progress on this incredibly important issue—the most important geostrategic challenge facing our Nation right now, probably the challenge that will be facing us for the next 50 to 100 years—that is with us today.

But there has been progress. I want to talk about this progress, and I want to talk about something, another development that I think is very important.

There has been an awakening. When I started to come down and talk about the rise of China, not a lot of people were talking about it, but there has been huge progress in that now everybody is talking about it—the Biden administration, and the Trump administration had been. I think President Trump and his team, with their national security strategy, their national defense strategy, deserve a lot of credit from reorienting our focus, which was the appropriate focus post-9/11 on violent extremist organizations, like al-Qaida and ISIS, to the new challenge of great power competition with China as the pacing threat that we have with regard to our Nation.

Again, this is something that has been very bipartisan. When you look at Members of this body, particularly those who focus on foreign policy and national security, they all agree that this reorientation on this challenge is something that we need to be doing as a country in a bipartisan way—dealing with the rise of China.

I think, when we talk about this challenge, we are at a place in history that, in many ways, is analogous to the period right after World War II. I want to talk briefly about that in my remarks.

In 1946, we had what at the time was a recognition that, post World War II, we had a new challenge—similar to the

challenge we are seeing right now, the recognition that we have this challenge with China. In 1946, we started to recognize that we have a challenge with our old World War II ally, the Soviet Union. There was a big focus on this challenge, but not necessarily in organizing foreign policy principles that could help us get through it.

Then, in the 1946–1947 period, an American diplomat named George Kennan wrote an article. It was an anonymous article—he signed it the ''X Article''—in Foreign Affairs, and it was called ''The Sources of Soviet Conduct.'' What Kennan did, really, for the country, for elected officials, for the Senate, for the executive branch, is that he laid out what he saw as the challenge that we are facing with regard to the Soviet Union—the internal weaknesses that the Soviets actually had—with incredible insights in that regard, and, then, what our long-term strategy should be.

Here is what he said in this article. He said that American policymakers need to enact a policy of ''firm containment'' with regard to the Soviet Union, a country that always was trying to expand. He said, if we, as a nation, with our allies, try to contain this expansion, it would ''increase enormously the strains under which the Soviet [Union and its] policy must operate . . . and in this way promote tendencies which must eventually find their outlet in either the breakup or the gradual mellowing of Soviet power.''

Think about that. That was the strategy of containment laid out by George Kennan, followed for decades by American administrations, by this body, Republicans and Democrats—the strategy of containment. And we all know what happened.

George Kennan's fundamental insights into this policy—that the Soviet Union would either mellow or completely break down and collapse because we were putting containment pressure on them—ended up happening. The Berlin Wall came down just as Kennan predicted. The Soviet Union broke up peacefully, and this was a remarkable triumph of American democracy and strategy that our Nation should be proud of. That is what happened then.

A lot of us have been saying that we are at a new point with regard to China. There is an awakening. What should that strategy be? I want to talk about a strategy document that just came out.

Kennan's document was called the ''Long Telegram.'' Just this past weekend, the Atlantic Council—which is a think tank here in DC and has been around for decades and is very well respected on the Republican side and the Democrat side—put out a strategy that they called the ''Longer Telegram,'' literally in kind of the analogous situation that George Kennan had done this in 1946 and 1947.

This strategy, also, coincidentally, does not identify the author. So it is similar to that ''X Article'' in 1946 and 1947. The author is anonymous and put out a strategy with insights on how we, as a nation, should deal with the rise of China. The Atlantic Council, as I said, has been around for decades. They published this, and they said this is probably the most impressive strategy document that they have ever published.

Now, is it perfect? Is this the answer? Is this the containment strategy from 1946 and 1947 that was the triumph of American diplomacy over the last 50 years with the Soviet Union?

We shall see. We don't know. But I looked through it, and I do think it is quite a remarkable document, and it is a great important development that we all need to come together on and this new administration—the Biden administration—needs to take a hard look at.

The focus of this strategy document says, which we all believe now, that ''the single most important challenge facing the United States in the twenty-first century is the rise of an increasingly authoritarian China under President General Secretary Xi Jinping.''

I think a lot of us know that. A lot of us have been talking about that. That is the awakening that I believe has happened here in the United States and certainly here in the U.S. Senate.

But like the Kennan article, this one has some very perceptive insights. One is that it focuses on what it sees as one of the biggest weaknesses in China right now, and that is the fracturing of the Communist Party leadership. I am going to talk about that because it emphasizes—''anonymous'' here emphasizes—that should be our focus.

The piece begins by setting the stage of where we are right now.

The strategy article published by the Atlantic Council is titled ''The Longer Telegram: Toward a New American China Strategy'' and can be found at https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/atlantic-council-strategy-paper-series/the-longer-telegram/.

It talks about the scale of the economy of China and its military and the speed of its technical advancement and its radically different world view than that of the United States. It notes that China now profoundly impacts every major U.S. national interest. This is our challenge, one that is gradually emerged over two decades and has accelerated greatly under the leadership of Xi Jinping.

How has Xi Jinping ruled during this rise? He has eliminated his political opponents. He has stalled market reforms, used ethno-nationalism to unite his country, and his treatment of ethnic minorities has bordered on genocide. In doing so, he has fostered a quasi-Maoist personality cult and a new form of totalitarian, high-tech police state.

Anonymous writes:

> In what is a fundamental departure from his risk-averse post-Mao predecessors, Xi [Jinping] has demonstrated that he intends to project China's authoritarian system, coercive foreign policy, and military presence well beyond his country's own borders to the world at large. China, under Xi, unlike under Deng Xiaoping, Jiang Zemin, and Hu Jintao—[three previous Chinese leaders]—is no longer a status quo power. It has become a revisionist power.

That is very troubling for the United States, and this is the situation as laid out by the author of the ''Long Telegram.''

What has the U.S. response been so far? It has been good, but it needs to improve.

The author gives credit to the Trump administration for sounding the alarm in its national security strategy and national defense strategy with regard to the ''strategic competition,'' the ''central challenge'' to our foreign policy, and great power competition that all have resulted from the rise of China.

Anonymous writes that a simple, Kennan-like strategy of containment won't be effective with regard to China because China has studied what happened to the USSR, learned from its mistakes, and understood that the inherent structural weakness with regard to the Soviet model itself was something that caused it to collapse, so China has focused on that.

Yet, as I mentioned, the author emphasizes another central vulnerability of the Chinese system, one which he or she, the author, thinks we need to take advantage of.

Here is what Anonymous writes:

> The political reality is that the [Chinese Communist Party] is significantly divided on Xi's leadership and his vast ambitions. Senior party members have been greatly troubled by Xi's policy directions and angered by his endless demands for absolute loyalty. They fear for their own lives and the future livelihoods of their families.

Of particular political toxicity in this mix are the reports unearthed by the international media of the wealth amassed by Xi's family and members of his political inner circle, like so many other authoritarians who amass wealth through corruption, despite the vigor with which Xi has conducted his own anti-corruption campaign, which has destroyed many of his rivals.

So what do we do with this information? As Anonymous writes here—the author of the ''Long Telegram''—we need to focus on Xi Jinping himself.

> U.S. strategy must remain laser-focused on Xi, his inner circle, and the Chinese political context in which they rule. Changing their decision-making will require understanding, operating within, and changing their political and strategic paradigm. All U.S. policy aimed at altering China's behavior should revolve around this fact, or it is likely to prove ineffectual.

This, Anonymous writes, has been the missing piece of the puzzle for our China strategy so far.

> While U.S. leaders often differentiate between China's Communist Party government and the Chinese people [correctly], Washington [leaders] must achieve the sophistication necessary to go even further. U.S. leaders also must differentiate between the government and the party elite, as well as between the party elite and Xi [Jinping himself].

That is critical.

According to Anonymous, we must work to drive a wedge between these groups and to frustrate Xi's ambitions in order to ''cause China's elite leadership to collectively conclude that it is in the country's best interests to continue operating within the existing U.S.-led liberal international order rather than build a rival [authoritarian] order [throughout the world], and that it is in the party's best interests . . . not to attempt to expand China's borders or to export its political [authoritarian] model beyond China's shores.''

That is the juxtaposition of the significant challenge we have right now with the current strategy in what Anonymous writes in this document that we should be building on.

In building on these insights, the author emphasizes that U.S. strategy should comprise seven integrated components. Many of us have come down to the floor to talk about some of these, but let me touch on a few: rebuilding the economic, military, technological, and human capital underpinnings of long-term U.S. national power, and I think we can all agree on that; agreeing on a set of limited, enforceable policy ''red lines'' that China should be deterred from crossing under any circumstances, such as forcibly invading Taiwan; agreeing on a larger number of ''major national security interests'' which are neither vital nor existential in nature but which require a range of retaliatory actions to inform Chinese strategic behavior; defining those areas where continued strategic cooperation with China remains in U.S. interests; and prosecuting a full-fledged global ideological battle in defense of our political and economic models in contrast with China's authoritarian state capitalist models around the world. Finally, all of this needs to be done in conjunction with and closely coordinating with all of our allies in Europe, in North America, and, of course, in the Asia-Pacific.

This last point is critical. Our allies are critical. We need to remember we are an ally-rich nation. China is an ally-poor nation. That is one of our huge comparative advantages in the geostrategic challenge that we have with China over the next decades

At the end of the day, as Anonymous writes, ideas matter. Ultimately, this is going to be the contest of ideas—China's authoritarian model, which it wants to promote and export, versus the U.S. Western model of open economies, just societies, and competitive, free political systems.

Over the long term, the author writes, the Chinese people may well come to question and challenge the party's century-long proposition that China's great, ancient civilization—thousands of years old—is forever destined to an authoritarian future over which the people have no choice. That decision, however, must come from the Chinese people themselves. We can only provide a model, and we can only show the way. We need to do so with confidence and with our allies.

As Anonymous concludes, there is a subtle, yet corrosive, force that has been at work in the United States for some time, raising doubt about our Nation's future, and some who are encouraging a sense that, as a country, America's best days may now be in the past. Well, I, for one, certainly and fully disagree with this, as does the author of the ''Long Telegram.'' We are a young country. We are a resilient country. Our innovation is beyond compare. We are a free country, and as a result of the long twilight struggle with the Soviet Union, we also know what works: maintaining peace through strength, promoting free markets and free people at home, and having the confidence in George Kennan's insights from 1946 and 1947 that the Chinese Communist Party, like the Soviet Communist Party, likely ''bears within it the seeds of its own decay.''

While democracies are resilient, adaptive, and self-renewing, there are many vulnerabilities embedded in China's perceived strengths. One-man rule creates acute political risks, as Anonymous has described, that we need to take advantage of. Historical grievance can breed violent nationalism. State-directed economic growth can produce massive overcapacity and mountains of debt.

The gradual and, in some ways, abrupt snuffing out of freedom in places like Hong Kong is creating spontaneous protests of tens of thousands of young people that we have been seeing now for months. China's budding military power and historical view of itself as a nation and culture superior to many others is alarming its neighboring states, inspiring them to step up their security cooperation with the United States. Nearly half of wealthy Chinese want to emigrate, and these are the winners from China's four decades of heavy economic growth.

As we have in the past, Americans can prevail in this long-term geopolitical and ideological contest, but doing so will require a new level of strategic initiative, organization, and confidence in who we are and what we stand for. This also means we must redouble our efforts in making the strategic case not just to Americans but to others around the world, particularly our allies.

Let me conclude by saying that the ''Long Telegram,'' while not perfect, sets out what I believe is certainly one of the best strategies I have read to date about how the United States needs to address the significant challenge that we will be facing for decades.

I hope my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, all have the opportunity to read this and analyze it, for, like Kennan's strategy of containment, our China policy, to be successful, also needs to be very bipartisan and ready to be operationalized for decades.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The majority leader.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF HENRY LOUIS AARON

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 23) honoring the life and legacy of Henry Louis Aaron.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble 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 resolution (S. Res. 23) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of January 28, 2021, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 25, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 25) designating the week of January 24 through January 30, 2021, as ''National School Choice Week''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 25) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.''

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C., sections 42 and 43, appoints the following Senators as Members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, respectively: the Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY of Vermont (reappointment) and the Honorable CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO of Nevada.

MORNING BUSINESS

CONFIRMATION OF PETER PAUL MONTGOMERY BUTTIGIEG

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I voted to confirm the nomination of Pete Buttigieg to be Secretary of the Department of Transportation. As a former mayor, Secretary Buttigieg understands that infrastructure in a state of good repair is crucial to economic growth. For too long, American infrastructure has gone without proper investment, while we simultaneously engage in a two-decade-long adventure to remake and rebuild the Middle East. Rather than increase gas taxes, I hope to work with Secretary Buttigieg and the rest of the Biden administration to put an end to endless wars, stop building infrastructure in Afghanistan, and start building infrastructure in America.

REMEMBERING BARBARA A. O'MALLEY

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, today I rise to pay tribute to Barbara A. O'Malley, a beloved wife, mother, grandmother, great-grandmother, dedicated public servant, and a veritable institution here in the U.S. Senate. She passed away last month at the age of 93.

Barbara Ann Suelzer, the daughter of Joseph and Martha Dix Suelzer, was born in 1928 and raised in Fort Wayne, IN. As a young woman, she was determined to learn how to fly. She obtained her pilot's license when she was 18, using $100 she received for graduating from high school to pay for the lessons, and later joined the Civil Air Patrol. She was also passionate about politics and especially about being a proud Democrat. She went to Washington to work for her local Congressman and met her future husband, Thomas Martin O'Malley, at the Young Democrats headquarters; they were married in 1954.

Over the next 30 years, Barbara O'Malley raised six children—one of whom, Martin J. O'Malley, became Governor of Maryland. She was a devoted mother, grandmother to 15 grandchildren, and great-grandmother to 8 great-grandchildren.

In 1986, with her children grown, Barbara O'Malley returned to Capitol Hill to work as a receptionist for another Barbara—Barbara Mikulski—who was elected to the Senate that year. She was ecstatic to work for a female Senator. At the time, there were just two female Senators: Senator Mikulski and Senator Nancy Kassebaum from Kansas. Barbara O'Malley stayed in the Senate for as long as Senator Mikulski did—30 years. During that time, she made the Mikulski staff, constituents, other Senators and their staff, and everyone else who visited the Mikulski office an extension of the O'Malley family. Everyone who knew her felt that bond.

Mrs. O, as everyone affectionately called her, had an unwavering cheerfulness, a graciousness, and an uplifting spirit that made her one of the most admired figures on Capitol Hill and around Maryland. I always looked forward to seeing her when I would visit Senator Mikulski's office, which was located just around the corner from my own office. Everyone who knew her treasured her political acumen and institutional knowledge, not just of history and politics and Congress but of the very buildings themselves here on Capitol Hill. Her genuine devotion to public service reflected her strong values and character, which her own children have carried on in their own careers and in service to our State of Maryland and to all Americans. Her legacy will live on in the hearts of those she loved, befriended, inspired, counseled, and mentored.

Mrs. O set so many fine examples for her family and everyone fortunate enough to know her. I work on retirement issues, and one thing experts recommend is for people to keep working if they enjoy their work and are able to continue meeting whatever challenges it presents. After Mrs. O spent 30 years raising her family, she returned to the workforce at an age when many people are retiring or close to retiring, and then she worked for 30 years, until she was 88. Mrs. O was a remarkable woman who gave enormously of herself. Myrna and I join the O'Malley family, Senator Mikulski and her staff, and so many other here in the Senate and across our State, in mourning the death of this wonderful woman, but more importantly, we celebrate and give thanks for her extraordinary life.

As Ralph Waldo Emerson said, ''To laugh often and much; to win the respect of the intelligent people and the affection of children; to earn the appreciation of honest critics and endure the betrayal of false friends; to appreciate beauty; to find the beauty in others; to leave the world a bit better whether by a healthy child, a garden patch, or a redeemed social condition; to know that one life has breathed easier because you lived here. This is to have succeeded.'' At home with her family, in her community, and here in the U.S. Senate, Mrs. O certainly succeeded.

Mr. President, I am not the only person who would like to pay tribute to Mrs. O. Senator Mikulski, who served in the Halls of Congress for 40 years—30 years in this body and 10 years in the House of Representatives—has provided a tribute. She is not only the longest serving woman in all of Congress but also the first Democratic woman elected to the U.S. Senate in her own right, the first woman to chair the Senate Appropriations Committee, an inductee into the National Women's Hall of Fame, and a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom award from President Barack Obama. As we remember Mrs. Barbara O'Malley, this great public servant and longtime staffer to Senator Mikulski, I thought it would be appropriate to share Senator Mikulski's heartfelt tribute. I also have tributes from former Majority Leader Harry Reid; Senator Mikulski's chief of staff, Dr. Shannon Kula; the Acting Administrator of the National Aeronautics & Space Administration, Steve Jurczyk; and a statement from the Civil Air Patrol. I ask unanimous consent that these statements be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BARBARA A. MIKULSKI ON THE PASSING OF BARBARA A. O'MALLEY

For over 30 years I have had the good fortune to know one of our state's greatest treasures, Barbara A. O'Malley, and her passing on January 6, 2021 has left a hole in our hearts the depths of the ocean wide.

Barbara Ann Suelzer, the daughter of Joseph and Martha Dix Suelzer, was born in 1928 and raised in Fort Wayne, Indiana, where she graduated from Central Catholic High School. During World War II and while still in high school, she joined the Civil Air Patrol, Group 523, earned her private pilot certificate in 1946, and then remarkably went on to work in the office of Flying Service.

Shortly thereafter, Barbara Suelzer went to Washington, DC to work for Rep. Edward Kruse and then a few years later, while a committee woman at the Young Democrats, she met a young Georgetown University Law School student, Thomas Martin O'Malley. Their love of politics grew into a love for one another and they were married in 1954. Together, they made a home in Rockville, Maryland and raised six wonderful children—four sons: Patrick, Peter, Paul and Martin O'Malley, as well as two daughters, Bridget (O'Malley) Hunter and Eileen (O'Malley) Schempp.

