The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEYER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, March 1, 2021.
I hereby appoint the Honorable DONALD S. BEYER, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Chair would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

RECESS
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today. Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

1400
AFTER RECESS
The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

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

Gracious God, what treasures You have set before us: a country rich with resources, a history founded on faith in You and invested in the noble principles of the American experiment.

And yet, we confess that we have allowed these endowments to be destroyed by moths of malice and misdirection. We acknowledge before You that we have tolerated and even taken delight in the corrosive rust of rivalries and debate.

Forgive us for taking for granted the precious gifts of life, liberty, and happiness, and letting them slip from our care, only to be stolen by pride and conceit.

Call us back to rededicate ourselves to the mercy You have shown us time and again. May we treasure in our hearts the privilege You have given us as Americans to serve as stewards of Your bounteous love.

We pray in the strength of Your holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL
The SPEAKER. The Chair will enter:

(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. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. POSEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

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

REPLANT ACT IS PRACTICAL LEGISLATION
(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, what I am about to show you are the examples of the cycle of destruction from the climate crisis in my home district on the central coast of California.

Last year, my district was victim to a brutal wildfire season in which almost 650,000 acres were burned. What was left behind in many of those areas is called a burn scar, ground that has crusted and is hard for water to penetrate. As a result, when it rains, it leads to floods, mudslides, and devastation, including this damage to Highway 1 in Big Sur, in which water and debris flowed down the hills, blocked the culverts, then flowed up over Highway 1, and took out the road from that side.

Now, we know we have a lot of work to do when it comes to reducing our carbon output. In the meantime, we can stop this type of damage with reforestation of burn scar areas.

That is why I will reintroduce the REPLANT Act, to fund those types of projects, and I plan to work on bipartisan legislation to help manage forests to prevent fires and not just suppress them. It is that type of reasonable and practical legislation that is the foundation for how we in Congress can protect our communities and prevent the effects of the climate crisis.

TRANSPARENCY IS PART OF GOOD GOVERNMENT
(Mr. POSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, transparency has always been a cornerstone of good government. Over the past 10 years, we have made important
progress toward making Congress more transparent and accountable to those we serve.

In 2010, I introduced a resolution calling for a 72-hour period of public availability before the House could bring a bill up for a vote. Members of the House and the public could actually see what was in a bill before we were asked to vote for it. In 2011, the proposal was adopted into House rules as a 3-day rule.

But, sadly, this year’s House rules package abolished that rule. It is incredibly sad to see that this House is moving backward and making government less open and less accountable to those we were sent here to represent.

CREATING A COVID–19 VICTIMS AND SURVIVORS MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. STANTON. Madam Speaker, last week, we mourned half a million American lives lost to the coronavirus. Their absence in our communities is difficult to comprehend. Sadly, many are facing the reality that it has now been more than a year without their loved ones. Tragically, many of them died alone, without loved ones to say good-bye.

To honor and memorialize those lost and those impacted by the virus, I introduced a resolution designating the first Monday in March as COVID–19 Victims and Survivors Memorial Day.

In my home State, this day of recognition has been pushed by two advocates who lost their fathers to COVID–19. Kristin Urquiza and Tara Krebs turned their grief into action and have mobilized more than 100 cities and multiple States to recognize today as a memorial day.

Long after our Nation moves beyond this ordeal, we will need to collectively recognize all that we have lost and the trauma of what we have experienced.

Together, we can overcome.

A BILL FOR POLITICIANS, NOT PEOPLE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, the top priority bill of the House of Representatives this year for the Democrats seems to be H.R. 1, known as the For the People Act.

What people is this going to benefit? For the politicians act, you might call it. It helps politicians and hacks like The Lincoln Project, not the people.

For example, if this bill passes, a political candidate raising approximately $800,000 in their campaign under certain guidelines could have the Federal Government match funds up to $6 million that could be used for anything put into campaign—$6 million of your Federal dollars going into a single congressional race under the right conditions.

These formulas are geared to ratchet up from the previous election cycle. As we know, campaigns get more expensive each time; so does the match.

Also, under this bill, the Federal Government would hand out $25 vouchers to every voter in three chosen States to donate to candidates. How much will that cost just to administer a program like that? We know the Federal Government doesn’t do that cheaply, maybe $25 per check to give each $25 contribution.

If you hand a bureaucrat a hammer, they will see everything as a nail. The new system fines more people in order to raise funds for this campaign giveaway. The fines will go up, and businesses will be hurt, all in order to provide something not for the people.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BROWNLEY) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:


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 March 1, 2021, at 4:30 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 79. With best wishes, I am, Sincerely, ROBERT F. RIEVES, Deputy Clerk.

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 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1919

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PHILLIPS) at 7 o’clock and 19 minutes p.m.

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:


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 March 1, 2021, at 4:30 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 79. With best wishes, I am, Sincerely, ROBERT F. RIEVES, Deputy Clerk.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1280, GEORGE FLOYD JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT OF 2021; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179
Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans’ access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, 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) an hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees; (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.

SUC. 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.

SUC. 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 House Administration or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of other 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 debateable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration 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 considered agreed to that in the House the bill (H.R. 1280) to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies, all points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the CENSUS BILL are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any 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 the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. The following resolutions are hereby adopted:

(a) House Resolution 176.

(b) House Resolution 177.

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 distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), 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.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days 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 179, providing for consideration of H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2021, under a structured rule. It self-executes a manager’s amendment by Chairperson LOFGREN and makes in order 56 amendments.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on House Administration and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021, under a closed rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also deems as passed H. Res. 176, which directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the engrossment of H.R. 1319, and H. Res. 177, which authorizes candidates for election to the House and Members of the House to file statements with the Clerk regarding the intention to participate or not participate in the small donor financing system for such elections created by H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, the House will be considering two pieces of critically important legislation this week that are a long time coming.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, will expand voting rights, limit partisan gerrymandering, improve election integrity, and revise rules for political spending and government ethics. The 2020 election brought out unprecedented turnout, even in the middle of the COVID–19 pandemic. Thanks in large part to voting by mail, more than 159 million Americans voted, the largest total vote turnout in United States history.

There followed was the most heavily scrutinized election in modern history, with our airwaves filled with horrific and dangerous lies that fundamentally damaged many people’s faith in our democracy. Yet, through that entire ordeal, not a single shred of evidence of any systemic fraud was ever discovered—none at all.

Voting in this country, however, is far from perfect. Many people, particularly Americans of color and those from low-income families, face tremendous obstacles making their votes heard, from long lines at the polls to discriminatory ID laws.

I believe, and the Democratic majority believes, our national effort should be aimed at eliminating barriers to the ballot. We believe true participatory democracy can only be achieved when everyone—everyone—is afforded the opportunity to vote. We believe it is better for America that every voice be heard here in Washington, in State capitols, and in city, town, and village halls across our Nation.

It is better for all of our citizens when each and every citizen has a stake in what their government says and what their government does. And we believe it is better for us on the world stage when our democracy shines as a beacon of hope and success for others to emulate.

It is becoming increasingly clear that not everyone believes our national interest is served by greater voter participation. It is held in some quarters that, rather than seeing greater participation as a sign of our democracy’s enduring strength, it is instead seen as evidence of a dark, sinister plot. Or perhaps, more cynically, they express that view because suppressing votes, particularly of those with whom they disagree, will improve their chances for electoral success, even though it weakens our democracy.

Rather than trying to build on the successes of record voter turnout, many of my friends on the other side of the aisle would rather turn their backs on those successes and begin an organ-ized effort to change the rules because they didn’t like the outcome.

The majority has put forward a narrative that suggests we must choose between two separate paths, accessibility and security. But that is a deliberately false narrative. We can, and we must, achieve both. H.R. 1 is the vehicle to advance both.

The For the People Act places a significant emphasis on election security, in everything from voter registration to ensuring all voting systems are secure with paper ballots and robust election result audits.

The outrage we have heard from Republican leaders in Congress demonstrating how out of touch they are with their own voters. More than two-thirds of likely voters, including 57 percent of Republicans, said they would back the proposals in H.R. 1. Americans want more accountability from their leaders, not less.

They want the influence of money out of politics. They want an end to gerrymandered districts. They want voting to be a celebration of our civil duty, not a constant battle to overcome administrative hurdles.

We owe it to those Americans to create the ethical and accessible democracy that they so richly deserve.

The House will also take up H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. This legislation represents the work of hundreds of legislators and millions of American advocates who have fought for decades for a more equitable future.

This fight is especially personal for me, as my own community of Rochester, New York, has grappled with two recent tragedies that underscore just how necessary police reform truly is.

Just one block from here, on the west pediment of the United States Supreme Court, is a promise to every American: “Equal justice under law.”

It would be laughable if it were not heartbreaking.

Equal justice under law was an enduring success story, even though it weakens our democracy. Yet, through that entire ordeal, we know that for too many Americans, that promise is an empty one. It was an empty promise for Daniel Prude, who, while naked and unarmored, faced a mental health crisis in the streets of Rochester when police arrived on the scene last March. He needed a warm blanket and treatment by a mental health professional. He got neither and died in police custody just days later.

It wasn’t true just a month ago for a young girl in my community, who was forcibly restrained and pepper sprayed as she called out for her father. She is 9 years old. A police officer on the scene, impatient with her pleas to see her dad, urged her to stop acting like a child. Her response: “I am a child.”

It would be laughable if it were not heartbreaking.

Equal justice under law was an empty promise for George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Jacob Blake, and for countless others, everywhere in America and for countless more still to come unless we take bold, decisive action.
Indeed, it is up to each of us to make the changes necessary to finally fulfill the promise of equal justice.

The time for incremental change has passed. It is clear that we need a cultural paradigm shift and massive reimagining of our public safety protocols, which starts with the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

The bill prohibits religious, racial, and discriminatory profiling by every police department in America, supported by improved training for officers and comprehensive data collection and tracking to ensure departments are following the law.

It will save lives by banning dangerous police practices, like choke holds and no-knock drug warrants. It will ensure that law enforcement uses deadly force only when absolutely necessary and only after exhausting deescalation tactics.

This legislation would limit the transfer of military-grade equipment to State and local law enforcement because peace, safety, and community trust cannot—cannot—be realized with weapons of war.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act will create desperately needed accountability by expanding the use of body-worn cameras and dashboard cameras and eliminating the qualified immunity protections that allow bad actors in law enforcement to stay on the force.

As a whole, this legislation addresses police misconduct, creates greater transparency, and affords victims meaningful avenues for redress. With these policies, we can build trust and we can begin to build cooperation between law enforcement and the communities they are supposed to serve and protect.

We passed both the For the People Act and the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act in the previous Congress, and I know that this year represents a real opportunity to move both bills forward to the President's desk so that we can build stronger democracy and justice for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this rule and to support both underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York, my very good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule covers two items, both of which will be familiar to Members who were here during the 116th Congress. We are once again considering H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Unfortunately, despite its title, H.R. 1 has nothing at all to do with the people. It is, instead, a bill about preserving the present Democrat majority. It is a bill by Democrats for Democrats. Though the majority claims this bill is about reforming our political system, the reality is that most of the changes in this bill, if enacted into law, would be detrimental to the minority.

The most egregious of these provisions are those dedicated to changing our national system of campaign finance. Now, in general, I think this is a worthwhile goal. Majority's proposed solution does not make much sense. The majority is proposing to create a new federally funded campaign ATM using corporate fines, ensuring that certain candidates will receive millions of dollars just for running a campaign.

My colleagues in the majority have bemoaned the massive amount of money that has been entering into our campaign system over the past few decades. The idea is to dump corporate dollars into the system.

In what world does this make sense? Even Democrats know what a flawed program this is, which is why today's vote to include the provision to allow Members of Congress to opt out of this program. Before this bill was even passed by the House, Democrats were already running from it. They should just keep running and pull this bill from the desk.

Other proposed changes in this bill are just egregious. Wherever possible, the majority is attempting to impose one-size-fits-all systems from Washington onto the States. It does this with a one-size-fits-all voter registration system, including forcing States to provide same-day voter registration whether they want to or not.

It takes away the power of the States to choose how to redistrict, forcing them to adopt Washington-imposed "independent redistricting commissions," something that less than 20 percent of the States who undertake redistricting actually do.

These provisions impede the traditional power of the States to control their own elections. As a former secretary of state and election official in my home State of Oklahoma, I find these changes to be particularly concerning.

But what is worse, H.R. 1 also includes severe restrictions on free speech and repeals the Lois Lerner rule, a rule put into place after the IRS began targeting the speech of conservative organizations in determining whether or not they would qualify for tax-exempt status. If enacted into law, these provisions would reawaken the IRS and limit the abilities of organizations, corporations, and individuals to freely exercise this most-important right guaranteed under the Constitution.

How the majority can claim that this bill is for the people when they are blatantly restricting the people's right to free speech is beyond my understanding.

Mr. Speaker, what the majority is attempting today is egregious. Changing the national campaign finance system to benefit themselves, taking traditional powers away from the States, and restricting the right of free speech are all part of an unprecedented power grab.

I strongly urge the majority to change course, and I urge my colleagues to reject this terrible bill.

Today, we are also considering H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. As with H.R. 1, this bill will be familiar to our returning Members, as the House passed an identical bill last summer.

Unfortunately, while I think this bill is well-intentioned, it, too, is misguided. Reforms contained in H.R. 1280 will do more harm than good. I do not doubt the majority's good intentions with this legislation.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act came about following the tragic events of last summer. George Floyd's death demonstrated what so many Americans know only too well, that abuses of power clearly exist and must be addressed.

And while the overwhelming majority of law enforcement officers faithfully and bravely carry out their duties and responsibilities each day, all too often many Americans receive differential treatment due to the color of their skin. Americans across the country rightly condemn this horrific and unacceptable act.

Unfortunately, rather than coming together to legislate in a bipartisan manner, the majority chose to take the exact opposite course last summer, and we are once again considering the same flawed and deeply partisan bill we considered then and that the Senate failed to take up. I believe this bill will have the same result, should the House pass it again this week.

During the last Congress, when the Judiciary Committee met to mark up this bill, the majority completely shut out Republicans from the process. Republicans made good-faith attempts to work with the Democrats to find common ground on needed reforms, yet every single one of these attempts were rejected.

This year, the majority has not even deigned to bring this bill to a markup in the Judiciary Committee, and, once again, the majority has shut Republicans out of the process.

This is no way to legislate on an issue that is this important. Mr. Speaker. Republicans and Democrats alike agree that reforms are necessary. We all watched the tragedy of George Floyd unfold last summer and we all watched the resulting protests. We all agree that action is necessary. But rather than working in the best interest of the American people, the majority is once again telling Republicans that they can only have a
Hobson's choice. They can take the Democrats' bill or they can take the Democrats' bill with no other options. But I, along with my fellow Republicans, reject that idea. We fully recognize the critical need for reform. My colleagues, both in the House and in the Senate, have put together our own package, the JUSTICE Act, filled with bipartisan reforms that could pass both the House and the Senate and be signed into law quickly. These reforms include critical measures, like providing funding for cameras for police officers, requiring deescalation procedures, and banning choke holds.

My colleague, Representative STAUBER, offered this as an amendment at the Rules Committee earlier today, but, once again, the majority chose to shut out Republicans and refused to make this amendment in order. That is a sad state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, but the real losers here are the American people. This is an issue we can cooperate on. I urge my colleagues in the majority to rethink the path they are on. On an issue that is this important and this critical to the American people, the very best thing we can do is work together. I think that would actually be good political advice for my friends.

We can work on bipartisan reforms together and we can produce consensus legislation that has the buy-in of Members on both sides. Unfortunately, the majority has once again chosen the opposite path: Partisan bills filled with provisions that do not reflect the best interest or consensus of the country. We can do better than that, Mr. Speaker. The American people deserve better.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 is the most significant democracy reform package in our lifetime. It will make it easier to vote—regardless of income, ability, geography, or race; ends the domination of big money in politics; and enacts voter accountability reforms.

With this landmark bill, we take a giant leap forward to ensuring our Republic is an authentic and inclusive representative democracy, and ensuring the voices of everyday Americans are no longer drowned out by those of wealthy special interests.

Article I, Section 4 says this: “The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. That is simply wrong. We should make sure that we pass laws that fulfill the dream of voter access for all Americans.

I do also note that I think it would be much easier for us to believe that there is good faith on the other side of the aisle to negotiate some of these items and to perhaps reach compromise, but I find it hard to believe—and I stated this in the Rules Committee—given what happened over the last several months, that we would be in this position, that there is a ability to have a belief in good faith.

It is hard to imagine 60 lawsuits were brought against decisions made by States—not the Federal Government, but States—on the electoral college. Two-thirds of the members of the House Republican Conference—two-thirds—objected to the results of the electoral college, and, in many cases, in statements, Representative leadership and Republicans serving as secretaries of state or as elections commissioners. So I would suggest that since—for the first time since 1800, when John Adams turned over the keys to the White House to President Jefferson and we observed the first peaceful transfer of power from one party to another, that since that foundational moment in American history over two centuries ago, this is the first time that people in this House have objected so strenuously and systematically to the results of the free and fair election of the American people.

So we are for the people. We want to continue to expand ball-by-mail, access to the ballot box, to make sure that we pass laws that fulfill the dream of voter access for all Americans, to make sure that every American has the voice that they deserve to have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Our democracy is in urgent need of repair. The American people deserve a transparent, inclusive, and healthy democracy, and H.R. 1 will get us there.

It is transformational, a once-in-a-generation, pro-democracy, anticorruption reform package. It is composed of comprehensive policies for eliminating structural barriers to voting, ending the dominance of big money in our campaign finance reforms, and implementing real government ethics and accountability reforms.

With this landmark bill, we take a giant leap forward to ensuring our Republic is an authentic and inclusive representative democracy, and ensuring the voices of everyday Americans are no longer drowned out by those of wealthy special interests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and “no” on H.R. 1.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 is the most significant democracy reform package in our lifetime. It will make it easier to vote—regardless of income, ability, geography, or race; ends the domination of big money in politics; and enacts tougher ethics standards to ensure that public officials actually work for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of three provisions that I helped incorporate into this bill:

Bringing the Oregon vote-by-mail model nationwide;

Paving the way for all States to offer vote-by-mail and early voting;

And automatic voter registration for individuals interacting with State agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this is personal for me. I started my political career as a college student, testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the constitutional amendment to lower the voting age. I spent 2 years of my life working in Oregon on that and on the national campaign. Subsequently, I was on a national commission from the Ford Foundation, the National League of Women Voters, and the Civic League to look into how we can make the election process to make it more uniform and easier for the American people.
Mr. Speaker, I was proud of that work, but I am a little embarrassed that that was four decades ago and we are still talking about the need for those reforms. And as my colleagues have mentioned, there are people right now in various State legislatures that are engaging in some of these tactics, making it hard for Americans to vote. This is embarrassing. This is not just a matter of what happened with civil rights, this has been refined as a high art to be able to gerrymander people into districts, to make some districts so that they undercut the ability of politicians selecting their voters, rather than people selecting their politicians.

Mr. Speaker, I have been pained by the lies that have been made about mail-in voting. I am the first Member of the House of Representatives to be elected as a result of a mail-in ballot. We pioneered that in 1996, and we have continued to pioneer that effort. And it is secure; it is convenient, it saves money for Government. It allows people to process this in their own home, in their own time, in their own way. In an era of the pandemic, it provides health—keeping older poll workers from being exposed.

The problem somehow this is a problem that justified some of the outrageous statements and behavior, defies description.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pained with this misrepresentation that the President of the United States would denigrate mail-in ballot voting while he, in fact, does it. This has been done by Republicans and Democrats alike. It is secure. It is safe. And it helps the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge approval of H.R. 1, because it is a fair, even-handed, rational way to make sure the majority of Americans have access to democracy. It is not only constitutional, but it will lead to chaos and confusion for voters.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, my friend and I disagree on the two pieces of legislation today, but we absolutely agree on the two pieces of legislation that require States which offer early voting to make it available to polling places serving college campuses. It is high time we make our democracy, our elections, accessible to the generations who will inherit the world that we are legislating about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule, to support my amendment, and to support final passage of H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE), my friend.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today against H.R. 1280. This bill is nothing more than a get-cops-killed campaign. It sends one clear message: Democrats hate law enforcement.

This bill does not bring justice to victims. It just takes revenge on all of the men and women in uniform. Mean-while, the Speaker and the Majority Leader have used an army of taxpayer-funded law enforcement 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

This bill disarms cops and opens them to frivolous lawsuits by lawyers representing criminals who got their feelings hurt simply because they broke the law and got arrested.

Speaker PELOSI is putting police on a hit list to be ambushed while on the job keeping our streets safe. So I have one message for Democrats: Shame on you.

Shame on you for using these men and women to protect your fortress...
Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to again just note, although it has been said ad nauseam for the last several months, that while we clearly respect States' roles in these elections and that it is the States who run elections and organize them, we did not give the Congress given to us in the Constitution. But more importantly, this year, while the voters in Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Arizona cast ballots in free and fair and open elections, and those were certified repeatedly despite an onslaught of litigation brought by the former President and his advocates, all of which were denied going all the way up to the Supreme Court, our colleagues did not respect those States' elections even though they were certified and even though, as we all met on what will be one of the darkest days in American history on January 6 to accept and certify those results given to us by the States, my colleagues and friends objected to them.

I am not sure what says about their respect for State elections since they didn't respect the results of those elections, in many cases run by Republicans in their respective States.

Mr. Speaker, I must say I find this a most curious and I am not going to abide by the results of elections, and if we are not going to trust those various States to submit elections unless they agree with the outcome that we want, why we would be arguing so strenuously for the continuance of our process and no involvement by the Federal Government, despite the fact that the Constitution clearly vests that power here in the Congress?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just quickly to my friend from New York, I wasn't here, he wasn't here, but our friends thought to challenge in this Chamber the election in 2001, after 2000. I was here in 2004 when they challenged a State and demanded a recount. Then, I was here in 2017 when my friends on the other side sought to challenge 10 different States. So, let's not act like this is somehow unusual.

Mr. Speaker, another part of today's rule includes a provision to deem passed a correction to last week's budget reconciliation. Given that the majority now wishes to reopen last week's reconciliation, it is certainly appropriate to further amend that resolution to correct one of the more egregious provisions in it.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately adopt H. Res. 178, an engrossment correction to strike funding in the budget reconciliation bill for the Pelosi subway tunnel in California and instead direct the $140 million to support the mental healthcare for these affected children. I think we can all agree that the mental health impacts on our children should be swiftly addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the Rule, along with 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE), my good friend, for further explanation of the amendment.

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question today, we will call up a resolution that I introduced, H. Res. 178, which would instruct the House Clerk to modify the text of H.R. 1319, the American Rescue Plan Act, to direct $140 million from Unfunded Priority, a study by my project and to instead put those funds toward critical mental health services for the Nation's children who have continued to suffer in isolation during the COVID–19 pandemic.

A resolution should ensure that mental health and suicide prevention services are provided in States where children do not have the option of in-person instruction in school, as isolation has been a major driver of mental health impacts on our Nation's kids.

Mr. Speaker, children across this Nation have been disproportionately affected by the mental health impacts of the COVID–19 pandemic. A study by the National Institutes of Health found that social isolation has had a significant impact on America's children. Social isolation during quarantine has caused many to develop feelings of sadness, anxiety, and loneliness.

Mr. Speaker, there is hope. The CDC recently released new guidelines that recommend students return to in-person instruction where it can be done safely. Dr. Anthony Fauci himself has backed these new guidelines and has spoken in support of getting our Nation's kids back in school.

The feelings of isolation felt by so many children today can be quickly alleviated by reopening our schools. In areas of the country where reopenings are not happening, my resolution would provide $140 million to bolster mental health care for these affected children. I think we can all agree that the mental health impacts on our children should be swiftly addressed on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, let me start again. As I told you on the previous question today so that we can provide needed relief and critical mental health services
Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to defeat the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, I mean this with all sincerity. There is a great gap between us on H.R. 1. We just simply look at this matter differentiy. I think it is egregious partisan overreach. On H.R. 1280, there really is an opportunity for bipartisan cooperation. The JUSTICE Act that Mr. STAUFFER filed last year and presented today as an amendment has a great deal in common with some of the objectives I know my friends want to achieve on their side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, in an almost evenly divided House and an evenly divided Senate that still has the filibuster, you can't do things by reconciliation every day. Mr. MOORE and I agree on this. It is going to require bipartisan cooperation.