To my amazing good fortune, her son, Martin O'Malley, became my 1986 campaign field director and later he went on to become Mayor of Baltimore City, Governor for the State of Maryland, and even a democratic Presidential candidate. But one of the greatest things Governor O'Malley did for me apart from his own service, was that he recommended his mother apply for the receptionist job in my new Senate office starting in January 1987. It was my distinct pleasure to have her on my staff until my retirement in January 2017.

For all who knew her, Mrs. O, greeted every constituent with kindness, care and consideration in what was after all, the people's house. She had a great love of history, and she knew the history of the Capitol. She knew every nook and cranny, even the basement, and when school groups came to the Capitol, it was Mrs. O who led the tour. She also developed relationships with other staffers and loved playing poker—and became a legend for her skill at the game—especially with other senators. Indeed, her love of flying combined with her passion for history, inspired her volunteer work as a docent for the Smithsonian Air & Space Museum for many years. In 2016, Mrs. O was formally recognized by the U.S. Civil Air Patrol during their 75th Anniversary Gala and received a replica of CAP's 2014 Congressional Gold Medal for her service during World War II.

I, along with my entire office, counted on Mrs. O over the course of 30 years. She was honest, kind, and looked out for one and all. Her life was rooted deep in her Catholic faith and together, we served the people of Maryland and this great nation. My deepest condolences go out to the entire O'Malley family and to her extended Mikulski staff family

who also feel her loss. May she rest in peace with her beloved husband Thomas Martin.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HARRY REID ON THE PASSING OF BARBARA A. O'MALLEY

Barbara O'Malley was beloved on the Hill. Mrs. O had an amazing love of politics, history, and the Capitol. She lived an admirable life. She earned her private pilot's license as a teenager and later served as Civil Air Patrol in World War II. She worked on presidential campaigns and in public service, working for decades in the United States Senate. She was admired on both sides of the aisle. Mrs. O will be dearly missed by all those privileged to have known her.

STATEMENT OF DR. SHANNON KULA, FORMER CHIEF OF STAFF TO U.S. SENATOR BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, ON THE PASSING OF BARBARA A. O'MALLEY

Barbara O'Malley, warmly known as ''Mrs. O,'' was our source of joy and someone we counted on as always and was a fierce defender of all of us as the BAMMER family. Every day and in every way, Mrs. O was our rock. We counted on her whether it was training new staffers, welcoming thousands of visitors during inaugurations, sit-ins, war protests, or, speaking with thousands of constituents on every policy and political issue you could think of, day in and day out. Then, just as she promised them, reporting to the Senator exactly what they were saying. Every person counted and she took her job seriously. She got us through the dark days of 9/11, anthrax and ricin attacks. She helped us celebrate victories whether it was successfully fighting for seniors who were due their social security benefits, the passage of important legislation on the Senate floor, or ushering in the holidays with her famous homemade treats. We loved her resident celebrity status too from legendary Senator poker games to her visit with Tony Bennett. Everyone knew and loved Mrs. O!

She looked out for staff in more ways than I can count. For me, I started my days around 7:30 a.m. and it was a toss-up whether she or I unlocked the doors each morning. In those quiet moments, we'd catch up before the day began and the rest of the staff arrived. Usually, she'd proudly share the latest pictures of her children, grandchildren or great grandchildren. Sometimes we'd then go to 8 a.m. mass together at St. Joseph's across the street. She'd look after all the office plants and helped me learn to grow mine—even reviving the ones I thought were clearly long dead. Most days, I would be running around the Capitol, the Senate floor, meeting after meeting and couldn't get to my desk until 4pm-ish and still had at least five or six hours of work ahead. But as I began to dig out, and was hungry from not having lunch yet, I would find a special Mrs. O tin of goodies waiting for me along with a sweet reminder note that was her mantra: ''Keep your eye upon the donut and not upon the hole.'' Her brownies and Spritz cookies were favorites. We couldn't be more grateful to have known her, worked alongside her, and to have had her in our corner.

Mrs. O embodied exactly what I believe the suffragettes fought for 100 years ago. She not only did all that they hoped for and more, but then reached back to bring more women along with her toward this journey of a more perfect union. She was bold, feared nothing and no one, a trailblazer who literally learned to fly, raised and cherished a beautiful family, had an incredible decades-long career in Congress, followed her faith, never said an unkind word, and was thoughtful and generous to everyone.

I know this former pilot now rides on eagle's wings and that is a comfort . . . but I, and so many, feel the hole, despite the donut. Mrs. O will be greatly missed but treasured in our memories always.

STATEMENT OF STEVE JURCZYK, ACTING ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, ON THE PASSING OF BARBARA A. O'MALLEY

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration fondly remembers Mrs. Barbara A. O'Malley, who was the first face and voice encountered by 10 NASA Administrators and scores of NASA staff in visiting or calling Senator Barbara A. Mikulski for 30 years. Mrs. O'Malley is an honorary employee of NASA, given her myriad interactions with Agency employees, her close attention to Agency milestones and activities, and her personal assistance in NASA interaction with the Committee on Appropriations and Chairwoman Mikulski. Mrs. O'Malley greeted dozens of NASA astronauts visiting Senator Mikulski and attended all manner of NASA events—including commemorations at the National Air and Space Museum, concerts at the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and launches at the NASA Kennedy Space Center and Wallops Flight Facility. Mrs. O'Malley is remembered for her wit, sparkling eyes, and ready smile.

NASA's condolences are extended to the O'Malley family and extended Mikulski staff family.

STATEMENT OF THE CIVIL AIR PATROL ON THE PASSING OF BARBARA A. O'MALLEY

Civil Air Patrol (CAP) mourns the loss of one of its original members from World War II, Mrs. Barbara Suelzer O'Malley, of Timonium, Maryland. She joined CAP in 1943 as a cadet while attending high school in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and stayed passionately involved with CAP throughout her life. She earned her private pilot certificate as a teenager and was a long-time aviation and space enthusiast. She loved working with young people interested in aviation, particularly CAP cadets and she later served as a docent with the Smithsonian's National Air and Space Museum. All this was in addition to her exceptional and long career in politics.

On December 1, 2016, during CAP's 75th Anniversary Gala at the Smithsonian's Steven F. Udvar-Hazy Center, Mrs. O'Malley was presented with a replica Congressional Gold Medal (CGM). She was one of only two to be so honored that evening. Presenting the award was retired Senator Tom Harkin and CAP's National Commander, Major General Joseph Vazquez. In the audience was the Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Deborah Lee James, among numerous other VIPs. The CGM was given to CAP in 2014 for the unusual and heroic service of its volunteers during World War II.

Civil Air Patrol is truly grateful for Mrs. O'Malley's dedication and service to CAP and our nation over her long life.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise to honor Mrs. Barbara Ann O'Malley, who passed away last month at the age of 93 after a long life guided by kindness, strength, grace, and humility. Mrs. O'Malley—affectionately known as Mrs. O to both Hill staffers and Members alike—served Maryland for 30 years in the office of former Senator Barbara Mikulski. The indelible mark she has left on our State and on Capitol Hill will endure for generations.

Barbara Ann O'Malley was born a pioneer. In her youth, she hungered to fly and earned a pilot's license at the age of 16 on her own initiative. But it was in the arena of public service where she would soar. Inspired by her father's service as chair of the county Democratic Party where she grew up, Barbara started volunteering for political campaigns when she was still too young to vote. Her passion for public service brought her from Indiana to Washington, where she worked for Democratic Congressman Edward Kruse and later became the national committeewoman for the Young Democrats. And as a mother, Barbara O'Malley raised her three children on the value of serving others. Her son Martin grew up to be the mayor of Baltimore, Governor of Maryland, and a candidate for President of the United States.

After her boys left home, Mrs. O'Malley turned to raising a new family on Capitol Hill. She spread kindness, collegiality, and community from the front desk of Senator Mikulski's office for three decades. She was notorious for dropping off treats at coworker's desks throughout the day, shuttling baked goods back-and-forth from the so-called BAMtry, a cache of snacks that kept the staff running. And she gave moral nourishment to the team by sharing advice cultivated through years in politics. Legions of Hill staffers, from new hires to chiefs of staff, turned to her for counsel. But it wasn't just staff. Senator Mikulski likes to say that Mrs. O gave her the ''first briefing of the day'' when she walked into work. Senators Jay Rockefeller and Arlen Specter could often be spotted circling her desk just before heading to the Senate floor. And when I served in the House of Representatives, Mrs. O'Malley was always the first to warmly greet me on my way in to see Senator Mikulski, and I always relished the moment.

If flying was her first love, then history was her second. She knew every fact, detail, and anecdote about the U.S. Senate, and for years, Barbara O'Malley's Capitol Hill tours were the hottest tickets in town. She guided Marylanders of all ages and interests through the halls of American democracy with trademark wit—never compromising between her reverence for the Senate and her taste for a good joke. At the front desk, she was known as the office historian, collecting the stories of constituents who passed through and maintaining a long catalogue of staff directories that she held onto throughout her life. She forged deep friendships and kept up with colleagues even after they left the office.

That was Barbara O'Malley's gift. She saw the multitudes that live in all of us and treated each person who crossed her path like they were the first and last thing in the world. That talent for compassion made her the soul of the Senate for 30 years and makes this loss all the more painful for me and for my State. But though she has passed, her spirit survives. Barbara O'Malley's legacy lives on in the generations of Hill staffers, students, and

public servants whom she taught and trained and who now serve throughout Washington and across the country.

ADD1TIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO SARAH MOYER

• Mr. DAINES. Madam President, today I have the honor of recognizing Sarah Moyer of Yellowstone County for serving her community in a time of need.

When schools were shut down in March due to the COVID–19 pandemic, hundreds of children who rely on school for getting their meals were sent home. Sarah saw the need to feed her community and did not hesitate to jump in. Her business, Project Lunch, started to make healthy lunches available to anyone in need. By the end of the summer, Sarah and her volunteers had delivered over 21,800 lunches right to the front doors of Montanans—a truly remarkable act of service for her neighbors.

Her dedication to her fellow Montanans does not stop there. Heading into 2021, Sarah opened a pay-what-you-can restaurant in downtown Billings that employs Montanans who are struggling to find employment elsewhere. The community rallied behind Sarah and donated time, equipment, and resources to help get this restaurant started. Her goal for this project is to create a place for folks to give back and support their neighbors. Sarah has brought her community together, inspired volunteers, helped those in need, and started a legacy of service.

I am thankful for Sarah's dedication and heart for the Billings community. She has truly shown us all what it means to put service above self.•

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK ROADY

• Mr. DAINES. Madam President, today I have the honor of recognizing my good friend Chuck Roady of Flathead County.

It is hard to imagine where the Montana timber industry would be right now were it not for the leadership of Chuck. The last few decades haven't been easy on the timber industry or the communities that rely upon it for good paying jobs. Yet, throughout his career, Chuck has met these challenges head-on, fighting tooth and nail to protect timber jobs and advocate for the proper management of our forests.

Growing up, Chuck loved the outdoors and wanted to find a job that would allow him to be in the woods. After graduating from the University of Idaho College of Forestry, he worked for various timber companies across the Pacific Northwest. In 2003, he became lands and resources manager for F.H. Stoltze Land and Lumber Company in Columbia Falls, MT. The Stoltze Mill employs more than 130 hard-working Montanans.

From the beginning of his time with Stoltze, Chuck became a leading voice in the community for our timber industry and proper forest management. Chuck's approach is to build bridges and find common ground amongst groups with different interests. His work has brought people together to find solutions that benefit the mills, the communities that depend on them, and our forests.

Chuck has been a leader on timber issues on the national stage as well. He was a founding member of the Federal Forest Resource Coalition and served as its chair. In this role, he successfully worked to elevate forest management issues to the forefront of our national debates, making real progress along the way. He has given us all a reason to be optimistic about the future.

I thank Chuck for his years of service to this cause and wish him all the best in his retirement.•

RECOGNIZING MIKE THE BORDER COLLIE

• Mr. DAINES. Madam President, today I have the honor of recognizing Mike, a Montana ranch dog who was crowned this year's runner up for Farm Dog of the Year.

As a dog dad to Ruby, Reagan, and Jessie, I know the important role a dog plays in life. Dogs are there for us through the good and the bad, and they are always happy to see you. Our four-legged friends are a source of laughter and always make for a good hunting partner.

In Montana, our dogs take on another role. They become a trusty ranch hand for many. Tim Feddes, a rancher from Manhattan, knows just how important it is to have a hard-working cow dog. That is exactly why he thought Mike, his border collie, should have a shot at American Farm Bureau's 2021 Farm Dog of the Year Contest.

Out of hundreds of furry applicants, an expert panel chose Mike to be crowned as the runner-up for Farm Dog of the Year. Mike is a special dog that takes his job seriously and makes life on the ranch a little bit brighter.

It is my honor to recognize Mike on this incredible accomplishment. He has represented ranch dogs everywhere, and especially in Montana, with pride.•

TRIBUTE TO ELLIOT PERRY

• Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I am proud to recognize Elliot Perry of Bedford as January 2021's Granite Stater of the Month. Elliot, a fourth grader at Bedford Memorial Elementary School and an ambassador for the Children's Hospital at Dartmouth-Hitchcock—CHaD—has started a fundraising campaign to build two accessible playgrounds at CHaD locations in Lebanon and Manchester to help improve the experience of children who visit these facilities.

Elliot was born nearly 4 months early and given only an 18-percent chance to live. The medical professionals at CHaD worked hard to ensure that Elliot received the best care that they could provide and 121 days later, Elliot went home with his mom and dad.

Since then, Elliot has been one of CHaD's best ambassadors and has helped raise more than $100,000 for the organization that he and his parents credit with saving his life.

Last year, Elliot launched a new effort to support the patients at CHaD. The 121 Club that Elliot founded aims to raise $121,000 to build two sensory-neutral playgrounds that are compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act's Standards for Accessible Design at CHaD locations in Lebanon and Manchester. With the help of his friends and neighbors, Elliot has already raised a little more than $80,000 for his cause.

Elliot hopes that these new playgrounds will provide an outlet for any family who wishes to take a break during longer visits, as well as provide a safe space for children of all abilities to play and develop their motor skills.

Elliot embodies the best of New Hampshire. His drive to help others, along with his empathy and inclusivity, has made an enormous difference, especially for children facing particularly difficult challenges and their families. I wish Elliot the best as he continues fundraising to reach his goal, and I look forward to seeing what he accomplishes next.•

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statues (20 U.S.C. 42–43), and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: Ms. MATSUI of California and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD of California.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following concurrent resolution was discharged from the Committee on the Budget pursuant to Section 300 of the Congressional Budget Act, and placed on the calendar:

S. Con. Res. 5. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–160. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0212)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–161. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–1056)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–162. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes; Amendment 39–19922'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0987)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–163. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders; Amendment 39–21154'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0600)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–164. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21185'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0672)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–165. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters; Amendment 39–21210'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0418)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–166. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes; Amendment 39–21186'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0536)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–167. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited Helicopters; Amendment 39–21215'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0589)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–168. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Continental Aerospace Technologies, Inc. (Type Certificate Previously held by Continental Motors, Inc.) Reciprocating Engines; Amendment 39–21195'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0222)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–169. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21204'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–21204)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–170. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39–21199'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0212)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–171. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Blanik Aircraft CZ s.r.o.; Amendment 39–21189'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0711)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–172. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled'' Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0212)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–173. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Aviat Aircraft Inc.; Amendment 39–21190'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0715)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–174. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39–21196'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0212)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–175. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39–21191'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0716)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–176. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd. & Co. KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–21201'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0265)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–177. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters; Amendment 39–21203'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–1115)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–178. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21216'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0994)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–179. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39–21200'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0743)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–180. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39–21205'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0842)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–181. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes;

Amendment 39–21202'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0682)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–182. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21206'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0688)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–183. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; GA8 Airvan (Pty) Ltd Airplanes; Amendment 39–21214'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0615)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–184. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39–21213'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0769)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–185. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21184'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0106)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–186. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21209'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0107)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–187. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21183'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0217)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–188. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21208'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0201)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–189. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company; Amendment 39–21229'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0786)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–190. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airlines; Amendment 39–212027'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0690)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–191. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment 3916'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31324)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–192. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment 3915'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31323)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–193. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment 3917'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31325)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–194. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment 3918'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31326)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–195. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation, Amendment, and Establishment of Multiple Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes Due to the Decommissioning of the Greene County, Mississippi, VOR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0815)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–196. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of the Requirement for Helicopters to Use the New York North Shore Helicopter Route'' ((RIN2120–AL65) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0772)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–197. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of V–55, V–271, T–217 and T–265, and Revocation of V–215, and V–450 in the Vicinity of Muskegon, Michigan'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0189)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–198. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference; Amendment No. 71–52'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0702)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–199. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Killdeer and New Town, North Dakota'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0110)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–200. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Harrison, Arkansas'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0365)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–201. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–354; North Central United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0294)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–202. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Northeastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0186)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–203. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment, Establishment and Revocation of Multiple Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes in the Vicinity of Waukon, Iowa'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0004)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–204. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ithaca, New York'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0242)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–205. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pottsville, Pennsylvania'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0277)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–206. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V–24, V–97, and V–171 in the Vicinity of Lone Rock , Wisconsin'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0244)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–207. A communication from the Senior Trial Attorney, Office of Aviation Consumer Protection, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defining Unfair or Deceptive Practices'' (RIN2105–AE72) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–208. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations, Edgefield, South Carolina'' (MB Docket No. 20–155) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–209. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes; Amendment 39–19923'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0104)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–210. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–19925'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0329)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–211. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2017'' ; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–212. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Use of the 5.850–5.925 GHz Band'' ((FCC 20–164) (ET Docket No. 19–138)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 31, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–213. A communication from the Assistant Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Promoting Broadcast Internet Innovation Through ATSC 3.0, Report and Order'' ((MB Docket No. 20–145) (FCC 20–181)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 31, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–214. A communication from the Deputy Division Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protecting Against National Security Threats to the Communications Supply Chain Through FCC Programs'' ((RIN3060–AK95) (CC Docket No. 18–89)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 31, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–215. A communication from the Assistant Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2017 Report to Congress on the Disclosure of Financial Interest and Recusal Requirements for Regional Fishery Management Councils and Scientific and Statistical Committees and on Apportionment of Membership of the Regional Fishery Management Councils''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–216. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pipeline Safety: Gas Pipeline Regulatory Reform'' (RIN2137–AF36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–217. A communication from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Director for Financial Management, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation'' (RIN0605–AA58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–218. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties'' (RIN3072–AC85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–219. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Operation of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems Over People'' ((RIN2120–AK85) (Docket No. FAA–2018–1087)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–220. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Policy, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rulemaking Procedures Update'' (RIN2126–AB96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BOOZMAN for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Thomas J. Vilsack, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. MORAN for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