We often say that never happens. The reality is it happens a lot more than people acknowledge. Five times last year we came together as Republicans and Democrats and passed COVID relief packages that made a big difference in this country. We also passed the spending bill on a bipartisan basis that funded the government for this entire fiscal year. We did that in the middle of a Presidential election year that was extraordinarily divisive.

Mr. Speaker, we can work together. I would ask my friends to rethink the course of the reconciliation bill and look at the two pieces of legislation and start thinking about where we can actually get things done. I think the George Floyd bill, H.R. 1280, is one of those places. I also think the appropriations process can be one of those places. We can probably even find some common ground on some of the electoral issues, although personally, in my view, H.R. 1 is a very flawed piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from New York for the debate and tell him that, despite our disagreements on these two pieces of legislation, I look forward to working with him. I don't think either of these are likely to get through the United States Senate. I do think we can get a product back from the United States Senate that both of us might be able to vote for, in terms of police justice and overhaul. We will wait and see what happens with H.R. 1. I am less optimistic we will ever see it again, but I am happy to say good-bye to it out of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the rule and I urge rejection of both underlying pieces of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much, as always, the thoughtful comments by my colleague and friend, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. Speaker, it relates to the question of matters before us here, we do have significant differences in how we view access to the ballot. I would note that, historically, parties change. They evolve. Typically, because this is in keeping with American democracy, we evolve to reflect the needs and concerns and wishes and results of American elections and their expression of the will of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, what I find troubling right now is that friends across the aisle, to be focused not so much on learning the lessons given to us by those voters, by the American public, as expressed in the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

But instead, conscientious, by-design work to limit those who would want to participate to the right, because they can choose the voters, as opposed to the other way around—disenfranchising those, and setting up barriers, as we see happening in State capitals across the country, is troubling indeed. And, I think, it demonstrates the clear division between the two parties on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, we seek, and we will always seek, to expand access to make sure that every single American, every single citizen who wants to participate in our democracy, is free to do so, and to the right, because they can choose the voters, as opposed to the other way around—disenfranchising those, and setting up barriers, as we see happening in State capitals across the country, is troubling indeed. And, I think, it demonstrates the clear division between the two parties on this particular issue.
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DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1319

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 179, H. Res. 176 is hereby adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 176

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall, in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 1319, make the following corrections:

(1) Strike section 2103 and redesignate section 2104 as section 2103 and amend the table of contents in section 2104 accordingly.

(2) Strike paragraph (5) in section 2401(a).

(3) Redesignate paragraphs (6), (7), (8), (9), and (11) in section 2401(a) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10), respectively.

(4) In paragraph (7) of section 2401(a), as redesignated by paragraph (3), strike “paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (9)” and insert “paragraphs (5), (6), and (8), respectively.”

(5) In paragraph (8) of section 2401(a), as so redesignated, strike “paragraph (6)(C)” and insert “paragraph (5)(C).”

(6) Strike paragraph (5) in section 9501(a). Redesignate paragraphs (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10), and (11) of section 9501(a) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10), respectively.

(7) Redesignate paragraphs (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10) of section 9501(a) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10), respectively.

(8) In paragraph (7) of section 9501(a), as so redesignated by paragraph (7), strike “paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (9)” and insert “paragraphs (5), (6), and (8)”.

(9) In paragraph (8) of section 9501(a), as so redesignated, strike “paragraph (6)(C)” and insert “paragraph (5)(C).”

AUTHORIZING CANDIDATES FOR ELECTION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO FILE STATEMENTS WITH THE CLERK REGARDING THE INTENTION TO PARTICIPATE OR NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE SMALL DONOR FINANCING SYSTEM FOR HOUSE CANDIDATES

(a) In General.—At the time a candidate for election for the office of Member of the House of Representatives files with the Clerk the report required under section 101(c) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1989, or a Member of the House of Representatives files with the Clerk the report required under section 101(d) of such Act, the candidate or Member may file a statement indicating whether or not the candidate or Member intends to be a participant in such election under title V of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by part 2 of subtitle B of title V of the For the People Act of 2021) with respect to the subsequent election for such office which is held after the candidate or Member files the report and for which the small donor financing system under such title is in effect.

(b) Posting.—The Clerk shall post on the official public website of the Office of the Clerk each statement filed under subsection (a).

(c) Effective Date.—This section shall apply with respect to reports filed on or after the date of the adoption of this resolution.

UNVEILING OF COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA, MONUMENT

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, tomorrow, at noon, the city of Columbia, South Carolina, Historic Columbia, and the University of South Carolina will unveil a monument that will mark the 60th anniversary of the landmark case Edwards v. South Carolina.

That case resulted from the protest march of almost 200 college and high school students from across South Carolina who came to Columbia to protest segregation, discrimination, and what amounted to apartheid.

Madam Speaker, 192 or 193 of us were arrested on that day, and 189 were convicted. Two years later, the Supreme Court of the United States overturned those convictions in this historic and landmark case against South Carolina, which rendered an end to any state passing laws to subject protest marchers to anything but what they were.

Madam Speaker, tomorrow, I will submit a full statement, thanking those for doing so.

CELEBRATING 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOSES LAKE BAPTIST CHURCH

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the 10th anniversary of Moses Lake Baptist Church and to sincerely thank them for their contributions to the Moses Lake community.

Madam Speaker, central Washingtonians are people of deep and sincere faith. We know firsthand that churches and faith-based organizations like the Lake Baptist Church are fundamental to the well-being and very fiber of our local communities.

From performing acts of service, to ensuring the spiritual and emotional health of their congregants, particularly during the challenging times of the past year, Moses Lake Baptist Church goes above and beyond to deliver the Word of God to individuals.
and families throughout central Washington.

Madam Speaker, I have personally experienced the kindness and prayers of the leadership, including Pastor Dennis Fountain and the congregation at the church, I know firsthand how they spread the message of love through God’s teachings.

Madam Speaker, as we celebrate 10 years of faithful service, I extend my congratulations to Moses Lake Baptist Church and wish them many more decades of blessing our community.

SUPPORT COVID–19 HOSPITAL LOAN CONVERSION

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give thanks for the service of David M. Friedman, recently our Ambassador from the United States to Israel.

As Ambassador, Mr. Friedman strengthened our bond with Israel, took our partnership to new heights, secured peaceful relationships for Israel in the Middle East, and was influential in moving the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem.

Through his diligent work, Mr. Friedman set in motion the peaceful resolution of Israeli-Arab conflicts. His hard work and service set the standard for building U.S. diplomatic relationships, and earned him a well-deserved nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize.

I would like to thank Ambassador Friedman for his service, and wish him success in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF AMBASSADOR DAVID M. FRIEDMAN

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, tonight, I stand with my Congressional Black Caucus members, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE and Congressman JAMAAL BOWMAN, to recognize the tragic death of George Floyd, which has awakened the Nation and is designed to provide support to all providers is helpful, more support is needed, especially in regions that fall well below the median household income at the national average.

Madam Speaker, this major shift has put some of America's hospitals on the brink of financial disaster. While a provider grant program that costs $175 billion and is designed to provide support to all providers is helpful, more support is needed, especially in regions that fall well below the median household income at the national average.

Madam Speaker, this legislation will convert Medicare accelerated and advance payment loans to grants to ensure the additional financial support hospitals and other providers direly need.

Hospitals across my district have experienced heavy loss of patients due to the coronavirus pandemic. They canceled tens of thousands of elective surgeries and nonemergency patient tests, at the government's request, to help ensure adequate hospital capacity, preserve gear and equipment, and reduce the risk of unnecessary patient spread.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues and I have introduced legislation to support the COVID–19 Hospital Loan Conversion Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation that I have introduced along with my good friend from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Madam Speaker, our Nation’s hospitals have invested heavily to prepare for and care for us during the coronavirus pandemic. They canceled tens of thousands of elective surgeries and nonemergency patient tests, at the government's request, to help ensure adequate hospital capacity, preserve gear and equipment, and reduce the risk of unnecessary patient spread.

Madam Speaker, this major shift has put some of America’s hospitals on the brink of financial disaster. While a provider grant program that costs $175 billion and is designed to provide support to all providers is helpful, more support is needed, especially in regions that fall well below the median household income at the national average.

Madam Speaker, this legislation will convert Medicare accelerated and advance payment loans to grants to ensure the additional financial support hospitals and other providers direly need.

Hospitals across my district have shared that in the absence of more financial support, including this assistance, it is possible they will be forced to close their significantly scaled back operations.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the bill, the Gibbes-Kaptur-Kaptur-Gibbs bill, to help these hospitals out.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, this legislation will provide support to all providers, including hospitals and other health care providers, to ensure they can continue to provide vital services to our communities.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Justice Giordano of Pennsylvania. Justice Giordano, a 17-year-old junior at Portage Area High School, has been selected by the Pennsylvania Chapter of Students Against Destructive Decisions to serve as an ambassador for the upcoming year.

Students Against Destructive Decisions, often referred to as SADD, is the nation’s premier youth health and safety organization. The organization’s mission is to empower young people to successfully confront the risks and pressures that challenge them throughout their daily lives. Justice will play an integral role in achieving that mission and raising awareness across the Commonwealth. Most recently, Justice has shifted her focus to the dangers of vaping and electronic cigarettes.

Justice’s school principal had nothing but great things to say about her. He said, “Justice is a leader among her peers, and she strives to make positive decisions while making those around her better. We are very proud of Justice here at Portage Area.”

Madam Speaker, I am confident Justice’s positive attitude and dedication to helping fellow students will help her excel in this exciting new role.

Congratulations, Justice.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, with great expectation, we expect to have the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act on the floor of the House this week.

I am joined in these special 1-minute speeches by Congressman BOWMAN from New York and Congresswoman LEE of California. On behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, we are here to let the nation know that, in order to transform policing, we must hold bad actors accountable while working to prevent instances of brutality and misconduct.

As a mother and a grandmother of Black men and boys, these issues are really personal to me and my family and countless other families who face excessive force from law enforcement each and every day. This bill will address racial profiling, create a use-of-force database, improve transparency with a national police misconduct database, ban no-knock warrants and choke holds, end qualified immunity—nobody is above the law—and will limit the transfer of military-grade equipment to State and local law enforcement.

We stand with the American people to turn this moment of agony into one of action, as we honor Mr. George Floyd’s life and the lives of all those killed by police brutality. We will continue working with the millions of Americans marching and demanding action, and we will not stop until this legislation becomes law.

As an original cosponsor of this bill, I urge us to take this opportunity to honor the lives of all police misconduct victims by preventing future cases from occurring.

TRANSFORMING POLICE AND HOLDING BAD ACTORS ACCOUNTABLE

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, tonight, I stand with my Congressional Black Caucus members, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE and Congressman JAMAAL BOWMAN, to recognize the tragic death of George Floyd, which has awakened the Nation and is designed to provide support to all providers is helpful, more support is needed, especially in regions that fall well below the median household income at the national average.

Madam Speaker, this legislation will convert Medicare accelerated and advance payment loans to grants to ensure the additional financial support hospitals and other providers direly need.

Hospitals across my district have shared that in the absence of more financial support, including this assistance, it is possible they will be forced to close their significantly scaled back operations.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the bill, the Gibbes-Kaptur-Kaptur-Gibbs bill, to help these hospitals out.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Justice Giordano of Pennsylvania. Justice Giordano, a 17-year-old junior at Portage Area High School, has been selected by the Pennsylvania Chapter of Students Against Destructive Decisions to serve as an ambassador for the upcoming year.

Students Against Destructive Decisions, often referred to as SADD, is the nation’s premier youth health and safety organization. The organization’s mission is to empower young people to successfully confront the risks and pressures that challenge them throughout their daily lives. Justice will play an integral role in achieving that mission and raising awareness across the Commonwealth. Most recently, Justice has shifted her focus to the dangers of vaping and electronic cigarettes.

Justice’s school principal had nothing but great things to say about her. He said, “Justice is a leader among her peers, and she strives to make positive decisions while making those around her better. We are very proud of Justice here at Portage Area.”

Madam Speaker, I am confident Justice’s positive attitude and dedication to helping fellow students will help her excel in this exciting new role.

Congratulations, Justice.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, with great expectation, we expect to have the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act on the floor of the House this week.