*Denis Richard McDonough, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

*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. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 146. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to provide bankruptcy protections for medically distressed debtors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 147. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a limitation on excess business losses of non-corporate taxpayers and to modify the carryback of net operating losses for certain taxable years; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 148. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain dependent income when calculating modified adjusted gross income for the purposes of eligibility for premium tax credits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 149. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide Secretarial authority to temporarily waive or modify application of certain Medicare requirements

with respect to ambulance services furnished during certain emergency periods; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 150. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the inclusion of certain audio-only diagnoses in the determination of risk adjustment for Medicare Advantage plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 151. A bill to provide for an emergency increase in Federal funding to State Medicaid programs for expenditures on home and community-based services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 152. A bill to allow States to approve the use of diagnostic tests during a public health emergency; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 153. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and improve health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 154. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for reciprocal marketing approval of certain drugs, biological products, and devices that are authorized to be lawfully marketed abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 155. A bill to permit a licensed health care provider to provide health care services to individuals in one or more States in which the provider is not licensed; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 156. A bill to permit reenrollment and establishment by retiree beneficiaries of monthly enrollment fee payment for TRICARE Select at any time during 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 157. A bill to provide funding for the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use to award grants for the purpose of supporting virtual peer behavioral health support services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 158. A bill to promote international efforts in combating corruption, kleptocracy, and illicit finance by foreign officials and other foreign persons, including through a new anti-corruption action fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OSSOFF, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 159. A bill to require additional disclosures relating to donations to the Presidential Inaugural Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. COONS):

S. 160. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish an Innovation Voucher Grant Program; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. RISCH, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 161. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a program to establish a program to assist small business concerns with purchasing cybersecurity products and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 162. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for public health research and investment into understanding and eliminating structural racism and police violence; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 163. A bill to address the workforce needs of the telecommunications industry; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 164. A bill to educate health care providers and the public on biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 165. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to States, political subdivisions of States, Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations, community-based entities, and primary care and behavioral health organizations to address behavioral health needs caused by the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 166. A bill to authorize grants to address substance use during COVID–19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 167. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to covered health departments to increase the rate of recommended immunizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 168. A bill to provide temporary licensing reciprocity for telehealth and interstate health care treatment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 169. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to require the Register of Copyrights to waive fees for filing an application for registration of a copyright claim in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 170. A bill to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 to provide for regulatory impact analyses for certain rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 171. A bill to authorize the Keystone XL Pipeline; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 172. A bill to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 173. A bill to provide for the designation of certain wilderness areas, recreation management areas, and conservation areas in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 174. A bill to modify the 7(a) loan guaranty program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt a portion of unemployment compensation received during 2020 from income taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 176. A bill to require a longitudinal study on the impact of COVID–19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. LUJÀN):

S. 177. A bill to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to establish the Cerro de la Olla Wilderness in the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument and to modify the boundary of the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 179. A bill to authorize the appropriation of an additional $10,000,000,000 to secure critical materials and supplies to combat the COVID–19 pandemic; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 180. A bill to withdraw certain Bureau of Land Management land from mineral development; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. OSSOFF, Ms.

ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 181. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his dedication to justice and equality; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 182. A bill to withdraw certain Federal land in the Pecos Watershed area of the State of New Mexico from mineral entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 183. A bill to provide appropriate information to Federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies, pursuant to investigating terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 184. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an emergency temporary standard that requires operators to develop and implement a comprehensive infectious disease exposure control plan to protect miners from exposure to SARS–CoV–2, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 185. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to limit the face value of coins; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 186. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to award grants to develop, administer, and evaluate early childhood education apprenticeships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 24. A resolution supporting efforts by the Government and people of Colombia to pursue peace and regional stability; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BURR, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 25. A resolution designating the week of January 24 through January 30, 2021, as ''National School Choice Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. Con. Res. 5. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 14

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 14, a bill to identify and combat corruption in countries, to establish a tiered system of countries with respect to levels of corruption by their governments and their efforts to combat such corruption, and to evaluate foreign persons engaged in grand corruption for inclusion as specially designated nationals under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act.

S. 35

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 35, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Officer Eugene Goodman.

S. 40

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 40, a bill to address the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to study and consider a national apology and proposal for reparations for the institution of slavery, its subsequent de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.

S. 43

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 43, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations and eligible workforce training organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 44

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 44, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit kindergarten through grade 12 educational expenses to be paid from a 529 account.

S. 51

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 51, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S. 59

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 59, a bill to provide a civil remedy for individuals harmed by sanctuary jurisdiction policies, and for other purposes.

S. 67

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 67, a bill to support efforts by international financial institutions to provide a robust global response to the COVID–19 pandemic.

S. 68

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 68, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 71

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to expand the use of E–Verify to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes.

S. 80

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 80, a bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes.

S. 88

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 88, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 92

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 92, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S. 96

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 96, a bill to provide for the long-term improvement of public school facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 99

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 99, a bill to implement equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the right to life of each born and preborn human person.

S. 139

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 139, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

S. 145

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 145, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to repeal the requirement that the United States Postal Service prepay future retirement benefits, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 3

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S. RES. 18

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 18, a resolution in support of an international investigation into the handling by the Government of the People's Republic of China of COVID–19 and the impact thereof on the people of the United States and other nations.

S. RES. 23

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 23, a resolution honoring the life and legacy of Henry Louis Aaron.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 163. A bill to address the workforce needs of the telecommunications industry; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. THUNE. 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. 163

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 ''Telecommunications Skilled Workforce Act''.

SEC. 2. TELECOMMUNICATIONS INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 344. TELECOMMUNICATIONS INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) 5G.—The term '5G', with respect to wireless infrastructure and wireless technology, means fifth-generation wireless infrastructure and wireless technology.

''(2) RURAL AREA.—The term 'rural area' means any area other than—

''(A) a city, town, or incorporated area that has a population of more than 20,000 inhabitants; or

''(B) an urbanized area adjacent to a city or town that has a population of more than 50,000 inhabitants.

''(3) TELECOMMUNICATIONS INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—The term 'telecommunications interagency working group' means the interagency working group established under subsection (b).

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Chairman of the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall establish within the Commission an interagency working group to develop recommendations to address the workforce needs of the telecommunications industry.

''(c) DUTIES.—In developing recommendations under subsection (b), the telecommunications interagency working group shall—

''(1) determine whether, and if so how, any Federal laws (including regulations), guidance, policies, or practices, or any budgetary constraints, inhibit institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) or for-profit businesses from establishing, adopting, or expanding programs intended to address the workforce needs of the telecommunications industry, including the workforce needed to build and maintain the 5G wireless infrastructure necessary to support 5G wireless technology;

''(2) identify potential policies and programs that could encourage and improve coordination among Federal agencies, between Federal agencies and States, and among States, on telecommunications workforce needs;

''(3) identify ways in which existing Federal programs, including programs that help facilitate the employment of veterans and military personnel transitioning into civilian life, could be leveraged to help address the workforce needs of the telecommunications industry;

''(4) identify ways to encourage individuals and for-profit businesses to participate in qualified industry-led workforce development programs, including the Telecommunications Industry Registered Apprenticeship Program;

''(5) identify ways to improve recruitment in qualified industry-led workforce development programs, including the Telecommunications Industry Registered Apprenticeship Program and other industry-recognized apprenticeship programs; and

''(6) identify Federal incentives that could be provided to institutions of higher education, for-profit businesses, State workforce development boards established under section 101 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3111), or other relevant stakeholders to establish or adopt programs, or expand current programs, to address the workforce needs of the telecommunications industry, including such needs in rural areas.

''(d) MEMBERS.—The telecommunications interagency working group shall be composed of representatives of such Federal agencies and relevant non-Federal industry stakeholder organizations as the Chairman of the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, considers appropriate, including—

''(1) a representative of the Department of Education, appointed by the Secretary of Education;

''(2) a representative of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, appointed by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information;

''(3) a representative of the Department of Commerce, appointed by the Secretary of Commerce;

''(4) a representative of the Commission, appointed by the Chairman of the Commission;

''(5) a representative of the Telecommunications Industry Registered Apprenticeship Program, appointed by the Secretary of Labor;

''(6) a representative of a telecommunications industry association, appointed by the Chairman of the Commission;

''(7) a representative of an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization, appointed by the Secretary of Labor;

''(8) a representative of a rural telecommunications carrier, appointed by the Chairman of the Commission;

''(9) a representative of a telecommunications contractor firm, appointed by the Chairman of the Commission;

''(10) a representative of a minority institution (as defined in section 365 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1067k)), appointed by the Secretary of Education; and

''(11) a representative of a labor organization, appointed by the Secretary of Labor.

''(e) NO COMPENSATION.—A member of the telecommunications interagency working group shall serve without compensation.

''(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the telecommunications interagency working group is established, the working group shall submit a report containing recommendations to address the workforce needs of the telecommunications industry to—

''(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

''(2) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

''(3) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

''(4) the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

''(g) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C.

App.) shall not apply to the telecommunications interagency working group.''.

(b) SUNSET.—Section 344 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by subsection (a), shall be repealed on the day after the date on which the interagency working group established under subsection (b) of that section submits the report to Congress under subsection (f) of that section.

SEC. 3. TELECOMMUNICATIONS WORKFORCE GUIDANCE.

Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall establish and issue guidance on how States can address the workforce needs of the telecommunications industry, including guidance on how a State workforce development board established under section 101 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3111) can—

(1) utilize Federal resources available to States to meet the workforce needs of the telecommunications industry; and

(2) promote and improve recruitment in qualified industry-led workforce development programs, including the Telecommunications Industry Registered Apprenticeship Program.

SEC. 4. GAO ASSESSMENT OF WORKFORCE NEEDS OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) 5G.—The term ''5G'', with respect to wireless infrastructure and wireless technology, means fifth-generation wireless infrastructure and wireless technology.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

(3) BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ''broadband infrastructure'' means any buried, underground, or aerial facility, and any wireless or wireline connection, that enables users to send and receive voice, video, data, graphics, or any combination thereof.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that estimates the number of skilled telecommunications workers that will be required to build and maintain—

(1) broadband infrastructure in rural areas; and

(2) the 5G wireless infrastructure needed to support 5G wireless technology.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt a portion of unemployment compensation received during 2020 from income taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

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. 175

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 ''Coronavirus Unemployment Benefits Tax Relief Act''.

SEC. 2. SUSPENSION OF TAX ON PORTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 85 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR 2020.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in 2020, gross income shall not include so much of the unemployment compensation received by an individual as does not exceed $10,200.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am reintroducing the Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act with Senators BLUMENTHAL, WHITEHOUSE, MERKLEY, BALDWIN, WARREN, VAN HELLENE, and BROWN. This legislation fully closes a loophole that has allowed publicly traded corporations to deduct the cost of multimillion-dollar bonuses from their corporate tax bills. U.S. taxpayers shouldn't continue to have to subsidize these massive bonuses.

Under section 162(m) of the tax code as amended by the 2017 Trump tax law (TCJA), when a publicly traded corporation calculates its taxable income, it is generally permitted to deduct compensation costs from its revenues, with limits up to $1 million for some of the firm's most senior executives.

In the 115th Congress, the TCJA got rid of some of the prior 162(m) loopholes by taking provisions from my Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act, including removing the exemption for performance-based compensation, which previously permitted compensation deductions above $1 million when executives met performance benchmarks,

While these steps were a start, even more should have been done, such as applying section 162(m) to all employees of publicly traded corporations so that all compensation is subject to a deductibility cap of $1 million. This was the only provision from my Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act from the l15th Congress that was not incorporated into the Trump tax law.

Partially closing these 162(m) loopholes saved taxpayers $9.2 billion according to the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT), but last Congress, the JCT estimated that fully closing the loophole along the lines of the legislation I am reintroducing today would save taxpayers an additional $27 billion dollars.

Under this legislation, publicly traded corporations would still be permitted to pay their executives as much as they desire, but compensation above and beyond $1 million would no longer be subsidized through our tax code. This is simply a matter of fairness, ensuring that corporations—and not hardworking taxpayers who face their own challenges in this economy—are paying for the multi-million dollar bonuses corporations have decided to dole out to their senior executives. Instead of showering corporations with additional benefits they certainly don't need, we should be doing everything within our power to help more families, who are barely surviving, make it to the other side of this public health emergency.

I thank Public Citizen, the Institute for Policy Studies—Global Economy Project, Americans for Financial Reform, the AFL–CIO, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and MIT Professor Simon Johnson for their support. I urge our colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this legislation and pressing for its passage.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. OSSOFF, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 181. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his dedication to justice and equality; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to posthumously award Fred Toyosaburo Korematsu with the Congressional Gold Medal. Fred challenged the illegal internment of Japanese Americans during World War II and devoted his life to expanding civil rights and liberties for all people. Awarding him the Congressional Gold Medal, Congress' highest civilian honor, would be a fitting tribute to his lifelong pursuit of justice and equality.

Fred was born in Oakland, California on January 30, 1919, to Japanese immigrant parents. Although he was an American citizen, Fred was discriminated against due to his Japanese ancestry. As the United States entered World War II, Fred tried unsuccessfully to enlist in the U.S. military, and was fired from his job at the Oakland shipyard. In 1942, Fred was arrested and convicted of defying military orders issued under Executive Order 9066, a discriminatory presidential order that authorized the mass removal and incarceration of more than 120,000 Japanese Americans during World War II.

Fred challenged the constitutionality of the government's order but was convicted in federal court of violating

military orders issued under Executive Order 9066. After a federal appeals court upheld his conviction, he appealed his case to the U.S. Supreme Court. On December 18, 1944, the Court ruled against him in a 6-3 decision, finding the government's discriminatory policy to incarcerate Japanese Americans was justified due to military necessity.

Decades later, legal historians discovered key information that the federal government did not share with the Supreme Court, including a report that concluded very few Japanese Americans represented a national security risk. After this evidence of government misconduct emerged and was presented to the court, Fred's conviction was overturned by a Federal court in San Francisco nearly forty years later, on November 10, 1983. Fred believed that the Supreme Court's decision was wrong, and stated, ''I would like to see the Government admit that they were wrong and do something about it so this will never happen again to any American citizen of any race, creed or color.'' Although the Supreme Court's infamous ruling in Korematsu v. United States has been widely rejected by historians and legal experts, it has never been formally repudiated, and stands as one of the Supreme Court's worst precedents.

The internment of Japanese Americans was a shameful act, and it was not until 1988 that the Civil Liberties Act was passed and our Government formally apologized to Americans of Japanese ancestry who were incarcerated during World War II. Fred Korematsu fought for this redress legislation and continued working to expand civil rights throughout his life. He spoke out against prejudice directed at minorities and immigrants, and after September 11, 2001, filed amicus briefs with the Supreme Court, warning our nation not to repeat history by committing civil and human rights travesties.

During his lifetime, Fred Korematsu did not choose the easy route. Instead, he chose to fight and speak out against injustice his entire life. He fought not just for himself, but for everyone, particularly minorities who could be discriminated against based on their ethnicity. However, many of these injustices remain, and can be reborn as we have seen with the rise in anti-Asian prejudice during the COVID–19 pandemic. Fred Korematsu reminds us that we must remain vigilant against discrimination, particularly when it is disguised in times of emergency or for reasons of security. On January 30, Fred Korematsu Day of Civil Liberties and the Constitution, we honor the life of this civil rights hero whose legacy continues to inspire people of all backgrounds to speak up and fight for justice. This day uses one of the most blatant examples of racial discrimination to educate individuals on the dangers of political scapegoating and works toward a future that guarantees civil rights for everyone. I am proud to introduce the Fred Korematsu Congressional Gold Medal Act in his memory, and I call on my colleagues in the United States Senate to swiftly pass this bill during the 117th Congress.