I am joined in these special 1-minute speeches by Congressman BOWMAN from New York and Congresswoman LEE of California. On behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, we are here to let the nation know that, in order to transform policing, we must hold bad actors accountable while working to prevent instances of brutality and misconduct.

As a mother and a grandmother of Black men and boys, these issues are really personal to me and my family and countless other families who face excessive force from law enforcement each and every day. This bill will address racial profiling, create a use-of-force database, improve transparency with a national police misconduct database, ban no-knock warrants and choke holds, end qualified immunity—nobody is above the law—and will limit the transfer of military-grade equipment to State and local law enforcement.

We stand with the American people to turn this moment of agony into one of action, as we honor Mr. George Floyd’s life and the lives of all those killed by police brutality. We will continue working with the millions of Americans marching and demanding action, and we will not stop until this legislation becomes law.

As an original cosponsor of this bill, I urge us to take this opportunity to honor the lives of all police misconduct victims by preventing future cases from occurring.
HONORING THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the American Red Cross for celebrating 140 years of service.

Since their founding by Clara Barton in 1881, the American Red Cross has been paramount in preventing and alleviating human suffering in the face of emergencies.

As an organization, they aspire to turn compassion into action so that countless individuals affected by disaster receive care, shelter, and hope. They are part of the world’s largest volunteer network found in nearly 200 countries. The American Red Cross developed the first nationwide civilian blood program in the 1940s, and they still provide more than 40 percent of the blood products in this country.

As we continue to navigate this health crisis, they remain steadfast in their commitment to delivering much-needed communities across the Nation. I am extremely grateful for the work the American Red Cross has done to uplift those in need.

A LIFETIME OF DEALING WITH POLICE BRUTALITY AND POLICE MISCONDUCT

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

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise proudly in support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, along with my colleagues, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

Unfortunately, I have had a lifetime of dealing with police brutality and police misconduct. It first happened when I was 11 years old. I was simply horse-playing with some of my friends in my neighborhood when the police approached us and asked us to keep it down. Because we had the audacity to ask a follow-up question, I was grabbed on my arm, I was thrown against the wall, and I was variously struck in the back, handcuffed, and night-sticked in the back.

Unfortunately, this was the first time, but not the last time. I have been taken out of my car and handcuffed, taken to jail and released without seeing a judge. Unfortunately, this is the norm for too many African Americans and too many poor people across this country.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act so that we can finally have justice and most importantly, accountability across this country. Those who serve us in law enforcement are not above the law.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

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

Mr. FLEISHMANN. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to join my colleagues in opposition to the resolution that would deny the U.S. recognition of the government of Taiwan in favor of the government of China.

Taiwan is a self-governing, democratic entity with a rich history and cultural ties to the Chinese people. It is a beacon of freedom and democracy in the region. Recognizing the government of Taiwan would send a message that contradicts our commitment to the one-China policy.

A RULE FOR Plates

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

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to require the Speaker’s desk to place a copy of the rule notice on a safe, metal plate before introducing legislation.

Without this rule, representatives may be unaware of pending legislation, and important fracking-related bills may pass with little to no debate or consideration.
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RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR FOR THE 117TH CONGRESS

Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives,

Washington, DC, March 1, 2021.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause (2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I hereby submit the Rules of the Committee on Education and Labor for the 117th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record.

These Rules were adopted in an open meeting of the Committee on February 8, 2021, by voice vote.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT,
Chairman.

RULE 1. REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held on the second Wednesday of each month at 10:00 a.m., while the House is in session.

(b) The Chair may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or the conduct of other Committee business.

(c) If at least three members of the Committee desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chair, those members may file with the clerk of the Committee their written request to the Chair for that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the staff director of the Committee shall notify the Chair of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the request, the Chair does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Committee may file with the clerk of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the staff director of the Committee shall notify all members of the Committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered. Such notice shall be made publicly available in electronic form and shall satisfy the notice requirements in clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(d) Legislative meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be open to the public, including radio, television, and still photography, and such nontelevised meetings are closed pursuant to the requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

No business meeting of the Committee, other than regular and special meetings, may be held without each member being given reasonable notice.

(e) The Speaker may call a meeting of the Committee in order to consider business at any time the House is in session.

RULE 2. DECORUM

The Chair shall enforce decorum including with regard to actions that impact the health and safety of Members and staff and also extend the rules of the House to the Committee.

RULE 3. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES AND JURISDICTION

(a) There shall be five standing subcommittees. In addition to conducting oversight in the area of their respective jurisdictions as required in clause 2 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each subcommittee shall have the following jurisdiction:

Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.—Education from early learning through school level, including but not limited to early care and education programs such as the Head Start Program and the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act, special education, and homeless and migrant education; overseas dependent schools; career and technical education; school climate; and bullying.

Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment.—Education and workforce development beyond the high school level, including but not limited to higher education generally, postsecondary student assistance and employment services, and the Higher Education Act, including campus safety and climate; adult education; postsecondary career and technical education, apprenticeship programs, and workforce development, including but not limited to the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, vocational rehabilitation, and workforce development block grant programs; federal- and state-funded programs related to the arts and humanities, museums and library services, and arts and humanities; science and technology programs; and domestic service and national service programs, including the Corporation for National and Community Service.

Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.—Wages and hours of workers, including but not limited to the Davis-Bacon Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, the Service Contract Act, and the Fair Labor Standards Act; workers’ compensation, including but not limited to the Federal Employees’ Compensation Act, the Longshore and Harbor Workers’ Compensation Act, and the Black Lung Benefits Act; the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act; the Family and Medical Leave Act; the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act; the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988; trade, immigration, labor rights and immigration issues as they affect employers and workers; and workers’ safety and health, including but not limited to occupational safety and health, mine safety and health, and agricultural worker safety and health.

Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.—Matters dealing with relation-
RULE 8. HEARING PROCEDURE
(a) The Chair, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chair, in the case of hearings conducted by the subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing. The announcement shall set forth any alternation of the hearing, or date or time of the hearing not previously determined. The opening statement of any witness, or a statement of the Committee, shall be printed in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable after such public announcement is made.

(b) Subcommittees are authorized to hold hearings, receive exhibits, hear witnesses, and report to the Committee for final action, together with such recommendations as may be made upon the subcommittee.

(c) All opening statements at hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee shall be part of the permanent written record. Opening statements by members may not be presented orally, unless the Chair authorizes them. Only one such statement shall be made by any member of the Committee or any subcommittee. Such statements shall be furnished to all members, as well as to the staff director of the Committee. The staff director shall promptly furnish to the staff director the hearing record a brief summary thereof, and shall notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Committee or any subcommittee is a witness scheduled to testify at any hearing or a designee may also make a statement. If a witness scheduled to testify at any hearing of the Committee or any subcommittee is a witness scheduled to testify at any hearing, the staff director of the Committee or any subcommittee shall file with the staff director the hearing record a brief summary thereof, and shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Committee or any subcommittee.

(d) In an investigative hearing or in an executive session, the Committee may conduct a hearing at which no record is kept. In such a case, the Chair of the Committee shall cause a record to be made public announcement of the final list of witnesses scheduled to testify at least 48 hours before the commencement of the hearing. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the hearing record as soon as practicable after such public announcement is made.

RULE 9. QUESTIONING OF HEARING WITNESSES
(a) Subject to clauses (b), (c), and (d), a Committee member may question hearing witnesses only when the member has been recognized by the Chair for that purpose, and only for a five-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The questioning of witnesses in both Committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chair, followed by the Ranking Member and other alternates authorized by the majority party and minority party. The Chair shall exercise discretion in determining the order in which members will be recognized. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chair shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority party present and shall establish the order of questioning such a manner as to place the members of the majority party in a disadvantaged position.

(b) The Chair may permit a specified number of members to question a witness for longer than five minutes. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this clause shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(c) The Chair may permit the subcommittee staff for the majority and the minority party members to question a witness for equal specified periods. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this clause shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

RULE 10. SUBPOENA AUTHORITY
The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chair of the full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(ii) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Member prior to issuing any subpoena under such authority. To the extent practicable, the Chair or majority staff shall consult with the Ranking Member at least 24 hours in advance of a subpoena being issued under such authority, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays. Any subpoena issued under such authority shall be recognized by the Chair in writing all members of the Committee and the issuance of the subpoena.

RULE 11. DEPOSITION PROCEDURE
(a) In accordance with Section 3 of H. Res. 8, regarding deposition authority in the House of Representatives, the Chair, upon consultation with the Committee, may order the taking of depositions pursuant to notice or subpoena as contemplated by this rule.

(b) The Chair or majority staff shall consult with the Ranking Member or minority staff no less than three business days before any notice or subpoena for a deposition is issued. After such consultation, the members shall receive written notice that a notice or subpoena for a deposition will be issued.

(c) A notice or subpoena issued under this rule shall specify the date, time, and place of the deposition and the method or methods by which the deposition will be recorded. Prior to testifying, a deponent shall be provided with a copy of the Committee’s rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(d) A deposition shall be conducted by one or more members or Committee counsel as designated by the Chair or Ranking Member.
(2) A deposition shall be taken under oath or affirmation administered by a member or a person otherwise authorized to administer oaths and affirmations.

(e) The deponent shall be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise the deponent of the deponent’s rights. Only members and Committee counsel, however, may examine the deponent. The deponent may be questioned by the deponent other than members, Committee staff designated by the Chair or Ranking Member, such individuals as may be required to administer oaths or affirmations, such electronic transcription staff as may be engaged to transcribe or record the proceedings, the deponent, and the deponent’s counsel (including personal counsel for flexibility employing the deponent if the scope of the deposition is expected to cover actions taken as part of the deponent’s employment). A stenographer for other persons or entities may not attend.

(f) (1) Unless the majority, minority, and deponent agree otherwise, questions in a deposition shall be propounded in rounds, alternating between the majority and minority. A single round shall not exceed 60 minutes per side. When the members or counsel conducting the deposition agree to a different length of questioning. In each round, a member or Committee counsel designated by the Chair or Ranking Member may first, and the minority member or Committee counsel designated by the Ranking Member shall ask questions second.

(2) When during a deposition must be stated concisely and in a non-argumentative and non-suggestive manner. Dependent may refuse to answer a question only to preserve a privilege. When the deponent has objected and refused to answer a question to preserve a privilege, the Chair may order any such objection to which a privilege objection was lodged, such ruling shall be filed with the clerk of the Committee and shall be provided to members and the deponent no less than three days before the ruling is enforced at a reconvened deposition. If a member of the Committee appears in writing the ruling of the Chair, the appeal shall be preserved for Committee consideration. A deponent who refuses to answer a question on the ground of privilege, the Chair in writing may be subject to sanction, except that no sanctions may be imposed if the ruling of the Chair is reversed on appeal. Any deposition testimony for which an objection has been made is offered for admission in evidence before the Committee, all properly lodged objections shall be considered by the Committee prior to admission in evidence before the Committee.

(g) Deposition testimony shall be transcribed by any stenographic means and may also be video recorded. The clerk of the Committee shall receive the transcript and any video recording and promptly forward such to members of the Committee at the same time the clerk distributes such to other majority staff.

(h) The individual administering the oath shall certify that the transcript is a true, verbatim record of the testimony, and the transcript and any exhibits shall be filed, as shall any video recording, with the clerk of the Committee. In no case shall any video recording be considered the official transcript of a deposition or electronic deposition as the certified written transcript.

(i) After receiving the transcript, majority staff shall make available the transcript for review by the deponent or deponent’s counsel. No later than ten business days thereafter, the deponent may submit suggested changes to the Chair. Committee majority staff may direct the clerk of the Committee to note any typographical errors, including any requested by the deponent or minority staff, of an amendment to the transcript. Any proposed substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments to the deposition testimony shall be initialed by the electronic transcription staff as an affirmation that includes the deponent’s reasons therefore. Any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments shall be initialed by the electronic transcription staff, a copy of which shall be promptly forwarded to minority staff.

The Ranking Member shall consult regarding the release of deposition transcript or electronic recordings. If other objections in writing to a proposed release of a deposition transcript or electronic recording, or a portion thereof, the matter shall be promptly referred to the Committee for resolution.

RULE 12. QUORUMS

One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than amending Committee rules, closing a meeting, or adjourning a meeting from a quorum to a quorum. For the enumerated actions, a majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. Any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE 13. REFERRAL OF BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) The Chair shall consult with the subcommittee chair regarding referral to the appropriate subcommittees of such bills, resolutions, and other matters submitted by the deponent, or committee as a subcommittee to the Committee for further consideration. Only the Majority Chair of the Committee or the Ranking Member may recall the proceedings of the Committee for further consideration. When the Committee agrees to recall proceedings for further consideration, the Committee shall, with in three weeks of such availability, provide notice of referral, if any, to the appropriate subcommittee.

(b) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until three days have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittees at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless such legislation is otherwise submitted by the deponent or committee as a subcommittee to the Committee for further consideration. The proposed legislation shall be included as an appendix to the transcript. Any proposed substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments shall be initialed by the electronic transcription staff as an affirmation that includes the deponent’s reasons therefore. Any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments shall be initialed by the electronic transcription staff, a copy of which shall be promptly forwarded to minority staff.

The Chair shall provide the Ranking Member a copy of any Committee letter exchanged with another committee waiving Committee consideration of a bill referred to the Committee within 24 hours of issuing such a letter.

RULE 14. VOTES

(a) With respect to each roll call vote on a motion to report any bill, resolution, or matter of public charge of an amendment offered thereto, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of the members voting shall be included in the Committee report on the matter or measure.

(b) In accordance with clause 2(b)(4) of Rule II of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chair of the Committee or a subcommittee is authorized to postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment. Such Chair may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underhanging proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE 15. RECORDS AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Written records shall be kept of the proceedings of the Committee and of each action of the Committee on any roll call vote. The written records shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order,
or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition; and the names of those members present and voting. The text of an amendment offered to a measure or matter considered in Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than the day following its final disposition in Committee. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member.

(b) In accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, any official record of the Committee (including any record of a legislative, oversight, or other activity of the Committee or any subcommittee) shall be made available for public use if such record has been in existence for 50 years; or

(1) any record that the Committee (or a subcommittee) makes available for public use before such record is delivered to the Archivist under clause 2 of Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be maintained and preserved by the Committee immediately, including any record described in subsection (a) of this Rule;

(2) any investigative record that contains personal data relating to a specific living individual (the disclosure of which would be an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy), any administrative record with respect to personal privacy, and any record with respect to an investigation hearing closed pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be available if such record has been in existence for 50 years; or

(3) except as otherwise provided by order of the House of Representatives, any record of the Committee that, for a time, schedule, or condition for availability is specified by order of the Committee (entered during the Congress in which the record is made or acquired by the Committee) shall be made available in accordance with the order of the Committee.

(c) The official permanent records of the Committee include noncurrent records of the Committee (including subcommittees) delivered by the Clerk of the House of Representatives or by any member of the Committee (after the Committee’s records are accepted for preservation at the National Archives and Records Administration, which are the property of and remain subject to the rules and orders of the House of Representatives.

(d) Any order of the Committee with respect to the adoption of a measure for which a quorum consisting of a majority of the members of the Committee is present at the time of the vote, and a majority of those present and voting approve the adoption of the order, which shall be submitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, together with any accompanying report.

(2) This subsection applies to any order of the Committee.

(A) provides for the non-availability of any record subject to subsection (b) of this rule for a period longer than the period otherwise applicable; or

(B) is subsequent to, and constitutes a later order under clause 4(b) of Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, regarding a determination of the Committee's right to take action on a matter which has been delivered to the Archivist under clause 2 of Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; or

(C) is a report, committee, or subcommittee report, with which the Committee has made an order under clause 4(a) of Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the staff director of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the staff director of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the Chair of the Committee a notice of the filing of that request.

(2) Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the Committee as of the time they are reported. No bill or resolution or other matter reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee until it has been delivered or electronically sent to all members and notice of its prior transmission has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours before the commencement of the meeting. When a bill is reported from a subcommittee, such measure shall be accompanied by a section-by-section analysis; and, if the Chair of the Committee so requests, by a request from the Ranking Member of the Committee or for other reasons, a comparison showing proposed changes in existing law.

(c)(1) The chair of the Committee, or a subcommittee thereof and therefore may not necessarily reflect the views of its members.

Such disclaimer need not be included if the report was circulated to all members of the Committee at least seven days prior to its submission to the House of Representatives and provision is made for the filing by any member, as part of the printed report, of individual, minority, or dissenting views.

(2) All Committee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report:

This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Education and Labor or any subcommittee thereof and therefore may not necessarily reflect the views of its members.

The minority party members of the Committee shall have three calendar days, excluding weekends and holidays, to file, as part of the printed report, supplemental, minority, or additional views.

(c)(2) Reports of subcommittees. Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the Committee, the chair of the subcommittee reports the name of the bill or matter to the Committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the Committee. The chair shall provide the Committee with a copy of the report of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps for acting on such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(1) In any event, the report, described in the proviso in subsection (c)(2) of this rule, shall be filed with the Committee if such report has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of
(1) Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, or still photography, subject to the requirements of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and except when the hearing or meeting is closed pursuant to the Rules of the House of Representatives and of the Committee. The coverage of any hearing or meeting of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the Chair of the Committee, the subcommittee chair, or other member of the Committee presiding at such hearing and may be terminated by such member in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be accredited to Committee business and no other Hirod, for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee; and, after consultation with the minority party membership, the Chair shall include the amounts budgeted for majority party members for staff personnel to be under the direction and supervision of the minority party, travel expenses of minority party members and staff, office expenses. All travel expenses of minority party members and staff shall be paid for out of the amounts so set aside and budgeted by the Chair. The Chair shall determine when it is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the Committee duly authorized by the House of Representatives. After such budget shall have been adopted, no change shall be made in such budget unless approved by the Committee. The Chair or the chair of any standing subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Committee Rule 21 within the limits of their portion of the consolidated budget as approved by the House, and the Chair may execute necessary vouchers therefor.

(b) Subject to the Rules of the House of Representatives and procedures prescribed by the Committee on House Administration, and with the prior authorization of the Chair of the Committee in each case, there may be expended in any one session of Congress for necessary travel expenses of witnesses attending hearings in Washington, D.C.: (1) Out of funds budgeted and set aside for each subcommittee, not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending hearings of each such subcommittee; (2) Out of funds budgeted for the full Committee majority, not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending full Committee hearings; and (3) Out of funds set aside to the minority party members:

(a) Not to exceed, for each of the subcommittees, $5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending subcommittee hearings, and (b) Not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending full Committee hearings.

(c) A full and detailed monthly report accounting for all expenditures of Committee funds shall be maintained by the Committee, and it shall be available to each member of the Committee. Such a report shall show the amount and purpose of each expenditure, and the budget to which such expenditure is attributed.

Rule 24. Changes in Committee Rules

The Committee shall not consider a proposed change in these rules unless the text of such change has been delivered or electronically sent to all members and notice of its prior transmission has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours prior to such consideration.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. NEWMAN). Pursuant to section 5(a)(1)(B) of House Resolution 8, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. to-morrow. Thereupon (at 10 o’clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 2021, at 9 a.m.

EC-481. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP)); Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes (Docket No.: FAA-2020-0698; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-0134-AD; Amendment 21-2020-0698; AD 2020-24-03) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-482. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. Airplanes (Docket No.: FAA-2020-0795; Product Identifier MCAI-2020-0134-AD; Amendment 21-2020-0795; AD 2020-24-03) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-483. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. Airplanes (Docket No.: FAA-2020-0693; Product Identifier MCAI-2020-0134-AD; Amendment 21-2020-0693; AD 2020-24-01) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
H.R. 1452. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy, and to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for prohibitions on service dogs to veterans with mental illness.

H.R. 1453. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require firearm assembly accounts for small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on the net value of assets of a taxpayer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1455. A bill to obtain and direct the President to purchase from the United States Armed Forces into hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1456. A bill to require the purchase by United States employers with a defunded a municipal police department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1457. A bill to prohibit funds available for the United States Armed Forces to be obligated or expended for introduction of foreign personnel officers in United States Armed Forces into hostilities, and for other purposes; to add provisions for the registration of certain aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1458. A bill to modernize the technology for delivery of unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1459. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1460. A bill to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1461. A bill to provide transparency regarding waivers granted to individuals from executive orders related to ethics committees or compliance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

H.R. 1462. A bill to modify the requirements for the registration of certain aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 1463. A bill to require a joint task force on air travel during and after the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

H.R. 1464. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons listed in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence report titled “Assessing the Saudi Government’s Role in the Killing of Jamal Khashoggi”, dated February 11, 2021; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 1465. A bill to require the purchase by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 1466. A bill to require the purchase by the Federal Department of certain medical
supplies and protection equipment from the
Committee on Armed Services, and in addi-
tion to the Committee on House Administra-
tion, for other purposes; to the Committee on
Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEUBE:
H.R. 1473. A bill to require the Commissi-
oner of Food and Drugs and the Director of
the Centers for Disease Control and Preven-
tion to report to Congress all serious adverse
events that are reported to such agencies in
connection with administration of a COVID-
19 vaccine, and for other purposes; to the
Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WATERERS (for herself and Mr. SMITH):
H.R. 1474. A bill to amend the Public
Health Service Act to authorize grants for
training and support for families and un-
paid caregivers of people living with
Alzheimer’s disease or a related dementia;
to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself,
Mr. KATKO, Mrs. HAYES, MR. BARRAGAN,
Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CLEVER, Ms. DEAN,
Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE of
Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi,
Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr.
KASKIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. DUNCAN,
Ms. PORTON, Mr. CLARKE of New York, Mr.
SMITH of Washington, Ms. VARGAS, Mr. TRONE,
Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BASS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ,
Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SAN
NICOLAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCALAN,
Mr. OMAR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms.
WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of
Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FITZPATRICK,
Mr. COHEN, Mr. GUI

ja

H.R. 1467. A bill to amend the Peace Corps
Act to ensure access to menstrual products for
Peace Corps volunteers, and for other
purposes; to the Committee on Foreign
Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 1468. A bill to amend title 40, United
States Code, to eliminate the leasing author-
purposes; to the Committee on Natural
Resources.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself and Mr.
GOLDY):
H.R. 1469. A bill to amend the Wild and
Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain river
segments within the York watershed in the
State of Pennsylvania as components of the Na-
tional Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and
for other purposes; to the Committee on Nat-
ural Resources.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms.
BEATTY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. NORTON,
Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr.
KHANNA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BLUMENAUER,
Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms.
BLAIS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK,
Ms. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr.
SCHACHTER, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms.
DEGETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES,
Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLARK of Massachusetts,
Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. LEVIN of Cal-
ifornia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr.
MCGOVERN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN,
Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr.
DELBENGE, Mr. MOUTON, Ms. BUSH, Mr.
BONAMICI, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of
Georgia).

H.R. 1470. A bill to amend the Revised
Statutes to remove the defense of qualified
imunity in the case of any action under
section 1983, and for other purposes; to the
Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself and Mr.
FITZPATRICK):
H.R. 1471. A bill to amend the Federal
Credit Union Act to include an exception for
credit unions and, for other pur-
purposes, to the Committee on Financial Ser-

By Mrs. STEEL (for herself, Mr.
MCCARTHY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LOVATTO,
Mr. NUSSER, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr.
ISSA, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr.
MCCINTOCK, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr.
OBERNOLTE, and Mr. GRIJALVA):
H.R. 1472. A bill to prohibit the use of Fed-
eral financial assistance for a certain high-
speed rail development project in the State
of California that was subject to a previous
cooperative agreement, and for other pur-
purposes; to the Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, and the Committee on
Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEUBE:
H.R. 1473. A bill to require the Commissi-
oner of Food and Drugs and the Director of
the Centers for Disease Control and Preven-
tion to report to Congress all serious adverse
events that are reported to such agencies in
connection with administration of a COVID-
19 vaccine, and for other purposes; to the
Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WATERERS (for herself and Mr. SMITH):
H.R. 1474. A bill to amend the Public
Health Service Act to authorize grants for
training and support for families and un-
paid caregivers of people living with
Alzheimer’s disease or a related dementia;
to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself,
Mr. KATKO, Mrs. HAYES, MR. BARRAGAN,
Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CLEVER, Ms. DEAN,
Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE of
Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi,
Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr.
KASKIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. DUNCAN,
Ms. PORTON, Mr. CLARKE of New York, Mr.
SMITH of Washington, Ms. VARGAS, Mr. TRONE,
Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BASS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ,
Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SAN
NICOLAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCALAN,
Mr. OMAR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms.
WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of
Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FITZPATRICK,
Mr. COHEN, Mr. GUI

ja

H.R. 1467. A bill to amend the Peace Corps
Act to ensure access to menstrual products for
Peace Corps volunteers, and for other
purposes; to the Committee on Foreign
Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 1468. A bill to amend title 40, United
States Code, to eliminate the leasing author-
purposes; to the Committee on Natural
Resources.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself and Mr.
GOLDY):
H.R. 1469. A bill to amend the Wild and
Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain river
segments within the York watershed in the
State of Pennsylvania as components of the Na-
tional Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and
for other purposes; to the Committee on Nat-
ural Resources.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms.
BEATTY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. NORTON,
Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr.
KHANNA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BLUMENAUER,
Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms.
BLAIS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK,
Ms. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr.
SCHACHTER, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms.
DEGETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES,
Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLARK of Massachusetts,
Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. LEVIN of Cal-
ifornia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr.
MCGOVERN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN,
Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr.
DELBENGE, Mr. MOUTON, Ms. BUSH, Mr.
BONAMICI, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of
Georgia).