I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 24—SUPPORTING EFFORTS BY THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF COLOMBIA TO PURSUE PEACE AND REGIONAL STABILITY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 24

Whereas, in 2016, the Government of Colombia concluded a historic peace agreement with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia-People's Army (FARC-EP) aimed at addressing the historical causes of the half-a-century armed conflict in Colombia, and the Government of Colombia is currently working to implement that agreement;

Whereas the Governments and people of the United States and Colombia have forged a resolute bond through a shared commitment to support peace, human rights, democracy, the rule of law, and security throughout the Western Hemisphere and the world, which has been bolstered by the support of hundreds of thousands of Colombian-Americans and their contributions to life in the United States;

Whereas, in 2000, the Government of Colombia achieved a national consensus to build state capacity, and the United States committed to combat organized crime, drugs, and violence through its foreign assistance in support of Plan Colombia;

Whereas Plan Colombia and its successor, Peace Colombia, have received consistent support from each United States President since 1999, and from both Democrats and Republicans in the United States Congress;

Whereas, while the Government of Colombia contributed more than 95 percent of funds over the duration of Plan Colombia, the political leadership, technical advice, military assistance, and intelligence-sharing role of the United States, along with the $11,000,000,000 appropriated by the United States Congress through Plan Colombia and Peace Colombia to combat narcotics trafficking and transnational criminal organizations, strengthen democratic governance, promote economic growth, and defend human rights, played a key role in helping to transform a country on the brink of collapse into an increasingly peaceful and prosperous democracy, while also safeguarding important United States interests;

Whereas the Government of Colombia has made major investments and shown strong leadership, often at great cost and sacrifice, to consolidate domestic security, socioeconomic development, and the rule of law;

Whereas, since 2000, levels of crime and violence have decreased significantly in Colombia, with annual per capita homicide rates declining from 62 per 100,000 people in 1999 to a low of 24.5 per 100,000 people in 2015;

Whereas the alignment of improved security and sound economic policies has translated into steady growth in the gross domestic product of Colombia, which increased from approximately $86,000,000,000 in 1999 to more than $309,000,000,000 in 2017, and led to greater foreign direct investment, which grew from approximately $1,500,000,000 in 1999 to one of the highest in Latin America at an estimated $14,000,000,000 in 2017;

Whereas the United States and Colombia enjoy a robust economic relationship, with United States goods and services trade with Colombia totaling an estimated $36,400,000,000 in 2017, supporting more than 100,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas the Government of Colombia has made impressive strides in reducing poverty since 2005, with the poverty rate decreasing from 64 percent in 1999 to 27 percent in 2017, according to the World Bank;

Whereas, since 1999, the Government of Colombia has expanded its presence across all 32 territorial departments, has contributed to the professionalism of the Colombian judiciary, and has improved the capacity of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and National Police of Colombia;

Whereas Colombia is one of the United States' most consistent and strategic partners through its support of United States diplomatic objectives at the United Nations and efforts made in combating transnational organized crime and increased security and rule of law abroad;

Whereas, in 2017, Colombia signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and became the first NATO partner country in Latin America;

Whereas the gains Colombia has made are threatened by an escalating crisis in Venezuela, which has led to an influx of more than 1,800,000 Venezuelans into Colombia, and the need for continued financial support to implement the peace agreement;

Whereas the internal armed conflict victimized all Colombians, including women, children, and Afro-descendant and indigenous peoples, resulted in one of the largest populations of internally displaced persons in the world, and has led to the repeated targeting of leading representatives of civil society, including trade unionists, journalists, human rights defenders, and other community activists who remain at grave risk from guerrilla groups, successors to paramilitary groups, organized criminal organizations, and corrupt officials and individuals;

Whereas efforts to achieve lasting peace in Colombia must address the hardships faced by victims of the armed conflict, including implementing the Law on Victims and Restitution of Land of 2011;

Whereas the prospects for national reconciliation and sustainable peace in Colombia rely on the effective delivery of justice for victims of the conflict, long-term solutions for individuals who have been displaced, and the ability to hold accountable perpetrators of violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, particularly obligations under Article 3 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, done at Geneva August 12, 1949 (commonly referred to as the ''Fourth Geneva Convention'');

Whereas the work of the Special Jurisdiction for Peace, the transitional justice mechanism created for the purpose of ensuring accountability in the context of Colombia's internal armed conflict, is fundamental to the implementation of the peace agreement and the consolidation of peace in the country;

Whereas implementation of the peace agreement faces serious challenges, including a dramatic increase of coca cultivation and cocaine production, a spike in violent attacks against civilians, including social leaders implementing peace agreement programs, and the enormous burden of a mass exodus of Venezuelans fleeing the authoritarian regime of Nicolás Maduro; and

Whereas, on August 29, 2019, Luciano Marin Arango, also known as Iván Márquez, and

Seuxis Hernández Solarte, also known as Jesús Santrich, along with other members of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), publicly called for the renewal of armed conflict in Colombia and for increased cooperation between the FARC and the National Liberation Army (ELN), two organizations that are designated by the United States as foreign terrorist organizations under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the steadfast support of the Government and people of the United States for the people of Colombia in their pursuit of peace and stability so they can live in a country free of violence, impunity, injustice, and organized crime;

(2) lauds efforts to bring an end to Colombia's internal armed conflict;

(3) commends the work of the United Nations Verification Mission in Colombia in overseeing the implementation of the 2016 peace agreement and the disarmament and reintegration of former combatants;

(4) urges authorities in Colombia to hold accountable perpetrators of violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, particularly obligations under the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, done at Geneva August 12, 1949 (commonly referred to as the ''Fourth Geneva Convention'');

(5) encourages the Government of Colombia to protect vulnerable populations who remain at risk in Colombia, including defenders of human rights, individuals facing threats due to participation in crop substitution programs, internally displaced persons, Afro-descendant and indigenous leaders and communities, and demobilized combatants;

(6) condemns the assassinations of social leaders and demobilized combatants, and the decision of certain senior members of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) to return to arms and hostilities and strengthen their alliance with the National Liberation Army (ELN), which threatens the consolidation of lasting peace;

(7) reaffirms the importance of the extradition treaty between Colombia and the United States as an important part of the bilateral relationship that has promoted the interests of justice in both countries for decades;

(8) encourages the Secretary of State to develop a comprehensive strategy to assist the Government of Colombia in managing the impacts of the crisis in Venezuela while continuing the successful implementation and sustainability of the peace agreement and stabilization of territories previously in conflict in Colombia, and to further strengthen the close bilateral partnership between the United States and Colombia;

(9) reaffirms its commitment to its partnership with the Government and people of Colombia on issues of mutual interest, including security, counter-narcotics cooperation, combating transnational organized crime, ensuring justice for individuals who have caused harm to populations in the United States and Colombia, reintegration of former FARC combatants, inclusive economic growth and investment with a focus on disadvantaged communities, health cooperation, and educational and cultural exchanges that strengthen diplomatic relations; and

(10) commits to furthering the bilateral relationship between the United States and Colombia by working with leaders in the public and private sectors, as well as civil society in both countries, to ensure that the United States-Colombia relationship remains a pillar of United States foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere.

SENATE RESOLUTION 25—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JANUARY 24 THROUGH JANUARY 30, 2021, AS ''NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK''

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BURR, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.:

S. RES. 25

Whereas providing a diversity of choices in kindergarten through grade 12 (referred to in this preamble as ''K–12'') education empowers parents to select education environments that meet the individual needs and strengths of their children;

Whereas high-quality K–12 education environments of all varieties are available in the United States, including traditional public schools, public charter schools, public magnet schools, private schools, online academies, and home schooling;

Whereas talented teachers and school leaders in each of the education environments prepare children to achieve their dreams;

Whereas more families than ever before in the United States actively choose the best education for their children;

Whereas more public awareness of the issue of parental choice in education can inform additional families of the benefits of proactively choosing challenging, motivating, and effective education environments for their children;

Whereas the process by which parents choose schools for their children is nonpolitical, nonpartisan, and deserves the utmost respect;

Whereas the COVID–19 pandemic has exacerbated educational inequities for many children in the United States, highlighting the importance of a high-quality education; and

Whereas tens of thousands of events are planned to celebrate the benefits of educational choice during the 11th annual National School Choice Week, held the week of January 24 through January 30, 2021: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of January 24 through January 30, 2021, as ''National School Choice Week'';

(2) congratulates students, parents, teachers, and school leaders from kindergarten through grade 12 education environments of all varieties for their persistence, achievements, dedication, and contributions to society in the United States;

(3) encourages all parents, during National School Choice Week, to learn more about the education options available to them; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to hold appropriate programs, events, and activities during National School Choice Week to raise public awareness of the benefits of opportunity in education.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2022 THROUGH 2030

Mr. SANDERS submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. CON. RES. 5

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social security in the Senate.
Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.
Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the Senate.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Reserve fund for reconciliation legislation.
Sec. 3002. Reserve fund for deficit-neutral legislation.

TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 4001. Enforcement filing.
Sec. 4002. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
Sec. 4003. Application and effect of changes in allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels.
Sec. 4004. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 4005. Adjustment for changes in the baseline.
Sec. 4006. Limitation on advance appropriations.
Sec. 4007. Repeal of supermajority enforcement requirement.
Sec. 4008. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2030:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $2,303,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $2,768,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $2,971,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,092,643,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: $3,236,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,514,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $3,762,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $3,883,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $4,007,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $4,121,665,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: −$15,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −$17,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $98,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: −$106,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: −$121,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: −$128,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $6,020,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,091,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,011,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,072,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $4,267,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $4,449,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $4,642,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $4,960,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $5,082,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $5,471,756,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $6,140,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,298,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,070,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,070,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $4,250,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $4,425,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $4,606,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $4,950,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $5,019,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $5,419,949,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $3,837,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,529,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,099,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $977,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $1,014,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $911,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $844,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $1,066,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $1,011,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $1,298,284,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $29,943,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $31,647,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $32,911,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $34,102,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $35,262,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $36,311,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $37,261,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $38,443,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $39,652,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $41,068,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $24,081,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $25,818,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $27,153,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $28,380,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $29,610,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $30,730,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $31,882,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $33,333,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $34,768,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $36,518,000,000,000.

SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2021 through 2030 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $762,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $748,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $776,986,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $766,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $792,882,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $773,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $810,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $782,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $828,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $804,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $847,993,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $821,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $868,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $840,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $888,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $865,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $909,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $874,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $931,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $901,459,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $85,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $64,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $60,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $61,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,578,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $63,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $64,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $66,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $67,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $69,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $70,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,498,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $38,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $38,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $38,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $39,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $40,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $41,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $42,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $43,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $44,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $45,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,035,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $6,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $5,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $5,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $5,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $5,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $7,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $8,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $8,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,601,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $51,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $53,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $54,116,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $55,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $54,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $55,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $57,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,098,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $58,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $59,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,946,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $49,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $28,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $28,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $27,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $27,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, $27,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $27,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $27,715,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $27,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $28,058,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,392,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$242,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $327,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $19,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $20,198,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $21,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $20,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $21,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $22,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $21,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $22,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $21,683,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,389,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $206,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $185,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $104,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $104,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $105,569,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $106,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $107,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $108,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $109,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $110,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $111,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,056,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $127,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $32,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $32,624,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $33,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $34,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $34,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $35,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $36,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $37,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $37,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,189,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $372,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $115,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $116,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,773,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $118,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $150,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $121,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $125,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $134,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $128,638,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $132,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $131,492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $134,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $137,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,558,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $943,093,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $882,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $748,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $797,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $713,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $722,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $720,847,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $730,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $754,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $753,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $790,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $785,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $825,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $820,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $858,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $858,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $900,409,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $901,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $955,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $946,672,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $766,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $766,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $745,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $745,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $838,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $838,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $851,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $851,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $958,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $958,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $1,026,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,026,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $1,098,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,098,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $1,244,688,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,244,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $1,184,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,184,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $1,331,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,331,161,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $1,845,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,779,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $770,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $805,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $619,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $628,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $620,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $612,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $623,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $640,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $638,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $633,758,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $627,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $645,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $643,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $641,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $627,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $657,398,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $648,615,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $40,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $42,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $45,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $48,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $52,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $62,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,223,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $68,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $73,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $78,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $83,948,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $83,948,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $258,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $243,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $249,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $256,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $244,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $264,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $263,284,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $272,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $280,109,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $288,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $299,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $296,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $281,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $305,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,520,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $72,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $76,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $74,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $75,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $76,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $78,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $80,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $81,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $83,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $92,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,769,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $375,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $376,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,888,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $25,205,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $25,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $26,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $27,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $27,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $28,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $29,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,918,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $365,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $345,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $345,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $336,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $336,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $332,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $332,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $341,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $341,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $367,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $418,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $418,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $502,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $502,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $605,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $605,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $727,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $727,019,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$25,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$27,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$31,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,817,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$101,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$101,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$109,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$109,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$108,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$108,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, −$102,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$102,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, −$105,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$112,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, −$108,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$107,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, −$111,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$110,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, −$114,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$113,327,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, −$118,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$117,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, −$123,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$121,979,000,000.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2021: $898,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $930,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $996,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $1,040,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $1,085,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $1,133,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $1,182,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $1,231,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $1,279,075,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $1,326,172,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2021: $1,101,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,158,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,222,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $1,292,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $1,365,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $1,434,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $1,506,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $1,586,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $1,666,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $1,750,666,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $6,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $6,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $6,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $6,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $7,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $7,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,195,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $7,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $7,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $7,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,847,000,000.

SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $16,112,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(b) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—The Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $357,926,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(c) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $188,498,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(d) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $75,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(e) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(f) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $1,005,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(g) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $350,690,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(h) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $750,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(i) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—The Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $50,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(j) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $95,620,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(k) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $17,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(l) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the deficit by not more than $940,718,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(m) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than February 16, 2021, the committees named in the subsections of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.—The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $22,717,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(b) COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $89,250,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(c) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $35,903,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(d) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $3,206,500,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(e) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $1,296,487,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(f) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.—The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(g) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $304,956,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(h) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $50,687,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(i) COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $8,604,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(j) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP.—The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $50,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(k) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than $17,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(l) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than February 16, 2021, the Committees named in the subsections of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving all such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 3001. RESERVE FUND FOR RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

(a) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the House of the Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(2) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.—The point of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives shall not apply to reconciliation legislation reported by the Committee on the Budget pursuant to submissions under section 2001.

(b) SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2002 containing the recommendations of one or more committees,

or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(2) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(3) EXCEPTIONS FOR LEGISLATION.—

(A) SHORT-TERM.—Section 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, as amended by section 3201(b)(2) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under paragraph (1).

(B) LONG-TERM.—Section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under paragraph (1).

SEC. 3002. RESERVE FUND FOR DEFICIT-NEUTRAL LEGISLATION.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, or conference reports by the amounts provided in such legislation, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2021 to fiscal year 2025 or fiscal year 2021 to fiscal year 2030.

TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 4001. ENFORCEMENT FILING.

(a) IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House of Representatives, if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021 is adopted without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with respect to this concurrent resolution on the budget, for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) and applicable rules and requirements set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget, the allocations provided for in this subsection shall apply in the House of Representatives in the same manner as if such allocations were in a joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2021. The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2021 consistent with title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations consistent with title I for fiscal year 2021 and for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030 for the purpose of enforcing 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633).

(b) IN THE SENATE.—If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2021 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2021, 2021 through 2025, and 2021 through 2030 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633).

SEC. 4002. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committee on Appropriations of the applicable House of Congress amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House of Representatives and the Senate, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)), estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 4003. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS.—Revised allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House of Congress.

SEC. 4004. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

(a) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions consistent with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(1)).

(b) SENATE.—Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

SEC. 4005. ADJUSTMENT FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's updates to its baseline for fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SEC. 4006. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding subsection (d) of section 203 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 (Public Law 116–37; 133 Stat. 1052), such section 203 shall continue to have force and effect in the House of Representatives during fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 4007. REPEAL OF SUPERMAJORITY ENFORCEMENT REQUIREMENT.

Section 3203 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

SEC. 4008. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either the Senate or the House of Representatives to change those rules (insofar as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate or House of Representatives.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 7. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 8. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 9. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 10. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 11. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 12. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 13. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 14. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 15. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 16. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 17. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 18. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 19. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 20. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 21. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 22. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 23. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 24. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 25. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 26. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 27. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 28. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 29. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 30. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 31. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 32. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 33. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 34. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 35. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 36. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 37. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 38. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 39. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 40. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 41. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 42. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 43. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 44. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 45. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 46. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 47. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.
Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit reduction fund for efficiencies, consolidations, and other savings.
Sec. 3002. Reserve fund relating to health savings accounts.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Sec. 4001. Voting threshold for points of order.
Sec. 4002. Emergency legislation.
Sec. 4003. Enforcement of allocations, aggregates, and other levels.
Sec. 4004. Point of order against legislation providing funding within more than 3 suballocations under section 302(b).
Sec. 4005. Duplication determinations by the Congressional Budget Office.
Sec. 4006. Breakdown of cost estimates by budget function.
Sec. 4007. Sense of the Senate on treatment of reduction of appropriations levels to achieve savings.
Sec. 4008. Prohibition on preemptive waivers.
Sec. 4009. Adjustments for legislation reducing appropriations.
Sec. 4010. Adjustments to reflect legislation not included in the baseline.
Sec. 4011. Authority.
Sec. 4012. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2030:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $2,358,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $2,809,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $2,983,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,105,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,249,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,523,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $3,770,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $3,892,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $4,017,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $4,132,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $0.
Fiscal year 2022: $0.
Fiscal year 2023: $0.
Fiscal year 2024: $0.
Fiscal year 2025: $0.

Fiscal year 2026: $0.
Fiscal year 2027: $0.
Fiscal year 2028: $0.
Fiscal year 2029: $0.
Fiscal year 2030: $0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $4,045,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,923,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,805,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,691,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,581,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,473,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $3,543,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $3,613,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $3,686,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $3,759,914,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $6,133,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,772,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,055,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,849,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,658,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,537,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $3,503,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $3,537,284,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $3,579,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $3,644,354,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: −$1,687,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −$1,115,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: −$823,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: −$587,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: −$332,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $49,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $227,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $278,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $331,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $372,000,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $27,793,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $29,116,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $30,135,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $31,077,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $31,857,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $32,559,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $33,349,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $34,209,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $35,373,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $36,403,910,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2021: $20,270,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $21,863,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $23,177,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $24,219,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $25,044,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $25,907,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $26,864,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $27,697,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $29,112,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $30,169,910,000,000.

SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2021 through 2030 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $763,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $744,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $776,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $761,528,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $792,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $771,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $810,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $782,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $828,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $804,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $847,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $821,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $868,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $840,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $888,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $865,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $909,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $874,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $931,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $901,457,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $70,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $64,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $60,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $61,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $63,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $64,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $66,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $67,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $69,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $70,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,489,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $37,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $38,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,075,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $38,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $39,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $40,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $41,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $42,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $43,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $44,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $45,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,035,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $6,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $5,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $5,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $5,757,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $5,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $7,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $8,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $8,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,545,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $51,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $53,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $53,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $55,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $54,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027
(A) New budget authority, $55,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $56,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $58,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $59,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,809,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $28,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $27,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $28,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $27,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $27,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $27,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $27,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $27,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $27,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,008,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $27,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,293,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,523,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $19,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $20,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $21,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $20,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $21,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $22,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $21,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $22,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $21,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,334,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $104,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $104,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $104,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $105,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $106,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $107,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027
(A) New budget authority, $108,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $109,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $110,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $110,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $111,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,512,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $31,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $32,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $32,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $33,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $34,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $34,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $35,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $36,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $37,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $37,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,401,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $111,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $112,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $115,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $117,926,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $121,044,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $124,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $127,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $131,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $133,813,000.
(B) Outlays, $131,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $136,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $134,714,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $746,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $803,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $721,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $718,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $703,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $691,161,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $718,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $714,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $753,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $747,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $787,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $982,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $825,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $818,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $859,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $858,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $901,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $901,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $956,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $947,491,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $670,514,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $670,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $821,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $821,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $845,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $845,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $853,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $853,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $960,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $960,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $1,027,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,027,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $1,098,849,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,098,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $1,245,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,244,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $1,185,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,184,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $1,332,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,331,546,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $744,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $738,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $633,234,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $634,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $616,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $611,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $618,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $605,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $629,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $636,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $633,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $629,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $622,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $640,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $638,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $636,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $621,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $651,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $642,374,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $40,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $42,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $45,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $48,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $52,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $62,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,223,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $68,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $73,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $78,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $83,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,948,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $235,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $242,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $248,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, $256,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $243,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $263,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $271,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $279,205,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,505,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $287,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $298,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $295,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $280,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $305,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,300,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $74,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $72,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $73,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $75,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $75,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $77,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $79,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $81,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $83,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $92,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,837,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $24,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $25,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $25,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $26,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $27,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $27,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $28,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $29,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,919,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $361,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $337,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $325,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $325,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $319,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $319,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $326,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $326,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $350,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $396,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $472,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $472,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $565,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $565,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $678,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $678,032,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$18,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$27,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,688,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$31,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, −$39,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,817,000,000.
(20) New Efficiencies, Consolidations, and Other Savings (930):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$66,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$66,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, −$297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, −$606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, −$898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,568,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$101,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$101,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$109,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$109,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$108,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$108,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, −$102,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$102,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, −$105,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$112,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, −$108,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$107,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, −$111,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$110,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, −$114,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$113,327,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, −$118,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$117,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, −$123,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$121,979,000,000.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2021: $898,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $930,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $997,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $1,040,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $1,085,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $1,133,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $1,182,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $1,231,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $1,278,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $1,325,000,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2021: $1,107,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,165,116,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,228,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $1,298,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $1,371,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $1,441,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $1,513,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: $1,593,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: $1,674,447,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: $1,758,489,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, $6,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $6,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $6,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $6,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $6,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $7,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $7,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $7,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $7,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $7,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,847,000,000.

SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $404,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $404,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, $417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, $430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $430,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.—The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(b) ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(c) BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(d) COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(e) ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(f) ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(g) FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(h) HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(i) HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(j) INDIAN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(k) INTELLIGENCE.—The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(l) JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(m) RULES AND ADMINISTRATION.—The Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(n) VETERANS AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 and by not less than $5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(o) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than March 26, 2021, the committees named in subsections (a) through (o) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 3001. DEFICIT REDUCTION FUND FOR EFFICIENCIES, CONSOLIDATIONS, AND OTHER SAVINGS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efficiencies, consolidations, and other savings by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SEC. 3002. RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to health savings accounts by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

SEC. 4001. VOTING THRESHOLD FOR POINTS OF ORDER.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''covered point of order'' means a point of order—

(1) under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), or a concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(2) which, but for subsection (b), may be waived only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(b) VOTING THRESHOLD.—In the Senate—

(1) a covered point of order may be waived only by the affirmative vote of five-eighths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn; and

(2) an affirmative vote of five-eighths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a covered point of order.

SEC. 4002. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement, by an affirmative vote of five-eighths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress),

the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and sections 401 and 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(7)) for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''direct spending'', ''receipts'', and ''appropriations for discretionary accounts'' mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of five-eighths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of five-eighths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 4112 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, shall no longer apply.

SEC. 4003. ENFORCEMENT OF ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND OTHER LEVELS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—During each of fiscal years 2021 through 2030, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cause the amount of new budget authority, outlays, or deficits to be more than, or would cause the amount of revenues to be less than, the amount set forth under any allocation, aggregate, or other level established under this resolution.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of five-eighths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of five-eighths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SEC. 4004. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION PROVIDING FUNDING WITHIN MORE THAN 3 SUBALLOCATIONS UNDER SECTION 302(b).

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that appropriates amounts that are within more than 3 of the suballocations under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(b)).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of five-eighths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of five-eighths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SEC. 4005. DUPLICATION DETERMINATIONS BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''covered legislation'' means a bill or resolution of a public character reported by any committee of the Senate.

(b) DUPLICATION DETERMINATIONS BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.—Any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) for covered legislation shall include an analysis that includes—

(1) a determination of whether the covered legislation creates any new Federal program, office, or initiative that would duplicate or overlap with any existing Federal entity with similar mission, purpose, goals, or activities; and

(2) a listing of all such instances of duplication or overlapping created by the covered legislation.

SEC. 4006. BREAKDOWN OF COST ESTIMATES BY BUDGET FUNCTION.

Any cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office shall specify the percentage of the estimated cost that is within each budget function.

SEC. 4007. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TREATMENT OF REDUCTION OF APPROPRIATIONS LEVELS TO ACHIEVE SAVINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) H. Con. Res. 448 (96th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1981, gave authorizing committees reconciliation instructions which amounted to approximately two-thirds of the savings required under reconciliation.

(2) The language in H. Con. Res. 448 resulted in a debate about how reconciling discretionary spending programs could be in order given that authorizations of appropriations for programs did not actually change spending and the programs authorized would be funded through later annual appropriation. The staff of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the counsel to the Majority Leader advised that upon consultation with the Parliamentarian, the original instructions on discretionary spending would be out of order because of the phrase, ''to modify programs''. This was seen as too broad and programs could be modified without resulting in changes to their future appropriations.

(3) To rectify this violation, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate reported S. Con. Res. 9 (97th Congress), revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983, to include reconciliation, which revised the language in the reconciliation instructions to change entitlement law and ''to report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce appropriations levels so as to achieve savings''.

(4) This was understood to mean changes in authorization language of discretionary programs would be permissible under reconciliation procedures provided such changes in law would have the result in affecting a change in later outlays derived from future appropriations. Further it was understood that a change in authorization language that caused a change in later outlays was considered to be a change in outlays for the purpose of reconciliation.

(5) On April 2, 1981, the Senate voted 88 to 10 to approve S. Con. Res. 9 with the modified reconciliation language.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that committees reporting changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce appropriations levels so as to achieve savings shall be considered to be changes in outlays for the purpose of enforcing the prohibition on extraneous matters in reconciliation bills.

SEC. 4008. PROHIBITION ON PREEMPTIVE WAIVERS.

In the Senate, it shall not be in order to move to waive or suspend a point of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) or any concurrent resolution on the budget with respect to a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report unless the point of order has been specifically raised by a Senator.

SEC. 4009. ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION REDUCING APPROPRIATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations in effect under section 302(a) of the

Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) and the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the reduction in the amount of discretionary appropriations for a fiscal year caused by the measure.

SEC. 4010. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT LEGISLATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE BASELINE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution to reflect legislation enacted before the date on which this resolution is agreed to by Congress that is not incorporated in the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's September 2020 update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2020 to 2030.

SEC. 4011. AUTHORITY.

Congress adopts this title under the authority under section 301(b)(4) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(4)).

SEC. 4012. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SA 2. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING THE ENFORCEMENT OF PROVISIONS OF FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS THAT RELATE TO AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening the enforcement of provisions of free trade agreements that relate to agricultural commodities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 3. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS OF LIVESTOCK AND CROPS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that any climate change proposal by the Administration that relates to livestock and crops only considers emissions that are outside of the natural carbon cycle as greenhouse gas emissions by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 4. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF AND CREDIT FOR CONSERVATION PRACTICES IMPLEMENTED BY AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS THROUGH FEDERAL CLIMATE CHANGE ACTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that any actions taken by the Federal Government to address climate change consider conservation practices implemented by agricultural producers previously or currently, and credit the agricultural producers for those conservation practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 5. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING THE REGULATORY BURDEN ON AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the regulatory burden on agricultural operations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 6. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BORDER SECURITY AND THE REMOVAL OF DANGEROUS CRIMINAL ALIENS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to border security and dangerous criminal alien removal programs, which may include border wall systems, border patrol agents and officers, vehicles, air assets, technology, radars, towers, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, and immigration judges, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 7. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING THE BROADBAND NEEDS OF RURAL SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS RELATED TO THE COVID–19 PANDEMIC.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting the broadband needs of rural schools and school districts related to the COVID–19 pandemic by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 8. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING THE BROADBAND NEEDS OF RURAL HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CENTERS RELATED TO THE COVID–19 PANDEMIC.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting the broadband needs of rural hospitals and health centers related to the COVID–19 pandemic by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 9. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4_____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING DIRECT SPENDING WHEN THE NATIONAL DEBT EXCEEDS THE SIZE OF THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would result in a net increase in direct spending (as that term is defined in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c))) during any period during which the public debt is more than the gross domestic product of the United States.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 10. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4_____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST SUPPORTING THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION'S CLAIM THAT COVID–19 DID NOT ORIGINATE IN CHINA.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that supports the World Health Organization's claim that COVID–19 did not originate in China.

(2) POINT OF ORDER SUSTAINED.—If a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision described in paragraph (1), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a)(1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a)(1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chose and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 11. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4_____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVIDING FUNDING TO COMMUNIST CHINESE MILITARY COMPANIES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that provides funding to Communist Chinese military companies, particularly those named by the Department of Defense under section 1237(b) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(2) POINT OF ORDER SUSTAINED.—If a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision described in paragraph (1), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a)(1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a)(1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chose and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 12. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COMBATING CHINESE MISINFORMATION SURROUNDING THE COVID–19 PANDEMIC.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to combating Chinese misinformation surrounding the COVID–19 pandemic, which may include the manipulation of factual information and spread of disinformation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 13. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4_____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PROVIDE FEDERAL FUNDS TO TEACHER LABOR ORGANIZATIONS THAT REFUSE TO ALLOW CHILDREN BACK IN SCHOOL SAFELY DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that provides Federal funds to teacher labor organizations that refuse to allow children back in school safely during the COVID-19 pandemic.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to have force or effect on December 31, 2022.

SA 14. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4_____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD RESULT IN TAXPAYER SUBSIDIES FUNDING POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would result in taxpayer subsidies funding political campaigns.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to have force or effect on December 31, 2022.

SA 15. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELECTION INTEGRITY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring election integrity by requiring a valid government-issued photographic identification for voting in Federal elections, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 16. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4_____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD MAKE ANY CHANGES TO THE MEDICARE PROGRAM THAT WOULD REDIRECT FUNDS AWAY FROM RURAL HOSPITALS AND OTHER RURAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would make any changes to the Medicare program that would redirect funds away from rural hospitals and other rural health care providers.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to have force or effect on December 31, 2022.

SA 17. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING MEDICARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting Medicare and addressing current solvency issues, which may include prioritizing legislation that moves current financing models towards value-based care models, alternative payment models, or bundled care payment models, and improving current fee-for-service models by modernizing cost utilization management tools, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 18. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening Medicaid, which may include prioritizing legislation and innovative State plan options that shift fee-for-service financing models towards value-based care models, alternative payment models, or bundled care payment models, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

(1) strengthen Medicaid by prioritizing legislation and innovative state plan options that shift fee-for-service financing models towards value-based care models, alternative payment models, or bundled care payment models

---

SA 19. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DETERRING ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION FROM EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, AND HONDURAS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to deterring attempted illegal migration from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 20. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING ALIENS UNLAWFULLY PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES FROM QUALIFYING FOR FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED HEALTH CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving savings by prohibiting aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States and aliens granted lawful status who, before being granted such status, were unlawfully present in the United States, from qualifying for federally subsidized health care by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 21. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4_____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD RESULT IN JOB LOSS IN THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that results in job loss in the oil and gas industry.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) SUNSET.—The effectiveness of this section shall terminate on December 31, 2022.

SA 22. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4_____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD FAIL TO INCORPORATE THE PROTECTIONS OF THE HYDE AMENDMENT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would fail to incorporate the protections of the Hyde amendment for any Federal spending, tax credits for health coverage, or the establishment of a public option.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) SUNSET.—This section shall cease to have force or effect on December 31, 2022.

SA 23. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION AND PROHIBIT TAX CREDITS FOR COVERAGE OF ABORTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports to prohibit taxpayer funding for abortion and prohibit tax credits for coverage of abortion by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 24. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, INCLUDING HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to acknowledging that public and private institutions of higher education, including historically Black colleges and universities, play an integral role in providing access to education for our students, which may include providing eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to public and private institutions of higher education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 25. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WITHHOLDING FEDERAL ELECTION GRANTS FROM STATES THAT CONDUCT UNCONSTITUTIONAL PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS THAT ARE INCONSISTENT WITH STATE ELECTION LAWS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to withholding Federal election grants from States that conduct unconstitutional Presidential elections that are inconsistent with State election laws by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 26. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REMOVING BLANKET LIABILITY PROTECTION FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS THAT ENGAGE IN POLITICAL CENSORSHIP.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to removing blanket liability protection for online platforms that engage in political censorship by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 27. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT THE SENATE CONTINUES TO SERVE AS THE WORLD'S GREATEST DELIBERATIVE BODY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preserving existing rules, practices, and traditions as they pertain to the right of Senators to engage in extended debate on legislation before the Senate by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 28. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT FEDERAL WORKERS ARE TREATED THE SAME AS EVERY OTHER WORKER IN THE UNITED STATES AND CAN BE REMOVED BASED ON POOR PERFORMANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to civil service reform, including allowing Federal agency heads to reclassify certain confidential, policy-making, policy-determining, or policy-advocating positions from the career competitive service to a new class in the excepted service, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 29. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE U.S. DOLLAR'S POSITION AS THE LEADING CURRENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting the U.S. dollar's status as the world's reserve currency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 30. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STOP FEDERAL FUNDING TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES THAT LIMIT FREE SPEECH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the protection of the First Amendment by stopping Federal funding to colleges and universities that violate the First Amendment to the Constitution by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 31. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to support for law enforcement agencies, which may include increasing support for, and not defunding, law enforcement agencies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 32. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEPORTATION OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS WITH A GUN CRIME CONVICTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the deportation of illegal immigrants who have been convicted of a crime involving a firearm, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 33. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING IMMIGRATION POLICIES DESIGNED TO SUPPORT AND BENEFIT AMERICAN CITIZENS, NOT DISPLACE AMERICAN WORKERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting immigration policies designed to support and benefit American citizens, not displace American workers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 34. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS OF U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT IN COMBATING DRUG AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND SMUGGLING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting law enforcement officers of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement in combating drug and

human trafficking and smuggling by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 35. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF PHYSICAL BARRIERS AS EFFECTIVE SECURITY MEASURES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the construction of physical barriers, such as walls or fencing, where security measures are necessary, given the effectiveness of physical barriers as evidenced by their current use around the United States Capitol complex and the decrease in illegal southern border crossings in recent years, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 36. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WITHDRAWING FROM INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT ARE NOT ALIGNED WITH UNITED STATES INTERESTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to withdrawing from international organizations that refuse reforms after failing to meet their core mission and undermining the national security and vital interests of the United States and its allies and partners by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 37. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE SOUTHERN BORDER WALL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the physical barrier along the international border between the United States and Mexico that is designed to protect Americans from drug trafficking, human trafficking, and smuggling, which may include the preservation and maintenance of that wall, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 38. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENFORCING NON-NUCLEAR-RELATED PRESSURE AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enforcing non-nuclear-related pressure against the Islamic Republic of Iran for its activities related to terrorism, Lebanese Hizballah, the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria, narcotrafficking, missile proliferation, and serious human rights abuses and corruption, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 39. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COUNTERING THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN'S DESTABILIZING ACTIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to countering the Islamic Republic of Iran's destabilizing actions in the Middle East by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 40. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT THE UNITED STATES TAKES MEASURES TO ENSURING THAT THE UNITED STATES MAINTAINS ITS EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the United States maintains its embassy in Jerusalem by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 41. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT THE UNITED STATES SUSTAINS AND EXPANDS THE ABRAHAM ACCORDS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the United States takes measures to sustain existing normalization agreements between Israel and other nations and expand the accords to include new normalization agreements between Israel and other nations by the amounts provided in such legislation for

those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 42. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT THE UNITED STATES CONTINUES TO PURSUE THE COMPLETE, VERIFIABLE, AND IRREVERSIBLE DENUCLEARIZATION OF NORTH KOREA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the United States continues to pursue the complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization of North Korea by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 43. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE UNITED STATES LEADS NATIONS IN HOLDING THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND ITS RULING CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY ACCOUNTABLE FOR ENGAGING IN GENOCIDE AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY WITH RESPECT TO UYGHURS IN XINJIANG.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the United States leads nations in holding the People's Republic of China and its ruling Chinese Communist Party accountable for engaging in genocide and crimes against humanity with respect to Uyghurs in Xinjiang by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 44. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AS A DEVELOPING COUNTRY AT THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the United States and other members of the World Trade Organization challenge and end the use by the People's Republic of China of World Trade Organization rules available to developing countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 45. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE INVESTMENTS IN RURAL BROADBAND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting the investments of the Department of Agriculture in broadband for rural communities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 46. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING THE SCIENTIFICALLY BASED REOPENING OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IMMEDIATELY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting the scientifically based reopening of public schools immediately by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

SA 47. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE CHRISTMAS BOMBING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the December 25, 2020, Nashville, Tennessee Christmas bombing, which may include supporting the first responders, the businesses, and the families impacted by the event by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2025 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2021 through 2030.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I have 6 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 2, 2021, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the Session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 2, 2021, immediately following a floor vote, to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 2, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 2, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 2, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 2, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members from my staff and from Senator GRAHAM's staff be given all-access floor passes for consideration of the budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 5: the majority staff: Michael Jones, Joshua Smith, Michael Lawliss, Ethan Rosenkranz, and Ari Rabin-Havt; Republican staff: Nick Myers, Matthew Giroux, Matthew Joe Keeley, Doug Dziak, and Matthew Rimkunas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9 a.m., Wednesday, February 3; further, 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, and morning business be closed; further, that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 5, with 31 hours remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 9:21 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, February 3, at 9 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 2, 2021:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

ALEJANDRO NICHOLAS MAYORKAS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PETER PAUL MONTGOMERY BUTTIGIEG, OF INDIANA, TO BE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MS. SOPHIE PASIBE

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life and legacy of Sophie Pasibe and to recognize the impact she had on the Filipino-American community in Vallejo and Benicia.