H.R. 1470. A bill to amend the Revised
Statutes to remove the defense of qualified
imunity in the case of any action under
section 1983, and for other purposes; to the
Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself and Mr.
FITZPATRICK):
H.R. 1471. A bill to amend the Federal
Credit Union Act to include an exception for
disaster area member business loans made by
insured credit unions, and for other pur-
purposes, to the Committee on Financial Ser-

By Mrs. STEEL (for herself, Mr.
MCCARTHY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LOVATTO,
Mr. NUSSER, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr.
ISSA, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr.
MCCINTOCK, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr.
OBERNOLTE, and Mr. GRIJALVA):
H.R. 1472. A bill to prohibit the use of Fed-
eral financial assistance for a certain high-
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 13
The Congress shall have Power to provide and maintain a Navy.

By Mr. CLOUD:
H.R. 1449.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States: “The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect taxes . . .”

By Mr. CLOUD:
H.R. 1450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States: “The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect taxes . . .”

By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 1451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CROW:
H.R. 1453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. ESPAILLAT:
H.R. 1454.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8:
To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida:
H.R. 1455.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I
By Mr. GARAMENDI:
H.R. 1456.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. Himes:
H.R. 1457.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution clauses 11, 12, 13, 14, 18
By Mr. HORSFORD:
H.R. 1458.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States
By Ms. JAYAPAL:
H.R. 1459.
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 Ms. KUSTER:
H.R. 1460.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. LYNCH:
H.R. 1461.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. LYNCH:
H.R. 1462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. MALINOWSKI:
H.R. 1463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. MCEINLEY:
H.R. 1464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. MENG:
H.R. 1465.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution
By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 1466.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. PINGREE:
H.R. 1467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section clause 1 and Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. SHERMAN:
H.R. 1468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. STEEL:
H.R. 1469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section clause 1 and Article 1, section 8, clause 18
By Mr. STRUMBE:
H.R. 1470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. TUCKER:
H.R. 1471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution
By Mrs. STEELE:
H.R. 1472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. STRUMBE:
H.R. 1473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes:

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;
To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;
To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;
To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;
To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;
To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;
To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;
To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Repraisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;
To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;
To provide and maintain a Navy;
By Ms. WATERS:
H.R. 1474.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:
H.R. 1475.
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 Officer thereof.

By Mr. ZELDIN:
H.R. 1476.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

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. DEUTCH
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ethics in H.R. 1 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MS. JOHNSON OF TEXAS
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 1 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MS. LOGHREY
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Reform in H.R. 1 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MRS. CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Reform in H.R. 1 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;
The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 1 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

Offered by Mr. Neal

The provisions 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.

Offered by Mr. Scott of Virginia

The provisions in H.R. 1 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.

Offered by Mr. Smith of Washington

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Armed Services in H.R. 1 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

Offered by Mr. Thompson of Mississippi

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Homeland Security in H.R. 1 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

Offered by Ms. Waters

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Financial Services in H.R. 1 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative Scanlon or a designee to H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2021, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

Offered by Mr. Nadler

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 1280 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

Offered by Mr. Smith of Washington

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Armed Services in H.R. 1280 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

Offered by Mr. Pallone

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 1280 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.
The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tem (Mr. Leahy).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who commands the morning to appear, we place our trust in You. Lord, You keep us from dishonor. Continue to show our lawmakers the path where they should fall. Point them to the right road. When they have doubts, remove their uncertainty with Your wisdom. When they have fears, remind them that You are their refuge and strength. When they experience failure, strengthen them to rise again. Lord, lead them by Your truth and teach them how to make their path. Strengthen Our law-makers the path where they should fall.

We pray in Your matchless 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The President pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE

The President pro tempore. Pursuant to S. Res. 29, the Secretary of the Senate-elect will now present herself to the desk to take the oath of office.

Soneria Ann Berry, escorted by Mr. Schumer, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to her by the President pro tempore.

The President pro tempore. Congratulations, Madam Secretary.

(Appause.)

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The President pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.


Mr. Schumer. Mr. President, it is a proud day for the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 78, submitted earlier today. The Presiding Officer. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 78) notifying the President of the United States of the election of the Secretary of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution. Mr. Schumer. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 79) was agreed to. (The resolution is printed in today’s Record under “Submitted Resolutions.”) The President pro tempore. The majority leader.

SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. Schumer. Mr. President, we begin this week on a joyful note: welcoming an outstanding individual to serve as the new Secretary of the Senate, Ann Berry from the office of one Senator Patrick Leahy.

The position of the Secretary of the Senate dates back to April 8, 1789, just 2 days after the Senate achieved its first quorum. Today, 1 day after the conclusion of Black History Month and on the first day of Women’s History Month, Ann Berry was just sworn in as the first Black woman to ever serve as Secretary of the Senate—another glass ceiling broken.

It is a testament to her outstanding career as a public servant of the highest caliber. Over her 40 years in Washington, Ann has come to know the ins and outs of the Senate better than just about anyone else who works in the Capitol Complex. She came to Washington, a proud native of Birmingham,
AL, and a graduate of the University of North Alabama, to work for Senator Howell Heflin.

Clearly, word got around about her talents because, over the course of her career, she went to work for Senators CARPER, EDWARDS, MOWRYHAN, JONES, and, most recently, as Senator LEAHY’s deputy chief of staff, where she was an indispensable resource not only to Senator LEAHY’s office but to my team and to countless other Senators.

I want to thank Senator LEAHY for parting with Ann and lending her considerable talents to the full Senate. He told me he regretted her going, but he was so glad that the Senate had seen her talents.

And thank you, Ann. Thank you for accepting this incredible responsibility. Congratulations on beginning your historic tenure, and we all wish you the best as you work to bring this great institution to life.

As we all welcome Ann to her new role, I think we can all say good-bye to Julie Adams and Mary Jones. Over the last 6 years, Julie Adams and Mary Jones have served as Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Senate with impeccable skill and unflappable professionalism.

Both are longtime veterans of Washington. Julie worked for many years under Leader MCCONNELL and First Lady Laura Bush, while Mary served in the White House under President George H. W. Bush and, as I remember, because I was, I guess, chairman or ranking member—I can’t recall which, maybe both—as staff director of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, where she did just a great job.

Both of them are friendly and familiar faces around here in the Senate. Both have earned the respect here in the Senate of just about everyone who has worked with them.

Of course, Julie and Mary deserve special mention for their long tenure over the last 12 months. As a global pandemic forced the Senate to adapt to new ways, they kept the Senate functioning in the midst of this historic crisis. And in the wake of the horrific attacks on January 6, Julie and Mary were heroic—heroic—in getting the Senate back on its feet only a few hours after the violence had been quelled.

To Julie and Mary, thank you. Thank you for all you have done. The entire Senate wishes you and your families the very best, and we look forward to seeing what the road ahead holds for both of you.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, pro tempore, now, on Senate business, the Senate will have a busy week ahead of it. Today and tomorrow, the Senate will confirm for their portfolios members of President Biden’s Cabinet: Dr. Miguel Cardona to serve as Secretary of Education and Governor Gina Raimondo to serve as Commerce Secretary.

The Senate will also confirm Dr. Cecilia Rouse to serve as the Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers, another history-making pick who will be the first Black official to head that Department.

All three nominees are exceptionally well qualified. All have received bipartisan support in their respective committees, including a unanimous vote in favor of Dr. Rouse.

As we continue the fight against the pandemic on all fronts—in particular, the damage it has caused our schools and our economy—these nominees will have a difficult and important task ahead of them. It will be very good news once we have them confirmed and on the job.

The Senate will then return to the American Rescue Plan, comprehensive legislation that will help us crush the virus, recover our economy, and get life back to normal.

(Ms. HIRONO assumed the Chair.)

Defeating the pandemic is national priority No. 1; getting our schools to reopen as safely and quickly as possible; helping businesses hang on until the economy can come roaring back; keeping teachers and firefighters and other essential employees on the job; providing aid to the jobless, food to the hungry, direct cash payments to millions of struggling—for the cost of rent, groceries, medicine, and utilities; speeding the distribution of the vaccine, which is the cornerstone to ending this awfully dark chapter in American history.

That is what our country needs, and that is what the American Rescue Plan will achieve. To paraphrase Franklin Roosevelt, we must do the first things first.

Last week, the legislation passed in the House of Representatives. This week, the Senate will take up the measure. Let me say that again. The Senate will take up the American Rescue Plan this week.

I expect a hearty debate and some late nights, but the American people are desperate for relief, for the cost of rent, groceries, medicine, and utilities; speeding the distribution of the vaccine, which is the cornerstone to ending this awfully dark chapter in American history.

And that is just what we are going to do.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on another matter entirely, voting rights, the story of American democracy is a long and messy one, full of contradictions and halting progress. It was a century and a half after our founding before women got the right to vote, another half century before African Americans could enjoy the full rights of citizenship. It took mighty movements and decades of fraught political conflict even then to basic civil and political rights and establish the United States as a full democracy worthy of the title.

But any American who thinks that today, in 2021, that fight is over—that the fight for voting rights is over—is sorely and, unfortunately, sadly mistaken.

In the wake of the most recent election, the American people and the President has repeatedly lied about and claimed was stolen, more than 253 bills in 43 States have been introduced to tighten voting rules under the pernicious, nasty guise of election integrity.

In Iowa, the State legislature voted to cut early voting by 9 days. Polls will close an hour earlier. And they voted to tighten the rules on absentee voting, which so many—the elderly, the disabled, the frail—depend on.

In Wisconsin, Republican lawmakers have proposed limiting ballot drop boxes to one per municipality—a municipality of hundreds of thousands, and a tiny one gets the small one. I wonder why. I wonder why.

In Arizona, one Republican legislator wants to pass a law allowing the State legislators—listen to this—to ignore the results of the Presidential election and determine their own slate of electors. One legislator in Arizona wants to pass a law allowing voters to ignore the results of the Presidential election and determine their own slate of electors. That doesn’t sound like democracy. That sounds like dictatorship.

The most reprehensible of all efforts might be found in Georgia, where Republicans have introduced a bill to eliminate all early voting on Sundays, a day when Black churches sponsor ‘‘souls to the polls.’’

We have, supposedly—supposedly—come a long way since African Americans in the South were forced to guess the number of jelly beans in a jar in order to be allowed to vote. But it is very difficult to look at the specific laws proposed by Republican legislatures around the country, designed to limit voter participation in heavily African-American and Hispanic areas, to lower turnout and frustrate election administration in urban districts and near college campuses, to gerrymander districts to limit minority representation “with almost surgical precision,” to specifically target and thwart Black churches from organizing voting drives—it is difficult to look at the specific laws proposed by Republican legislatures around the country, designed to limit voter participation in heavily African-American and Hispanic areas, to lower turnout and frustrate election administration in urban districts and near college campuses, to gerrymander districts to limit minority representation “with almost surgical precision,” to specifically target and thwart Black churches from organizing voting drives. But it is difficult to look at the specific laws proposed by Republican legislatures around the country, designed to limit voter participation in heavily African-American and Hispanic areas, to lower turnout and frustrate election administration in urban districts and near college campuses, to gerrymander districts to limit minority representation “with almost surgical precision,” to specifically target and thwart Black churches from organizing voting drives—it is difficult, very difficult not to see the tentacles of America’s generations-old caste system, typically associated with slavery and Jim Crow, stretching into the 21st century and poisoning the wellsprings of any true democracy—from fair and free elections.

We see a lot of despicable things these days, but nothing that seems to be more despicable than this. When you lose an election in a democratic society, you update your party platform and appeal to more voters. You don’t change the rules to make it harder for your opponents to vote, especially not African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and other voters who have
American Rescue Plan

Mr. McCONNELL. On another matter, at about 2 a.m. on Saturday morning, House Democrats rammed through the bananza of partisan spending they are calling a pandemic rescue package. Only Democrats voted for it. Both Republicans and Democrats voted against it.

Last year, under a Republican Senate and a Republican administration, Congress passed five historic coronavirus relief bills—five of them. Not one of the five bills got fewer than 90 votes in the Senate or less than about 80 percent over in the House. All but one of this time Democrats have chosen to go a completely partisan route. Even famous liberal economists and liberal editorial boards are saying their half-baked plan is poorly targeted to what families need.

We have gone from passing public relief with 80 percent and 90 percent bipartisan supermajorities last year to the Speaker of the House ramming this through with just 50.7 percent of the House on Friday night. The bill contains all kinds of liberal spending on pet projects with no relationship whatsoever to pandemic relief.

Remember, we are almost to the 1-year anniversary of a leading House Democrat admitting they see this whole crisis as “a tremendous opportunity to restructure things to fit our vision.”

So, sorry to all the American families who have just been hoping to get their jobs back, their schools back, and their lives back. Democrats are more interested in some restructuring. That is why only 1 percent—1 percent—of this huge package goes directly to vaccinations—1 percent for vaccinations. That is why it proposes another 12 billion dollars for school choice, even though science shows those schools can be made safe right now. About 95 percent of that funding won’t even go out this fiscal year. Ninety-five percent of the school funding in this bill won’t go out this year. And this is an emergency package?

That is why they are pushing economic policies that would drag down our recovery—like the House’s vote for a one-size-fits-all minimum wage policy that would kill 1.4 million jobs or continuing to pay laid-off workers a premium to stay home that would extend well into a recovery where job growth and rehiring will be pivotal.

Whenever their long-term liberal dreams came into conflict with what Americans actually need right now, Democrats decided their ideology should win out.

Well, it doesn’t have to be this way. We could have had more practical policies to help the American people move forward. Some Senate Republicans literally went down to the White House and proposed that both sides work together, like we did five times last year. The administration declined. So this is where we’ve arrived: a bad bill, and a missed opportunity to do right by working families.

Foreign Policy

Mr. McCONNELL. Now, on one final matter, last weekend brought discordant headlines for the supporters of freedom and democracy in Asia. In Burma the military junta’s month-long coup turned bloody. Eighteen protesters have been murdered and at least a thousand civilian officials have been imprisoned on farcical grounds.

In Hong Kong, China’s puppet regime arrested 47 democracy advocates, including some who helped draw millions to the streets in peaceful protests in 2019, and are now holding them without bail.

Unfortunately, in both places, this sort of repression has become a familiar part of life, and it could be a dark preview of developments elsewhere if the free world does not act.

Even as Burma’s civilian government made history in 2015, the military made clear it would keep using cronymism and constitutional manipulation to obstruct real popular control. In last year’s election, the people overwhelmingly demanded true democracy and economic transparency, but that also raised the risk for those working publicly to make permanent reforms.

The military’s detention spree has hit Burma’s civilian leaders, including people like Mya Aye, a longtime Muslim pro-democracy leader. It has also swept up some of the brightest economic reformers working to fight corruption and grow prosperity—brave men like Bo Bo Nge, who spent years locked away in Burma’s Insein prison in the 1980s and 1990s, built a successful life abroad, and returned to help the civilian government craft economic reform. In last year’s election, the people overwhelmingly demanded true democracy and economic transparency, but that also raised the risk for those working publicly to make permanent reforms.

Burma the military junta’s month-long coup has hit Burma’s civilian leaders, including people like Mya Aye, a longtime Muslim pro-democracy leader. It has also swept up some of the brightest economic reformers working to fight corruption and grow prosperity—brave men like Bo Bo Nge, who spent years locked away in Burma’s Insein prison in the 1980s and 1990s, built a successful life abroad, and returned to help the civilian government craft economic reform. In last year’s election, the people overwhelmingly demanded true democracy and economic transparency, but that also raised the risk for those working publicly to make permanent reforms.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this Washington Post article detailing Bo Bo Nge’s story be printed in the Record.

[From the Washington Post, March 1, 2021]

An American Success Story Is Lost in Myanmar’s Coup

(By Shibani Mahtani)

HONG KONG.—Bo Bo Nge’s path typified that of his generation’s brightest and bravest. Jailed as a student for protesting Myanmar’s military regime in 1988, he spent years learning English from dictionary pages...
smuggled into his Yangon cell. After his release and continued persecution, he fled to the United States.

He made a new life, rising from dishwasher to owner in Yangon, said he sold an apartment in 2013 to a British investor for $800,000, and he is now a successful real estate agent. His wife, Hnin Wai Lwin, also a lawyer, has been arrested several times and is currently being held without charge since she was taken by authorities.

But Bo Bo Nge, heartened by a hopeful yet grim future in Myanmar, has gone on, if he was reoriented in a different direction, to become a lawyer's assistant and to pursue economic and political interests, following moves by the United States and other countries to support democracy in Myanmar.

In an interview, he said, "I have been arrested several times and was released on bail in 2013. I have been held for a total of 18 months, but I have not been charged with a crime." He added, "I have never been involved in any illegal activities and I was only arrested because I was a student leader in 1988." He also said, "I believe in non-violent resistance and I have always been a strong supporter of democracy in Myanmar."
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

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

MAIDEN SPEECH

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, I rise today to speak on the Senate floor for the first time as a U.S. Senator from the great State of Alabama.

I want to share some thoughts on how we can work together as a team to improve the lives of our constituents and to provide more opportunity for the next generation of Americans, but before I begin, I want to take a moment to thank the people of Alabama.

For the last 2 years, I have traveled the State, from Mobile to Muscle Shoals, from the Wiregrass to Lake Guntersville, and many places in between. I talked to folks from all walks of life, and I listened. To other people’s hopes, and I listened to their concerns. I heard what they thought was going right in our country and state and what they thought was going wrong, and even after being a football coach my entire career, working day and night, running for the Senate was still the hardest thing I have ever done, but I enjoyed every minute.

In the end, I asked the people of Alabama to trust me with the responsibility of representing them and of rejoining the United States Senate. And, today, I ask for your support.

To the senators from Alabama, I am here to represent you. I am here to listen and to work together as a team.

To the senators of the United States, I am here to represent the people of Alabama.

To the people of Alabama, I am here to represent you.

I have an interest in math and science, and I want to share some thoughts on how we can work together as a team to improve the lives of our constituents and to provide more opportunity for the next generation of Americans.

For the last 2 years, I have traveled the State, from Mobile to Muscle Shoals, from the Wiregrass to Lake Guntersville, and many places in between. I talked to folks from all walks of life, and I listened. To other people’s hopes, and I listened to their concerns. I heard what they thought was going right in our country and state and what they thought was going wrong, and even after being a football coach my entire career, working day and night, running for the Senate was still the hardest thing I have ever done, but I enjoyed every minute.

In the end, I asked the people of Alabama to trust me with the responsibility of representing them and of rejoining the United States Senate. And, today, I ask for your support.

To the senators from Alabama, I am here to represent you. I am here to listen and to work together as a team.

To the senators of the United States, I am here to represent the people of Alabama.

To the people of Alabama, I am here to represent you.

I have an interest in math and science, and I want to share some thoughts on how we can work together as a team to improve the lives of our constituents and to provide more opportunity for the next generation of Americans.
EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Miguel A. Cardona, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, back in 2017, before anyone had ever heard of COVID-19, our Republican colleagues could hardly vote fast enough for a $1.9 trillion tax bill. Most of the benefits of that bill went to the wealthiest people in America—$1.9 trillion in tax cuts, most of it to the ultrawealthy and large corporations. And of course there was little talk about the deficit and the debt when that was going on.

Now we are in the midst of a pandemic, and COVID-19 has killed more than half a million Americans. Americans are hurting. Our economy is hurting. Millions are unemployed. And our friends across the aisle are asking how little we can get away with doing at this moment in time. They want to know how much we can cut from President Joseph Biden’s American Rescue Plan. Can we cut money to open schools? Can’t we just wait? Let’s just wait and see what happens. That is their question. How about cutting funds to help keep families from losing their homes? How about cutting the funds for vaccination sites? How low can we go?

One point nine trillion dollars in tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires—no problem. A President who denies the truth about a pandemic as it rages across America—no problem. But when America elects a new President with a mandate and a plan to finally break the back of this pandemic, get our economy back on its feet, get our kids back in schools, and actually help American families, suddenly a lot of folks on the other side of the aisle have lost interest.

Do you remember last year? I do. We discovered this COVID-19 and started to worry about it, as we should. In March of last year, we passed a bill that cost almost $2 trillion—the largest spending bill in the history of the United States—under President Trump, and it got 96 votes in the Senate—96 votes. Every Democrat and every Republican Senator who voted, voted for it, and I was one of them. Did I stop and say, “Wait, just a minute”? Let’s just wait and see what happens. That is their question. How about cutting funds to help keep families from losing their homes? How about cutting the funds for vaccination sites? How low can we go?

We have 5 percent of the world’s population and 20 percent of the COVID-19 deaths. What is going on here in a great nation like America? Well, for a year, we didn’t get it together because we didn’t have a President who accepted reality. Now we have a President who accepts reality and wants to do something about it, and they find it, and he wants to lead.

Where is the Republican support? Democrats were there for the Trump plan; Republicans aren’t there for the Biden plan. We wasted time and resources, but now President Biden wants to turn it around.

The American Rescue Plan, proposed by President Biden and passed by the House of Representatives last week without a single Republican vote, no Republican votes for it, has the support of 80 percent of the American people—overwhelming majority of Democrats and Independents, even Republicans. It turns out the only people in America who are against this approach of taking this pandemic seriously are the Republicans in the House of Representatives and apparently in the Senate.

Every day this Senate delays passing the Biden American Rescue Plan, more small businesses close their doors, workers lose their jobs, parents turn to food banks and soup kitchens to feed their families, and more and more families face homelessness.

One provision that was included in the House version of the American Rescue Plan will not be part of the Senate plan, and that is the gradual increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Now, I understand. The rules in the Senate, particularly when it comes to reconciliation, as conceived by the late Robert C. Byrd, are almost impossible to understand and defend. I get it. I am in the last group of one person for that. That is a reality, and I have been here for a while, and I have seen it. So currently we cannot offer the Federal minimum wage under the so-called reconciliation bill because of the Byrd rules.

Our Senate Parliamentarian ruled last week that passing a Federal minimum wage increase as part of the rescue plan is not permitted under those rules. I respect the Parliamentarian’s judgment. I may disagree and I may be disappointed, but I respect her judgment. Our Republican friends should know this, however: Senate Democrats aren’t going to give up on raising the minimum wage. The issue is not going away.

Do you know how long it has been since we raised the minimum wage in America? Twelve years. Twelve years. The Presiding Officer knows that. That is the last time we increased the Federal minimum wage.

Twenty-nine States have done something about it, but 21 have not, and we don’t have a change in the Federal law. That is the longest that our Nation has ever gone without raising the minimum wage since Congress created that wage in 1938.

During this pandemic, billionaires—people like Jeff Bezos, Elon Musk, Bill Gates, Mark Zuckerberg—they have done pretty well. They have seen their net worth increase by billions, even tens of billions of dollars. How about middle-class families? What do they see? They see their savings dwindle, and they find it almost impossible to make ends meet.

Fortunately, as I said, many States are acting. Washington is not. In 29 States, including Illinois, the State minimum wage is $15 an hour. In Illinois, our State minimum wage is set to reach $15 an hour by 2025, just like the Biden plan. Most States that have increased their minimum wage have done so because their State legislatures have come to the rescue. Some States, like Missouri and Arkansas, raised the minimum wage by ballot measures.
Americans support raising the minimum wage.