Born September 29, 1931 in the Municipality of Agoo in La Union, Philippines, Ms. Sophie Pasibe's life was characterized by her years as a teacher, philanthropist, and public servant. Before her emigration from the Philippines to the United States in 1969, Ms. Pasibe served her community as a fourth grade teacher. Soon after arriving in the United States, she continued her teaching career for the Stockton Unified School District. In 1975, Ms. Pasibe settled in Benicia, California, where she resided for the remainder of her life.

Ms. Pasibe had a huge impact on advancing the interests of the Filipino-American community. She was a leader, serving as vice president of the Agooenians of California, president of Fil-Ams of Benicia, and chair of the Lakbay Aral Program. Additionally, she helped to found both the Young Generations of Agoo and the Solano County Filipino-American Chamber of Commerce. Through her leadership, she helped to advance the prosperity and cultural expression of her community through projects like the Lakbay Aral Travel Study Program, a collaboration with the Fili Am Chamber and Philippine government to send Filipino-American teenagers to the Philippines, many for the first time, to connect with their roots through an immersive program.

Ms. Pasibe's dedication to her community further fueled her philanthropy, as she served as a certified court interpreter, traveling throughout much of California. Furthermore, she utilized her artistry and creativity to sell crafts at street fairs, with all proceeds going back to her home in the Philippines. Ms. Pasibe will be remembered by her selfless dedication to others.

Madam Speaker, Ms. Sophie Pasibe was a committed community advocate and exceptional leader who dedicated her life to serving the Filipino community.

RECOGNIZING THE BICENTENNIAL OF FRANKLIN ACADEMY

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the Bicentennial of Franklin Academy in Columbus, Mississippi—the state's first Public School. In its two hundred years, Franklin Academy has had a profound impact on education in our state.

In December of 1821, construction was completed on the first schoolhouse. A 20x30 foot wood framed structure was erected to house the first classes, and in 1835 a second structure was built to separate the boys and girls. In 1866, a fourteen-room, three-story building became the new home of Franklin Academy. An adjoining chapel allowed for religious services and education.

In November of 1909 President Taft visited Franklin Academy as a stop on a national tour. Nine years later, the school adapted to elementary students when Stephen D. Lee High School was completed. It wasn't until 1939 that the current two-story building was constructed under the Public Works Administration.

Franklin Academy was integrated in September of 1965. It has since been named a Mississippi landmark and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

I commend all current and former faculty, staff, and administration at Franklin Academy for preserving educational excellence and continuously striving for the best quality education for our young people.

CONGRATULATING MAYOR HARRY J. PARRISH II ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JENNIFER WEXTON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate City of Manassas Mayor Harry J. Parrish, II on his retirement and thank him for his many years of dedicated service.

A life-long resident of Manassas, Mayor Parrish was appointed to the Manassas City Council in 1993 and was elected to the Council in 1996, 2000 and again in 2004. He had the honor of being elected by the Council as Vice Mayor in 1999. He continued in the Vice Mayor position until May of 2008 when he was elected Mayor. Mayor Parrish now completes his third term as Mayor of the City of Manassas.

Mayor Parrish has played an active role in his community as a member of many service organizations, including the Manassas Volunteer Fire Company, the Kiwanis Club of Bull Run, and the Prince William Hospital Foundation. He is also a member of the city's thriving business community, leading his family business as President of Manassas Ice & Fuel Company.

Mayor Parrish earned a bachelor's degree in Aerospace Engineering and Physics at the University of Virginia. He went on to serve our nation in the United States Air Force from 1973 to 1978. He then earned a master's degree in Business Management from Central Michigan University before returning home to Manassas.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives and the citizens of Virginia's 10th Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mayor Parrish on his retirement and thank him for his many years of dedicated and honorable service.

RECOGNIZING MS. TANYA DURHAM AS THE WALTON COUNTY, FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT PROFESSIONAL OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Ms. Tanya Durham as the Walton County Educational Support Professional of the Year. Since August of 2019, Ms. Durham has served the Walton County School District with exceptional passion and an unwavering commitment to serving others.

In Northwest Florida, we are fortunate to have some of the best teachers in the Nation. It is recognized that the position of custodian can be difficult—but also rewarding. Ms. Durham has performed her many duties without hesitation, while always providing a friendly smile for everyone she encounters.

Ms. Durham is revered by her Principal and colleagues for her strong work ethic and compassion. She selflessly considers the needs of both students and staff because of the immense pride she has for her school.

Her support and outreach extend far beyond the hearts and minds of her own students through her willingness to help wherever assistance is needed. Ms. Durham has displayed dedicated teamwork by coordinating events, like "Family Night" for The Boys and Girls Club and the May Day Festival. I commend her for her steadfast willingness to serve as an example for those who matter most—the students and youth of our Nation.

For all of her admirable contributions to our community, I am truly proud to have Ms. Durham as a constituent in Florida's First Congressional District.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Ms. Tanya Durham for her many accomplishments, and her commitment to excellence, professionalism, innovation, and collaboration in the Walton County School District. I thank her for her service, and wish her all the best for her continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MAJOR JACOB D. MCELWEE

HON. SHARICE DAVIDS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Major Jacob D. McElwee for his service in the Kansas Army

National Guard and his recent role in sending out troops to Topeka and Washington, D.C. this month to provide additional security support for the inauguration.

A resident of the Third District in Shawnee, Major McElwee became a commissioned Judge Advocate General Corps Officer in the Kansas Army National Guard in September 2010. During his service as a Judge Advocate General Corps Officer, Major McElwee deployed to Kosovo in 2014 through 2015 and then again to Kuwait and Iraq in 2018 through 2019.

Major McElwee is currently the legal advisor to the Adjutant General Major General David Weishaar. As a fulltime Kansas Army National Guard Judge Advocate General, Major McElwee handles a non-stop flow of requests and questions, while ensuring the highest quality work product possible. He dropped everything to travel to Salina with another officer and two paralegals to help with the rolling out of troops to protect our state and national capitols.

One of the most rewarding parts of representing the Third District is hearing about the exemplary service and accomplishments of my constituents. Major McElwee is certainly no exception and I commend him for his dedication to our state and country.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF DERWOOD RAY BOYLES

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Derwood Ray Boyles who passed away on October 13, 2020. Colonel Boyles was a dedicated serviceman and dedicated his life to faith, family, and country. I join countless Mississippians in mourning his loss.

Born March 20, 1928 to Silas and Lurline Windham Boyles in Lorena, Mississippi, Derwood Ray Boyles and his family soon moved to Jackson, Mississippi where he spent the rest of his life. Derwood was a founding member of the Jackson Boy's Club. In 1946, he graduated from Central High School as an Eagle Scout and a member of the Order of the Arrow. While at Central High, Derwood was also a ROTC cadet, which enabled him to join the U.S. Navy near the end of WWII. He was selected to be a squadron leader at boot camp and spent his tour of duty in the Mediterranean area on the *Providence*, the flag ship of the fleet. It was on this tour Derwood had the opportunity to meet Pope Pius XII.

Derwood returned stateside and graduated from Mississippi State University in 1951. He studied Accounting and soon joined his uncle at Dreyfus Insurance Agency—one of the oldest agencies in the state. He was committed to his partners, continuing to visit the office into his 90s, and was inducted into the Mississippi State University Insurance Hall of Fame in 2007.

While serving as the president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, Derwood met Miss Jackson, Regina Harlan. On December 17, 1957, the two were married in Rockefeller Center in a ceremony broadcasted on NBC. The two were married for over 62 years before his passing.

Colonel Boyles dedicated 28 years of service to the Mississippi Army National Guard. He was an active member of many veteran and military organizations. In 2006 he was awarded the Spirit of Volunteerism Award by the Defense Department. He also received the Medal for Exceptional Public Service, the highest level public service award given by the Department of Defense.

Derwood is survived by his wife, Regina Harlan Boyles. Other survivors are son, MG Janson Durr Boyles; daughter, Jennifer Boyles McCall; grandchildren Durwood Graham (Gray) Boyles and Connor Boyles of Dallas, TX; Carter McCall, Sarah Douglas McCall and Matt McCall (Laura) of Knoxville, TN.

Colonel Boyles was an outstanding Mississippian who expemplified a commitment to public service. He dedicated his life to making life better for his community. I am grateful for men like Derwood who so humbly served our great state, and my deepest condolences are with those who loved him.

HONORING AHMET AND NESUHI ERTEGUN FOR THEIR FIGHT AGAINST RACIAL INJUSTICE THROUGH THE POWER OF MUSIC

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to an article that appeared on January 20, 2021 in the Washington Post entitled, "These Turkish brothers found their calling in D.C., championing the Black music scene" by David Taylor. The article highlights the contributions made by Ahmet and Nesuhi Ertegun, two Turkish brothers who fought against racial injustice. The Ertegun brothers were the sons of Turkish Ambassador, Mehmet Munir Ertegun, and navigated the heavily segregated and complex Washington, D.C. These two young Turkish men dismissed racist comments and individuals, and instead familiarized themselves with the black neighborhoods of Washington.

The two quickly realized how racially divided the city was, and in order to satisfy their love for jazz, the brothers became familiar with jazz clubs on U street, record shops on Seventh Street, and were regulars at the famous "Waxie Maxie," where they would meet fellow jazz enthusiasts. Ignoring the racial barriers which divided the city and country, they unapologetically hosted jam sessions at the Turkish Embassy. The Turkish Ambassador received complaints from irritated neighbors, but simply ignored those who called the music "disturbing". Enamored by jazz music the Ertegun brothers organized the first integrated jazz concert at the Jewish Community Center in the 1940s.

Eventually, the Ertegun brothers founded Atlantic Records in 1947 and the record company became the most successful independent label in the country. Atlantic Records went on to work with Ray Charles, Ruth Brown, La Vern Baker, the Drifters, the Coasters, Aretha Franklin, and Led Zeppelin. The list of music icons also included Stevie Wonder and Mick Jagger. In 1995, the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame museum announced that its main exhibition hall would be named after Ahmet Ertegun.

Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Black History Month, I hope that my colleagues will join me in honoring Ahmet and Nesuhi Ertegun. Their story is a wonderful reminder that despite numerous differences there is always a common unifying force between people. Especially during these times when we find ourselves deeply divided, we must remember that we are able to come together despite our differences, and work for a better future as the Ertegun brothers did through the power of music.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 2021]

THESE TURKISH BROTHERS FOUND THEIR CALLING IN D.C., CHAMPIONING THE BLACK MUSIC SCENE

(By David A. Taylor)

Turkish filmmaker Umran Safter has a special place in her heart for Washington. She had the international premiere of her first documentary feature, "Eye of Istanbul," at the 2016 Washington, DC Independent Film Festival, where it won the award for best of the festival.

Her new film brought her back to D.C. for the story of Ahmet and Nesuhi Ertegun, the brothers behind Atlantic Records, and their early years as sons of Turkish ambassador Mehmet Munir Ertegun. The Erteguns, she says, "resisted all sorts of political pressure in the 1930s and 1940s" as they regularly hosted "Black jazz artists on special jazz evenings at the Turkish Embassy in Washington."

As teenagers, Ahmet and Nesuhi were smitten by jazz when they heard Duke Ellington play in London and were excited about moving to his hometown. But when they arrived, they were disappointed to find how racially segregated the city was. "When I first came to Washington, the stores downtown didn't carry any jazz records or blues records," Ahmet said in a 2002 interview. "I had to go to the Black section of Washington for the shops that sold records of the music we wanted to buy."

He visited jazz clubs on U Street and record shops on Seventh Street, and became a regular at Waxie Maxie, the music shop owned by Max Silverman, who built the store into a leading music retail chain. There, Ertegun found other jazz fans, such as Washington Post photographer and reporter Bill Gottlieb, later a writer for the influential Down Beat music magazine, and Billy Taylor, who would go on to become a bandleader and for decades directed jazz at the Kennedy Center.

Safter, 51, had read about the jazz concerts the Erteguns organized at the embassy. "It's a great story. I said to myself, 'Let's do this story as a documentary.'" For the film (working title: "Leave the Door Open"), she tracked down everyone she could find who knew them. In New York, she spoke with Atlantic Records colleague Bob Porter as well as Renee Pappas, ex-wife of Atlantic producer Jerry Wexler. Pappas had been friends with both brothers and had vivid stories. (Nesuhi Ertegun died in 1989; Ahmet, in 2006.)

Safter and her small crew arrived in Washington in February 2020 for filming. Everett House in Sheridan Circle—which served as the embassy during the Erteguns' era in D.C., and is now the residence of the Turkish ambassador—opened its doors to them. Safter also had sit-down interviews with jazz historians and radio DJs Willard Jenkins and Larry Appelbaum. And she interviewed people who had interviewed Ahmet (including me).

She pieced together a story of race in Washington, exploring how the Erteguns cracked barriers in segregation and the blowback they faced. When they invited

Black musicians to Sheridan Circle, the ambassador got complaints from White neighbors. ''They were saying, 'Oh, the music coming from the embassy is so disturbing!' '' Pappas told Safter. '' 'Who are these people?' ''

The ambassador, opting for diplomacy, replied: ''My sons are studying anthropology. That's why they have all these people coming.'' Still, he was stunned when the embassy's White staff balked at eating meals at the same table as Black staff members. As his daughter Selma explained to Safter, segregation ''was not something we were used to.''

The stories and images create a complex portrait of 1940s Washington. Historian Maurice Jackson described to Safter an Ertegun-organized concert at the Jewish community center: ''Two Muslim brothers bringing Black music to the center belonging to our Jewish brothers and sisters. This is historic.''

While in D.C. last year, Safter had planned to film a concert in the Ertegun Jazz Series at the Turkish Embassy, but it was canceled because of political events in Turkey. However, the crew filmed a jazz concert at the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Southwest Washington. They returned home just ahead of covid–19 travel restrictions. Passengers on their flight to Istanbul were already wearing masks.

Safter counts herself lucky that her crew managed to complete most of the filming before the pandemic lockdown. But work on the documentary dragged. ''It's not possible to meet with the rest of my crew,'' she explained in April. ''And the main challenge is I can't sit next to my editor.'' She was working with Omer Leventoglu, who edited her 2019 film ''On the Wings of Hope,'' about Iraqi Kurdish refugees. ''He's a great editor,'' she said, but they could talk only by Skype or WhatsApp.

Eventually during the summer they cobbled together a new editing process and went into postproduction in September. Now with a rough cut, Safter hopes to have a finished film very soon.

But other hurdles loom, including financing and distribution. Movie theaters remain closed. ''This is a very difficult time for filmmakers,'' Safter says. In darker moments, she thinks back to her D.C. premiere five years ago.

''Because it was my first feature-length documentary film,'' she recalls, ''it encouraged me. That's the reason I produced the second film.'' She has submitted a rough cut of her new film to several U.S. competitions, including the DC Independent Film Festival and FilmFest DC. She hopes she will be able to return to the city that gave her that first boost.

RECOGNIZING DR. BARBARA CAREY-SHULER

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Barbara Carey-Shuler, a courageous community leader, dedicated public servant, sagacious mentor, inspiring educator, and loving mother, in honor of Women's History Month.

Dr. Carey-Shuler has been a powerful force for positive change in South Florida for decades. She is a trailblazer who has paved the way for many successful professionals, entrepreneurs, and businesses. Her efforts have improved the quality of life for thousands of South Floridians.

Dr. Carey-Shuler's life is founded on a spirit of generosity. Her unselfish character is only overshadowed by her loving spirit and acceptance of others. She considers her ability to empower and inspire others as her greatest accomplishment. Regarding her passion for helping young people she says, ''I want to exude my passion so that they will have the same passion to give back and help other young people.''

Dr. Carey-Shuler was first appointed to the Miami Dade County Board of Commissioners in 1979. She made a major impact through her progressive policies and legislative decisions. She initiated the groundbreaking legislation to create Affirmative Action and set-aside programs in Miami Dade County which are credited with creating more jobs and opportunities for minorities and women than any other legislation in the county's history. She also created the 15 miles per hour school zone in Dade County and was later adopted by the rest of the State of Florida. She made history in 2002 when she was selected as the first African American woman to serve as chairperson of the Miami Dade County Commission.

Dr. Carey-Shuler has never shied away from an opportunity to help others or promote equality without regard to the popularity of her decisions. In 1990, she attended an event where the late South African President Nelson Mandela delivered a speech upon his release after being unjustly imprisoned for 27 years. The event was locally controversial but Dr. Carey-Shuler was among a small group of elected officials who attended because she understood President Mandela's importance to the international campaign for human rights. Her courage and vision earned the respect and admiration of her constituents and was a large part of the reason she was re-elected several times.

Above all, Dr. Carey-Shuler values education as the key to a happy and healthy life. She was well-regarded as an administrator with Miami Dade County Public Schools. She was also credited with inspiring and advancing the careers of dozens of educators as an assistant superintendent. She has an impressive educational resume of her own: Bachelor of Arts in Communications from Florida A&M University, Master of Science in Communications from Ohio State University, Specialist Degree in Guidance from the University of Miami, and a Doctorate in Education from the University of Florida.

Since retiring from elected office in 2005, Dr. Carey-Shuler has managed very successful family-owned funeral homes in Palm Beach County, Florida. However, she has continued her passion to help others and mentor young people. Her board memberships include Spady Cultural Heritage Museum, West Palm Beach Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., Delta Heritage Foundation, Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity Educational Foundation, Pathway to Prosperity, among several others.

Madam Speaker, in observance of Women's History Month, I urge my colleagues and all Americans to please join me in recognizing a great woman, a great public servant, a great businessperson, a great mother, and a great American, Dr. Barbara Carey-Shuler for her indelible contribution to our community and our nation.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF ROBERT MOORE

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Robert ''R.G.'' Moore who passed away January 6, 2021.

R.G. Moore was born on February 5, 1943 to Albert R and Mary M. Moore in Louise, Mississippi. R.G. dedicated his life to service and state as a SSGT U.S. Marine Corps Veteran. He also founded the Marine Corps League and became a founding member of the Desoto County Veteran's Park in Southaven, Mississippi.

R.G. served 34 years and retired as Captain from the Memphis Police Department. He was also involved with the American Legion Post No. 134 of Horn Lake and Rolling Thunder MS Chapter No. 2. I am grateful for Mr. Moore's lifetime of service to the United States and the state of Mississippi.

Left to cherish his memory is his wife of 54 years, Diane. He is remembered by his two sons; Matthew and Mark; and five grandchildren, Jackson, Tucker, Rylie, Lucy and Lily.

Mr. R.G. Moore was a light unto all who had the opportunity to know and love him, and he will be deeply missed. My deepest condolences are with his family and friends.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. DAVID J. FERGUSON, JR.

HON. BARRY LOUDERMILK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend, Sergeant David J. Ferguson, Jr. in honor of his retirement after nine years of service in the United States Air Force.

Sergeant Ferguson joined the United States Air Force in 2012, after his high school graduation, and through his years of service, has risen to the rank of Staff Sergeant. David was stationed at Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas where he served in the 7th Security Forces Squadron. In this role, he provided a vital service in fulfilling the Air Force's mission and demonstrated great resolve in protecting the 13,000 military and civilian personnel living and working on the base. Throughout his service, he has exemplified the core values of the Air Force: integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all you do.

Over the course of his service, his lovely wife and high school sweetheart, Colleen, has been a dedicated companion. David and Colleen have three daughters; in whom I am certain they will instill the same values and patriotism they have exemplified through service in the U.S. Armed Forces. They return home to Adairsville, Georgia in February 2021 to begin a new chapter in their lives as a family; and

I am proud to have them back in Georgia's 11th Congressional District.

On behalf of the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, and the United States House of Representatives, I commend Sergeant Ferguson for his nine years of outstanding and dedicated service.

HONORING LEE DUDLEY WALKER

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I offer these remarks in honor of Lee Dudley Walker of Martinsville, Virginia, who passed away on January 12, 2021 at the age of 90. Dudley Walker was a business and community leader who made a tremendous contribution to the Martinsville-Henry County area.

Mr. Walker was born on July 20, 1930 in Martinsville to Virginia Dudley and Samuel Stanhope Walker. He graduated as the valedictorian of Martinsville High School in 1947 and earned the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. The next year, he attained a post-graduate certificate from Riverside Military Academy in Gainesville, Georgia. In 1952, he graduated from North Carolina State University, where he had served in the Reserve Officer's Training Corps and became Cadet Regimental Adjutant. Mr. Walker served for two years in the United States Army and was assigned to the Armed Services Textile and Apparel Procurement Agency in New York City.

Upon completion of his military service, Mr. Walker returned home to join the family business, the Walker Knitting Company founded by his father Samuel in 1928. Samuel Walker also served as president of the Bassett-Walker Knitting Company. Dudley Walker became president of the Walker Knitting Company, and upon his father's death in 1960 he led both companies. They merged in 1964 under the Bassett-Walker Knitting Company name.

Under Mr. Walker's leadership, Bassett-Walker grew. It built a sewing plant in Stuart in 1965 and in Hillsville and Brookneal in the 1970s. It subsequently acquired yarn manufacturer Johnston Mills Co., opened divisions in Ferrum and Stoneville, North Carolina, and opened a distribution center in Henry County. At its zenith, Bassett-Walker owned 13 plants and employed more than 7,000 workers, helping Martinsville earn its reputation as ''The Sweatshirt Capital of the World.'' The company became part of VF Corp in 1984. Mr. Walker operated as Chairman of Knitwear for VF until 1986 and remained on the company's board until 2000. He acted not only as an executive but as a community leader whose businesses were an important support to the people of the area.

Beyond his role in this industry, at the time so fundamental to the Martinsville-Henry County area, Mr. Walker was a dedicated philanthropist. Wanting to keep young people in the region, he became a driving force behind the founding of Carlisle School, playing active roles from helping to choose the school's site to recruiting staff. He donated to Patrick Henry Community College, the YMCA, and the Boys and Girls Club of the Blue Ridge, among other organizations. He was a lifelong member of Broad Street Christian Church, which his mother had helped found.

Among the recognitions Mr. Walker received for his accomplishments were the Heck Ford Award from the Martinsville-Henry County Chamber of Commerce and the Pillar Award from the Martinsville-Henry County Economic Development Council for ''Lifetime Contributions to the Martinsville-Henry County Business Community.''

Mr. Walker's survivors include his wife of 65 years, Elizabeth Mitchell Walker; son Samuel Stanhope Walker II and wife Janice Meredith Walker; daughters Virginia Walker Hamlet and her husband Burgess Harrison Hamlet III and Anne Walker Poole and her husband Walker Lynch Poole; grandchildren Andrew Linwood Shelton, Blake Thomas Walker, Harrison Walker Hamlet, Lee Dudley Hamlet, Mitchell Hudson Hamlet, Walker Lynch Poole., Jr., Virginia Buchanan Poole, and Elizabeth Weaver Poole; and sister Spotswood Walker Box. I offer them my condolences on this loss of this great business leader and philanthropist of the Martinsville-Henry County area.

RECOGNIZING MS. JESSICA LANDRY AS THE OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLORIDA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Ms. Jessica Landry as the Okaloosa County Teacher of the Year. For nine years, Ms. Landry has served James E. Plew Elementary School with talent, passion, and an unwavering commitment to her students.

In Northwest Florida, we are fortunate to have some of the best teachers in the Nation. It is recognized that the teaching profession is one of the most difficult professions in existence—yet it can also be one of the most rewarding. Ms. Landry has performed her teaching duties exceptionally, while also being an active and supportive member of her community.

Ms. Landry attended Northwest Florida State College, where she earned a Bachelor's of Science in Elementary Education. She later attended the University of West Florida and earned a Masters of Education in Educational Leadership.

Her support and outreach extend far beyond the walls of her classroom through her involvement in other programs, such as the School Advisory Council and Plew's Parent Leadership Association, and serving as the Senior Building Representative for Okaloosa County Schools. Ms. Landry has spent her time outside of school hours as the Academic Team coach, Young Astronaut Club coordinator, and as a mentor to new mathematics and science teachers. I commend her for her steadfast willingness to serve those who matter most—the students and youth of our Nation.

For all of her admirable contributions to our community, I am truly proud to have Ms. Landry as a constituent in Florida's First Congressional District.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Ms. Jessica Landry for her many accomplishments, and her commitment to excellence, professionalism, innovation, and collaboration in the Okaloosa County School District. I thank her for her service, and wish her all the best for her continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF RICHARD RICE

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Mr. Richard Rice who passed away on Saturday, January 16 at North Mississippi Medical Center. His beloved wife, Jill, passed away in November of 2020.

Richard was born in September of 1940 in Ware, Massachusetts to Thomas and Jean Lech Rice. After attending public high schools, Richard enlisted in the United States Navy. During Basic Training in Millington, Tennessee, he met his wife Jill. The two were married in September of 1960. Throughout his military career, Chief Petty Officer Rice served as a meteorologist, forecasting sea swells and tracking atmospheric changes for missile launches.

In July, 1979, Richard and Jill moved to Tupelo, Mississippi where Richard soon became a household name. He was Northeast Mississippi's weatherman and delighted children each Christmas as the ''Santa Tracker.'' He was deeply invested in the community, frequently speaking to local organizations and schools about his career in meteorology. He mentored colleagues at WTVA and was a role model for local broadcasters. Off screen, Richard was a dedicated husband, father, and grandfather, as well as an accomplished gardener.

Richard Rice is survived by his daughter, Debbie; three grandchildren, John, Robert, and Scotty; and three great-grandchildren, Lauren, Aaryn, and Chloe.

Richard Rice was a local hero, community leader, and role model to many. I sincerely thank him for his service to the state of Mississippi and extend my deepest condolences to his loved ones.

HONORING AND RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF THE U.S. CAPITOL CUSTODIAL WORKERS

HON. A. DONALD McEACHIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. McEACHIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the work of the U.S. Capitol custodial staff, specifically the Black and brown members, for their excellent work every day, but especially for their work across the Capitol complex after it was desecrated on January 6, 2021 by a mob of rioters and insurrectionists trying to reverse the results of a fair and free election. It is a privilege to work alongside such dedicated stewards of our temple of democracy, and their exemplary work deserves to be acknowledged.

The labor of Black and brown Americans is integral to the history of our Capitol building. When the Capitol was first constructed, enslaved Black laborers were brought in from across the country to build the home of our nation's democracy. Enslaved laborers were involved in nearly every step of construction, from quarrying marble and sandstone to masonry to devising the architectural innovations needed to install the Statue of Freedom in 1863.

Today, our Capitol continues to rely on the labor of Black and brown Americans. Our Black and brown custodial staff make sure the entire Capitol complex is pristine and accessible to all that visit, and throughout the COVID–19 pandemic, they have worked to maintain our community's health and safety. I see the pride they take in their work each and every day and thank them for their endless dedication.

On January 6, 2021, Black and brown custodial staff were in attendance as well. While media coverage has largely focused on the experiences of House Members and Senators, custodial and administrative staff throughout the Capitol complex weathered the siege all the same. Once the Capitol was secured, these dedicated employees were the first back to work, scrubbing the stains inflicted on our temple of democracy by the same rioters who made them fear for their lives.

Our colleagues' work to clean the Capitol is particularly commendable considering the appalling racial nature of the riots. Former President Trump and his supporters spread baseless allegations and lies about the integrity of the 2020 presidential election, including about the validity of votes cast in majority Black or brown cities. When election officials and the courts refused to overturn the results, a predominately white mob, including proud white supremacists, stormed the Capitol. After seeing these white rioters treated more kindly than protestors for racial justice often are, the largely Black and brown custodial staff were left to clean up the mess. They cleaned up broken glass, blood, empty bottles, and other items left by the mob. I read that a staff member described the experience of cleaning up after the insurrection as ''degrading.'' To that end, I say we see you and we appreciate your efforts. Their work was not made in vain, nor did it go unnoticed.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing these distinguished members of the U.S. Capitol custodial staff for their hard work in the aftermath of January 6, 2021 and for the professionalism they show each and every day.

PASSING OF JOHN J. SWEENEY

HON. ANDY LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I first met John Sweeney when I was 22 and his staff offered me a job helping nursing home workers organize with SEIU in my home state of Michigan. The union was hiring a novice, front-line organizer, but I was ushered into the office of the president of the national union to meet the man himself. He was modest and unassuming that day, and he never changed, even as he doubled the size of SEIU, even as he became the consensus choice to lead the only insurgent takeover of the AFL–CIO in its history, even as he helped transform its policies to focus on organizing, support immigrant workers and much more. John Sweeney never saw himself as being above any of the workers he came to represent, and he fought for them with unquestioned integrity and an openness to innovation and change possible only with true humility. I ended up spending five years organizing with SEIU, then returning years later to help his campaign to take over the AFL–CIO, and then working 11 years under his leadership there. Throughout that time, I trusted President Sweeney completely-he gave me big assignments and the leeway to make them my own. He drew the best out of me by letting me know he had faith in me. He tolerated mistakes, but not lapsed ethics.

One story that captures John well is that when I was creating Union Summer, a program to put 1,000 young people onto the front lines of union organizing and bargaining campaigns in the summer of 1996, shortly after he became AFL–CIO president, he insisted on making the 'Summeristas' as we called them employees of the AFL–CIO, even though they were essentially doing a three-week summer camp. He knew it would be much more expensive and a lot more work, but he insisted on taking full responsibility for every one of them.

John put the interest of other people and the labor movement above his own, every time. I loved John Sweeney in an uncomplicated way that feels hard to describe and that I hope remains possible in our troubled world. He was an honest leader, a great soul, doing his best to keep faith with his God and lift up his fellow human beings. Godspeed, John Sweeney.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF SERGEANT JON MEADOR

HON. BETH VAN DUYNE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank Sergeant Jon Meador for his service with the Grapevine Police Department and to congratulate him on his retirement. His 30 years of law enforcement service is incredibly deserving of recognition, and, on behalf of the North Texans he has dedicated his career to serving and protecting, I am proud to extend my sincere appreciation for his selfless service before the House of Representatives.

I was impressed to hear of Sergeant Meador's background prior to joining law enforcement, specifically his experience in the banking industry that he utilized to investigate financial crimes in conjunction with the FBI, ICE, and the Secret Service. The courage and dedication he has displayed during his many years of service in law enforcement is admirable and the law enforcement community is better for having the benefit of his service and knowledge.

In these unprecedented times, I know it is a source of comfort for North Texans to have law enforcement officers like Sergeant Meador working tirelessly to serve and protect us. It has always been my view that public service is among the most admirable of callings, one that demands the very best among us tackle monumental challenges in the name of selfless service to others. Sergeant Meador's incredible service to the public will be remembered by many in Grapevine and I join them in congratulating him on not only heeding the call to serve, but for doing so with the devotion and passion he has exhibited for the past three decades.

It is my honor to congratulate Sergeant Meador on his successful career and retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF ROSE ROBERTS

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mrs. Rose Roberts who passed away at North Mississippi Medical Center in Pontotoc on January 8 of this year.

Mrs. Roberts was born to Charlie and Rosa Nell Smith Dickerson in March of 1930 in Tippah County. In 1948, she graduated from Ripley High School and attended Wood Junior College before earning her degree in Education from Blue Mountain College in 1956. She taught for many years in Dumas, Centre, Ripley, Hickory Flat and Walnut before becoming a Social Worker in 1963. Rose went on to earn her Master's Degree in Social Work from Tulane University. She continued to serve the state of Mississippi as Supervisor of Region II of the MS Welfare Department and upon her retirement she was EEOC for the Mississippi Department of Human Services.

Mrs. Rose Roberts was a dedicated servant to her community, Throughout her career she aided in facilitating both local and overseas adoptions, also serving as a board member for the Mississippi Department of Mental Health and the Northeast Mississippi Chapter of the American Red Cross. She worked as an associate professor in the Social Work Department at Ole Miss and worked with B.S.W. students in selecting a career path. She was often seen at the schools of her children, serving as homeroom mother, assisting the Girl Scouts, or working in the concession stand at Ripley High School football games.

Mrs. Rose Roberts is survived by her husband, James Roberts Jr.; children, Pat Harrison, Ava Jordan, and Kim Harrison; and grandchildren, Stacy, Shannon, Trey, Megan, Gage, Guy, Rob, and Sarah. Left to remember her are also five greatgrandchildren.

Mrs. Rose Roberts lived an admirable life of service and embodied dedication to faith and family. My deepest condolences are with her loved ones.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHIEF DENNY LINABURG

HON. JENNIFER WEXTON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Frederick County Fire Rescue's Chief Denny Linaburg on his retirement

and thank him for his many years of dedicated service.

Denny has served in the Frederick County Fire Department for 30 years, and began his career in the fire service as a volunteer at Greenwood Fire and Rescue in 1983.

He is a Nationally Registered Paramedic, a Fire Officer, Fire Investigator and certified Law Enforcement Officer and Instructor. He holds various certifications in each field.

Prior to his appointment as Chief, Denny was the Chief Fire Marshal, responsible for code enforcement, law enforcement and emergency management and planning. Denny graduated from both the Virginia Fire Marshal Academy and the Rappahannock Regional Criminal Justice Academy.

Outside of his service with the Frederick County Fire Department, Denny is also an active member of his community and is involved with several civic organizations. He is a current Board Member of the Virginia Association of Arson Investigators and served as the President from 2011 to 2012. Currently, he is a member of the Virginia Fire Prevention Association, the Virginia Association of Fire Chiefs and the Shenandoah Valley Joint Committee of Arson Investigators. He was appointed to the Virginia Fire Services Board by Governor Terry McAuliffe and is currently serving his second term.

Now that Denny is retiring, he will have more time to enjoy his family and some of his favorite pastimes, which include hunting, fishing and hiking, as well as working on collector and antique vehicles. I wish him well and thank him for his dedicated service.

IN MEMORY OF BARBARA ANSELMO CHIFICI

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following obituary for Barbara Anselmo Chifici.

BARBARA ANSELMO CHIFICI

Barbara ''Mrs. Barbara'' Anselmo Chifici, age 77, passed away unexpectedly on January 23, 2021 due to complications from Coronavirus at Ochsner Medical Center Kenner. A lifelong resident of New Orleans, Barbara attended grammar school at St. Rita Catholic School in New Orleans and graduated from Academy of the Holy Angels. She also studied at Meadows-Draughon Business College, Louisiana State University, Loyola University, and the University of New Orleans. Barbara was the owner and matriarch of the independent family-owned restaurant group Deanie's Seafood restaurants. Barbara came from a large extended Italian family of restaurateurs, where she learned the rigorous demands of running and owning family restaurants. Barbara was awarded an American Culinary Federation New Orleans' Outstanding Foodservice Professional Award in 2013, and had been sought to judge culinary competitions throughout the country during her career. She remained a fixture at the restaurants until the Coronavirus pandemic began last spring. Barbara was an inspiration to generations of culinarians and hospitality workers. As a widowed mother of seven children, she created a rich life for herself and her family around food, faith and community. Her achievements as a woman entrepreneur reached well beyond the expectations of her generation. She instilled a genuine sense of hospitality, quality, family and pride into everything she did with motherly poise and a steely determination that launched and sustained a New Orleans seafood restaurant institution for almost 40 years. Barbara married her late husband Frank Chifici in 1963, and the couple operated a catering business out of their home and later two restaurants, Chifici's Restaurant in the Central Business District and Gromboli's in Metairie, before purchasing Deanie's Seafood Restaurant & Seafood Market in Bucktown in 1982. She was widowed in 1985 after Frank passed away following an 18-month illness. The Chifici family celebrated 38 years as owners and operators of Deanie's Seafood in April 2020. Known for serving up overflowing fried seafood platters and boiled Louisiana seafood, Deanie's became a local favorite that garnered national attention. The restaurant was recognized year after year among New Orleans' best seafood restaurants and featured on numerous Travel Channel and Food Network programs. In 2001, she opened the second Deanie's Seafood restaurant located at the corner of Iberville and Dauphine streets in the French Quarter. Deanie's Sea Food Kitchen, located at 2200 Magazine St. in Uptown New Orleans, opened in 2018. In her later years, as her adult children involved the day-to-day management of the restaurants, she sought ways to champion the values and people she loved. Barbara created Pinchapalooza in 2009, an outdoor crawfish and music festival at Deanie's in Bucktown benefiting local charities that was celebrated for 10 years. She had a large holiday display at her home that later was showcased in windows of the former D.H. Holmes Department Store Annex that housed her French Quarter restaurant, where she also introduced an annual Santa's breakfast and holiday sing-along series offered from 2013 through 2019. She enjoyed travel, dining, cruises, cooking and had season tickets for the New Orleans Saints and local theater. Barbara also had a successful real estate business for over 40 years. She was past president and a longtime member of the Elenian Club of New Orleans, a philanthropic group of women of italian descent. She served in numerous officer positions for the St. Mary Magdalen Mothers' Club and the Archbishop Rummel High School Parents' Club, including vice president. Barbara was preceded in death by her parents Olga Eve Cazes Anselmo and Vincent Anselmo, and her loving husband, Frank Angelo Chifici. She is survived by her brothers Robert Vincent Anselmo (Marlee Early Anselmo) and Dale Anthony Anselmo, her sister in law Virginia Chifici Tedesco and seven children, Mark David Chifici (Joan Dardis Chifici), Darren Frank Chifici (Chasidy Fonseca), Eric John Chifici (Christina Haley Chifici), Keith Vincent Chifici (Renee Gascon Chifici), Garrett Paul Chifici (Candice Schloegel Chifici), Chandra Eve Chifici-Scarber (Richard Scarber) and Candace Ann Chifici (Douglas Farrington). She also adored her 12 grandchildren: Dillon, Erica, Alaina, Olivia, Nicholas, Therese, Sophia, Vito, Vincent, Dominic, Vivienne and Giovanni along with a huge extended family who admired her dedication and hospitality to everyone she encountered. Relatives and friends are invited to attend the Funeral Mass at St. Catherine of Siena Catholic Church, 105 Bonnabel Blvd., Metairie, LA 70005, on Friday, January 29, 2021 at 1:00 pm. Reception will follow at the Msgr. Melancon Center. Visitation will be Friday at 10:00 am. A private service will be held for her interment in Lake Lawn Park. In lieu of usual remembrances, donations may be made to Angels' Place of New Orleans, 4323 Division St., Suite 206, Metairie, LA 70002 and Ronald McDonald House, 4403 Canal St., New Orleans, LA 70119. The Mass will be live streamed on Youtube. Details are available at www.scschurch.com and will be posted to Deanie's Facebook page.

RECOGNIZING MS. LESLIE COONE AS THE WALTON COUNTY, FLORIDA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Ms. Leslie Coone as the Walton County Teacher of the Year. For twelve years, Ms. Coone has served the Walton County School District with talent, passion, and an unwavering commitment to serving her students.

In Northwest Florida, we are fortunate to have some of the best teachers in the Nation. It is recognized that teaching is one of the most difficult professions—yet also one of the most rewarding. Ms. Coone has performed her teaching duties exceptionally, while also being an active and supportive member of her community.

Ms. Coone is revered by her Principal and colleagues for her incredible willingness to always lend a helping hand. She holds high expectations for each student, and strives to help them discover their true potential; additionally, she engages her students with ''Accountable Talk'' and ''Stop-n-Jots.''

Her support and outreach extend far beyond the walls of her third-grade math class through her involvement as an ILDA teacher, School Improvement Team member, and Grade Level Chair. Ms. Coone has displayed dedicated teamwork as a teacher mentor, and assists new teachers by sharing the knowledge and skills she has acquired throughout her own teaching career. I commend her for her steadfast willingness to serve those who matter most—the students and youth of our Nation.

For all of her admirable contributions to our community, I am truly proud to have Ms. Coone as a constituent in Florida's First Congressional District.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Ms. Leslie Coone for her many accomplishments, and her commitment to excellence, professionalism, innovation, and collaboration in the Walton County School District. I thank her for her service, and wish her all the best for her continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF SIDNEY THOMAS GRIFFITH

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Mayor Thomas Griffith who passed away January 6 at the age of 80.

Mayor Griffith was born on February 7, 1940 in Okolona, MS to Sidney and Eva Mae Jones Griffith. He was raised in the Wren community

and graduated from Amory High School in 1958 before attending Itawamba Community College and Mississippi State University. There, he studied Business Administration. He soon returned to Amory and married Ms. Ruth Mcallister in September of 1964. He was a dedicated member of St. Andrew's Methodist Church in Amory, where he served as Chairman of the Administrative Board and President of the United Methodist Men. He was dedicated to the Amory community, serving as the Paul Harris Fellow of the Amory Rotary Club, on the Board of Directors for First Friends in Amory, as a member of the ICC Board of Trustees and the ICC Alumni Board.

In 1977, Thomas Griffith was elected Mayor of Amory. He served a 28 year tenure, dedicating countless hours to the betterment of the community in which he was raised. He cited his term in public service as the pinnacle of his career. He was appointed to numerous leadership councils following his retirement from city government, most notably as Administrator of the Tenn-Tom Waterway Authority.

Left to cherish his memory is his wife of 56 years, Ruth; two sons, Tommy and Dan; and four granddaughters, Erin, Sydney, Logann, and Reese.

Mayor Griffith was a dedicated husband and father, a servant to his state, and a man of faith. He will be deeply missed by all who had the opportunity to know and love him.

TRIBUTE TO GLADYS EDWARDS WALLACE: CHRISTIAN WOMAN OF PASSION, VIRTUE, COMMITMENT AND SUCCESS

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I first met and got to know Gladys and Vernon or Vernon and Gladys in the late 1960's and have interacted with them since that time. Of course, Vernon has preceded Gladys in transition. Gladys was born in Alberta, Alabama, came to Chicago with her Christian parents who were seeking a better life for themselves and their family. Gladys did what many children of solid families do, went to school, joined church, went to college, got involved in activities, met Vernon, fell in love, got married and the rest became history. Forty-eight years of marriage, successful careers, a productive business, charitable giving, helping others, giving advice, mentoring, providing work opportunities for others and being an integral part of life in a community. The question now is what can we do? We can thank God for the life and legacy of our blessed friend and sister who gave so much to all of us, her charitable giving, being a mentor, providing jobs, wise counsel, for being a rock for family and friends, for leaving a thriving business, a committed life, for leaving proof of her commitment. Gladys held every office and did everything at church that one could do except be the Pastor and I suspect that she was some of that. She was a member of every committee and headed up every auxiliary. She retired from the postal service after working there for thirty years. She was always a partner in the family business, active in the Mortuary Science Industry and of course ran the business after her husband passed. She was a true professional and left a legacy of service, a legacy of giving and a legacy of love.

God bless Gladys Edwards Wallace, and may she rest in peace.

IN RECOGNITION OF SIERRA PACIFIC HS GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Sierra Pacific High School Lady Bears Basketball Team for their victory as California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) Division IV Northern Regional State Champions.

After reigning undefeated in the East Sequoia League and recording the longest winning streak in school history with 20 victories, the Lady Bears of Hanford, California, defeated Colfax High School in the Northern Regional Finals. Having claimed the South Regional Championship title in 2018, the Lady Bears Basketball Team is the first in the state to win a Regional Championship in both the North and South. This season, they were also recognized as Cal-Hi Girls Basketball Division 4 Team of the Year.

While the 2020 California State Championship was cancelled in light of COVID–19 precautions, I know the Lady Bears Basketball Team would have represented their community and school with the same sportsmanship and dedication they exemplified all season.

Led by Head Coach Amy Bush and Assistant Coaches Victor Chavarin, Jr. and Christopher Kennedy, Sierra Pacific High School was proudly represented by Taylor West, Alana Roberts, Celeste Lewis, Taylor Whitfield, Haillee Larios, Kylie Brasil, Angelique Brazil, Cristina Avila, Makayla Carre, Savannah Torres, Annabelle Saavedra, and Lauren Zantos.

I further congratulate Alana Roberts and Celeste Lewis for their outstanding performances. Miss Roberts became the first of her school to achieve 1,000 points and 1,000 rebounds and is the Sierra Pacific Girls Basketball All-Time rebounder with 1,357 rebounds. Miss Lewis, the team's all-time leading scorer, earning 1,832 points, was honored as Cal-Hi Girls Basketball Division 4 State Player of the Year.

Additionally, I commend Alana Roberts, Celeste Lewis, Kylie Brasil, Annabelle Saavedra, and Makayla Carre for their 2020 East Sequoia League 1st Team Honors, as well as Cristina Avila for her 2nd Team Honors.

Off the court, these ladies have inspired many with their community involvement. This season, the Lady Bears Basketball Team volunteered at the Episcopal Church of the Savior Parish Soup Kitchen, hosted a Community Youth Basketball Camp, collected 500 canned food items to support families during the pandemic, and raised $1,290 for the families of Captain Raymond Figueroa and Firefighter Patrick Jones who tragically lost their lives while responding to the Porterville library fire.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me congratulating the 2020 Sierra Pacific Girls Basketball Team for these accomplishments and commend their unwavering commitment to serving the Central Valley community.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of Peter Paul Montgomery Buttigieg, of Indiana, to be Secretary of Transportation.

Senate confirmed the nomination of Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S215–S272

Measures Introduced: Forty-one bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 146–186, S. Res. 24–25, and S. Con. Res. 5. **Pages S247–49**

Measures Passed:

Honoring the Life of Henry Louis Aaron: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 23, honoring the life and legacy of Henry Louis Aaron, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S241**

National School Choice Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 25, designating the week of January 24 through January 30, 2021, as ''National School Choice Week''. **Page S241**

Measures Considered:

Congressional Budget Resolution—Agreement: Senate began consideration of S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030, after agreeing to the motion to proceed.

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Pages S225–41**

By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 13), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the resolution. **Pages S225–26**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the resolution at approximately 9 a.m., on Wednesday, February 3, 2021, with 31 hours of debate remaining. **Page S272**

Congressional Budget Resolution—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that for the duration of the Senate's consideration of S. Con. Res. 5, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030, the Majority and Republican managers of the concurrent resolution, while seated or standing at the managers' desks, be permitted to deliver floor remarks, retrieve, review, and edit documents, and send email and other data communications from text displayed on wireless personal digital assistant devices and tablet devices; provided further that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the resolution; and that the staff be permitted to make technical and conforming changes to the resolution, if necessary, consistent with the amendments adopted during Senate consideration, including calculating the associated change in the net interest function, and incorporating the effect of such adopted amendments on the budgetary aggregates for Federal revenues, the amount by which the Federal revenues should be changed, new budget authority, budget outlays, deficits, public debt, and debt held by the public. **Page S226**

Appointments:

Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C., sections 42 and 43, appointed the following Senators as Members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, respectively: Senator Leahy (reappointment) and Senator Cortez Masto. **Page S241**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 86 yeas to 13 nays (Vote No. EX. 11), Peter Paul Montgomery Buttigieg, of Indiana, to be Secretary of Transportation. **Pages S217–22, S272**

By 56 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 12), Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of Homeland Security. **Pages S222–25, S272**

Messages from the House: **Page S244**

Executive Communications: **Pages S244–47**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S247**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S249–50**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S250–58**

Additional Statements: **Page S244**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S258–71**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S271–72**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S272**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—13) **Pages S222, S225–26**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 9:21 p.m., until 9 a.m. on Wednesday, February 3, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S272.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Thomas J. Vilsack, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Agriculture, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Grassley, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Thomas J. Vilsack, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

NOMINATION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Kathleen Holland Hicks, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Shaheen, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Denis Richard McDonough, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 57 public bills, H.R. 682–738; 1 private bill, H.R. 739; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 84, 86–90, were introduced. **Pages H275–79**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H281**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 85, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 447) to amend the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly referred to as the "National Apprenticeship Act") and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–3). **Page H275**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Gomez to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H265**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:04 p.m. and reconvened at 5 p.m. **Pages H265–66**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:57 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H273**

National Apprenticeship Act of 2021 and Establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 85, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 447) to amend the Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly referred to as the ''National Apprenticeship Act'') and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 11) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030, by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 210 nays, Roll No. 20, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 19.

Pages H266–73, H273–74

Pursuant to section 7 of H. Res. 85, H. Res. 73 is hereby adopted. **Pages H274–75**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H265.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H273 and H274.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

Committee Meetings

NO TIME TO LOSE: SOLUTIONS TO INCREASE COVID–19 VACCINATIONS IN THE STATES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''No Time to Lose: Solutions to Increase COVID–19 Vaccinations in the States''. Testimony was heard from Ngozi Ezike, M.D., Director, Department of Public Health, Illinois; Joneigh S. Khaldun, M.D., Chief Medical Executive and Chief Deputy Director, Michigan Department of Health and Human Services; Clay Marsh, M.D., COVID–19/Coronavirus Czar, West Virginia; Courtney N. Phillips, Secretary, Department of Health, Louisiana; and Jill Hunsaker Ryan, Executive Director, Department of Public Health and Environment, Colorado.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Oversight and Reform: On February 1, 2021, Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its rules for the 117th Congress, without amendment. Subcommittee Chairs and the Full Committee Vice Chair were agreed to.

BUSINESS MEETING; NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 2021; ESTABLISHING THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2022 THROUGH 2030

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a business meeting and a hearing on H.R. 447, the ''National Apprenticeship Act of 2021''; and H. Con. Res. 11, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030. The Committee adopted revised rules for the 117th Congress. Representative Hastings was designated the Vice Chair of the Committee. The subcommittee ratios and subcommittee appointments were adopted. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–3, a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 447, the ''National Apprenticeship Act of 2021'', and H. Con. Res. 111, Establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 447, the ''National Apprenticeship Act of 2021'', under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides that following debate, each further amendment printed in part B of the Rules Committee report not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of the rule shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read,

shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Section 3 of the rule provides that at any time after debate the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee may offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the Rules Committee report or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of the rule. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 11, Establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030, under a closed rule. The rule provides three hours of general debate, with two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour, on the subject of economic goals and policies, divided and controlled by Representatives Beyer of Virginia and Schweikert of Arizona or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution. The rule provides that the amendment printed in part C of the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted and the concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended. The rule provides that rule XXVIII shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the House of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021. The rule provides that House Resolution 73 is hereby adopted. The rule amends Clause 3(g)(3)(C) of rule 2 to read as follows: ''(C) Upon receipt of an appeal pursuant to subdivision (B), the Committee on Ethics shall have 30 calendar days or five legislative days, whichever is later, to consider the appeal. The fine will be upheld unless the appeal is agreed to by a majority of the Committee. Upon a determination regarding the appeal or if no appeal has been filed at the expiration of the period specified as subdivision (B), the chair of the Committee on Ethics shall promptly notify the Member, Delegate, or the Resident Commissioner, the Speaker, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Chief Administrative Officer and make such notification publicly available. The Speaker shall promptly lay such notification before the House.'' The rule amends section 4(a)(2) of House Resolution 38 to read as follows: ''(2) a fine imposed pursuant to this section shall be treated as though imposed under clause 3(g) of rule 2, and shall be administered as though pursuant to clause 4(d) of rule 2, except that the time periods described in clause 3(g)(3)(C) of rule 2 shall not commence until the Committee on Ethics has adopted written rules, and the chair of the Committee on Ethics shall notify all Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner with pending appeals upon such commencement.'' The rule amends House Resolution 8, agreed to January 4, 2021 (as amended by House Resolution 41, agreed to January 13, 2021), by striking ''February 11'' each place that it appears and inserting ''March 12''. Testimony was heard from Chairman Scott of Virginia, Chairman Yarmuth, and Representatives Foxx and Smith of Missouri.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider the nomination of Gina Marie Raimondo, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of Commerce, 9:30 a.m., SR–325.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider the nomination of Jennifer Mulhern Granholm, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Energy; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine data and analysis by the United States' and world's leading authorities on global climate trends from energy related sectors, focusing on where and how progress has been made in addressing climate change, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Michael Stanley Regan, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 2 p.m., SD–106.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider the nominations of Linda Thomas-Greenfield, of Louisiana, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of the Ambassador, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, and to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as

Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, 9:45 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Miguel A. Cardona, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Education, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Isabella Casillas Guzman, of California, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, 10:30 a.m., SR–301.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 11 a.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Road to Recovery: Ramping Up COVID–19 Vaccines, Testing, and Medical Supply Chain'', 11 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 11 a.m., 2128 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 2 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 10 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H. Res. 72, removing a certain Member from certain standing committees of the House of Representatives, 3 p.m., Webex.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9 a.m., Wednesday, February 3

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 5, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2021, with 31 hours of debate remaining.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1 p.m., Wednesday, February 3

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H. Con. Res. 11—Establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2021 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2022 through 2030.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Davids, Sharice, Kans., E87
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E93
Gaetz, Matt, Fla., E87, E90, E92
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E90
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E88
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E87, E88, E89, E90, E91, E92
Levin, Andy, Mich., E91
Loudermilk, Barry, Ga., E89
McEachin, A. Donald, Va., E90
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E87
Valadao, David G., Calif., E93
Van Duyne, Beth, Tex., E91
Wexton, Jennifer, Va., E87, E91
Wilson, Frederica S., Fla., E89
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E92

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are 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.