I see Senator LEAHY from Vermont has come to the floor. Remember when we used to have a colleague back there in the back row who would stand up and bellow, "We would raise minimum wage!" His name was Ted Kennedy from Massachusetts. He didn’t let a month go by or 2 months go by without reminding us that a lot of people were struggling to get by in this country and we sit here in Washington ignoring it, and that their hard work should push for an increase in the minimum wage.

We are told that $15 an hour is exorbitant by some and that it is going to hurt the economy. The truth is just the opposite. Raising the Federal minimum wage gradually to $15 an hour will strengthen the American economy because minimum wage workers are most likely to spend the money they get on the necessities of life as soon as they get it—food, clothing, housing.

Lately, one of our Republican colleagues gave a speech and said that he worked for $6 an hour when he was a kid and he is opposed to the $15-an-hour minimum wage. Well, if you took that six bucks an hour and just matched it with inflation, it would be up over $15 an hour today. Reminiscing about the “good old days” of $6 an hour is only done by people who don’t have to live on $6 an hour.

Contrary to popular misconceptions, most minimum wage workers are not teenagers. According to the Economic Policy Institute, 59 percent of workers who would benefit from the Federal minimum wage are women—women. They are taking a beating in this pandemic. They stay at home to watch the kids who can’t go to school, trying to deal with daycare that has closed down, losing their own jobs—that is the reality.

Many mothers—two-thirds of them are the breadwinners in their family and count on the minimum wage. Nearly one in four workers who would receive a raise under the $15 Federal minimum wage is a Black or Latina woman.

During this pandemic, America has relied on minimum wage workers to do the hard work and dangerous work in the pandemic. Do you want to know the real pandemic heroes? Do you want to reduce poverty and raise opportunity in America? Pay workers a living wage. Allow workers to share the economic prosperity they are creating with their dedication and labor.

At this moment, we may not have a path, but I hope we can find one. It is time for us to raise the minimum wage, to give the American workers the real wage they need to survive, and to show that we really do value the dignity of work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I want to associate myself with the words of the distinguished deputy lead-
er. Nobody has said it better. Nobody could. But in the meantime, we have to get up and vote.

Madam President, I am going to put in a quorum call for just a minute, and then I will take it off.

I am seeking unanimous consent of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, earlier this month, actually for the first time in—earlier last month, I should say, in February, for the first time in our Nation’s history, the Senate convened as a Court of Impeachment to try a former President for a high crime and misdemeanor.

For 5 days, every Member of the Senate was here to hear presentations and arguments from an extraordinarily intelligent group of Congressmen and Congresswomen representing the House of Representatives and defenders of a new counsel for former President Donald Trump. After listening to the compelling evidence presented by the House managers, I voted to convict President Trump for inciting the Capitol riots on January 6, and I will have a lot more to say about my vote to convict the former President in a later statement.

Today, though, I am going to speak about the unique role I had in this historic trial as its Presiding Officer. It is unique in the history of the Senate, and I thought for my fellow Senators and, also, for historical purposes I would like you all to know some of my feelings.

Now, I understand why some of my Republican friends were skeptical of a Democratic Senator presiding over the trial of a Republican former President. I noted the Constitution does not contemplate that the Chief Justice would preside over the impeachment trial of a former President, but I also note the impeachment process, no matter who presides, is inherently and often intensely divisive. Presidential impeachments have historically been partisan. Having a member of one particular political party in the Chair presiding over the trial could understandably give some pause.

Now, as my fellow Senators know, I did not ask, I did not seek to preside over this trial, but I am occupying the constitutional office of the President pro tempore, and because I am, it was incumbent upon me to do so. A Court of Impeachment is not a civil or a criminal court; it is a constitutional court. And the President pro tempore, as a constitutional officer, has historically participated in impeachment trials of non-Presidents. As President Trump’s term had expired before the trial began, the responsibility to preside over this historic trial fell to me, as it would have anybody who would have been President pro tempore. I just happened to be.

I was not going to shirk my duty. My staff and I spent hundreds of hours over the course of these trials, reviewing transcripts, everything. And what I found is, throughout our Nation’s history, each President pro tempore has almost without exception belonged to a political party, and each President pro tempore had their own personal and political views on the matters before the Senate.

But when presiding over the Senate, as I go back through history, I see Presidents pro tempore have historically served as a neutral arbiter, issuing rulings where appropriate and preserving order. I consider holding the Office of the President pro tempore and the responsibilities that come with it as one of the highest honors but also one of the most serious responsibilities of my career here in the Senate.

When presiding over an impeachment trial, the President pro tempore takes an additional—not just his regular role but an additional one to do impartial justice according to the Constitution and the laws. This is an oath that I take extraordinarily seriously.

In fact, to demonstrate my commitment to preside over the trial with fairness and transparency, before the trial I wrote a letter to every single Senator to explain the trial. In it I made clear my intention and my solemn obligation was to conduct the trial with fairness to all. I committed to adhering to the Constitution and to applicable Senate rules, precedents, and governing resolutions.

I committed to consulting with the Senate’s esteemed and nonpartisan Parliamentary Counselor, Elizabeth MacDonough, and I committed to being guided by Senate precedent should a motion for an objection or an application be put before me. I reiterated that any decision I made—any decision I made—from the Chair would be subject to the review of the full Senate—every Democratic Senator, every Republican Senator, every Independent Senator. And I stated I would put any matter before the entire Senate in the first instance where appropriate in light of the precedents and practices of the Senate, giving all Senators an opportunity to resolve the issue at the outset. I also informed all Senators, though, that I would enforce the Senate rules, and I would enforce the precedent governing decorum and do what I could to ensure the trial reflected the best traditions of the Senate.

Now, with the trial behind us, I believe I made good on those commitments. My job wasn’t to shape the trial or to direct or slant it in any particular way but to make sure the rules were followed, the proceedings were fair to all parties, consistent with the will of the whole Senate, and I believe it was.
I did my best. I followed the advice of the Parliamentarian and enforced our rules and precedents. Where objections were raised, they were ultimately resolved without a vote challenging the rulings I made from the Chair.

When I reflected on this situation, before the start of the trial I had decided—and I had informed the Parliamentarian of my decision—that should a ruling of mine be appealed, I would abstain from voting as a Senator on the question of whether to sustain my own ruling. Now, knowing from the Constitution and the laws and the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer is fully empowered to do so—to vote—and it happens routinely during legislative sessions. But in going back through all the hundreds of pages—the thousands of pages—I could not find a historical precedent for Presiding Officers doing so during impeachment trials, and I was determined to strictly adhere to precedent, even if it limited my authority as a Senator in this instance.

Now I would note that, on two occasions during the trial, I felt it was necessary to remind counsel—and I did, as did Chief Justice Roberts during President Trump's first trial—to refrain from using language that was not conducive to civil discourse. On the final day of the trial, when it got a little bit heated, I was prepared to do so in stronger terms, if needed. Yet, during closing arguments, I believe neither side gave me reason to do so.

Now, like those who presided over the three prior Presidential impeachment trials in our history, I understood each of my decisions was important historically and would become important precedents to guide those who presided over trials in the future, just as I had read and studied the precedents of past trials.

Since the conclusion of the trial, both Republican and Democratic Senators have thanked me for being fair, and I appreciate that greatly. I may have had a prominent role for this historic trial, but I was committed to not shaping it in any way. I just wanted to give voice to our institution's precedents and rules and to otherwise let the Senate determine the trial's structure and direction, to let each side present its case, and let the chips fall where they may, but let the Senate do its job.

I have now had the opportunity to sit as a judge and juror in numerous impeachment trials, including three trials of Presidents. All were historic moments for the Senate and this country. I hold no illusion that the Senate was at its best for every moment of every trial, but each has nonetheless increased my respect for our system of government and our Constitution.

I was proud to uphold my oath as a Senator and as a Presiding Officer, my oath to uphold impartial justice according to our Constitution and the laws during last month's trial. There are some things I consider far more important than allegiance to any person or political party, and my commitment to the Constitution and this great institution of the Senate are listed high among them.

I have felt from the first day I came here and feel now that I can be and must be the conscience of the Nation. I wanted to help make sure that conscience was upheld, and I appreciate the fact that my colleagues elected me President pro tempore and gave me this opportunity.

I suggest the presence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the Appropriations Committee is reportedly preparing to announce the return of earmarks. That is a process that, around here, we know. People back home might not know, so let me explain that the process of earmarks involves Members designating for specific interests into a bill, most often an appropriations bill. When I say "individual projects," it means Senators doing it for probably their district or their State.

Earmarks are a practice that has become a symbol to the American people of the waste and out-of-control spending in Washington. I am strongly against the return of earmarks.

The earmark moratorium was implemented as a direct result of the events leading up to the election of 2010, and there was clearly a mandate coming from that 2010 election to do away with earmarks. So people sometimes think, through the elections or through contacting Congress, they don't have an impact. In this case, it had a very dramatic impact that has lasted at least until now, and hopefully it will last longer.

The American people spoke because they were worried at that time about the country's growing Federal deficit and ballooning public debt—something we aren't as concerned about now as we were then and we ought to be concerned about more so now because the debt has more than doubled during that period.

At that time, back in 2010, the debt was estimated to be 62 percent of gross domestic product.

In 2010, President Obama and congressional Democrats passed a $787 billion stimulus bill that was filled with wasteful spending, special projects, and unauthorized programs that completely violated the rules of the road for responsible governance.

In September 2010, during the time of the election I am talking about—a Rasmussen poll, 61 percent of U.S. voters said cutting government spending and deficits would do more to create jobs than President Obama's proposed $50 billion infrastructure program. It was pretty evident, then, from people's opinion at that time, that the election of 2010 sent a clear message that the American people wanted Congress to stop wasteful spending. So it didn't take long for President Obama to get the message.

He had a weekly address on November 13, 2010, calling upon Congress to stop earmarks. He said: "Given the deficits that have mounted over the past decade, we can't afford to make these investments"—in things like infrastructure, education, research, and development—"unless we are willing to cut what we don't need."

Now, I am going to give you a further Obama quote, and it is a fairly long one, but it is coming from a Democratic President.

I agree with those Republican and Democratic members of Congress who've recently said that in these challenging days, we can't afford what are called these are more projects in our local communities. But many others do not. We cannot afford Bridges to Nowhere like the one that was planned a few years ago. Earmarks like these represent a relatively small portion of overall federal spending. But when it comes to signaling our commitment to fiscal responsibility, addressing them would have an important impact.

We have a chance to not only shine a light on a bad Washington habit that wastes billions of taxpayer dollars, but take a step towards restoring public trust. We have a chance to advance the interests not of Republicans or Democrats, but of the American people, to put our country on a path of fiscal discipline and responsibility that will lead to a brighter economic future for all. And that's a future I hope that we can reach across party lines to build together.

Remember, President Obama said in 2010 that earmarks are bad. Unlike 2020—today we are in even more dismal fiscal shape with even larger Federal deficits and a ballooning Federal debt. And according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Federal debt held by the public stood at 100 percent of GDP at the end of fiscal year 2020 and is projected to reach 102 percent of GDP at the end of 2021.

In other words, even though we have the largest economy in the world, we owe more than the entire U.S. economy is producing in a year. If we stay on this course, CBO projects that by 2031, debt will equal 107 percent of GDP, the highest in the Nation's history.

America cannot afford to go back to including earmarks in some ill-conceived effort to grease the wheels to pass legislation only because it includes the pet projects of Members of Congress.

While a small part of the budget—and I would have to admit, earmarks are a small part of the budget—earmarks can cause Members of Congress to focus on projects for their districts or States instead of holding people accountable and being fiscally responsible.

Congress should follow regular order by authorizing funding for programs
with very specific criteria. Legislation, including funding bills, should be passed on its merits, not on whether an earmark is included.

Dr. Tom Coburn, former Senator from Oklahoma, said:

Earmarks are the gateway drug to . . . spending addiction.

There is an insatiable appetite for projects, and this leads to large bills weighed down with spending our country can ill afford, whether we are talking about appropriations or authorization bills.

A Congressional Research Service—CRS, as we know it—study showed that from 1994 to 2011, there was a 282-percent jump in earmarks in appropriations bills. In the fiscal year 1994 appropriations bill, there were 4,155, and—can you believe this?—by 2011, that number for earmarks had risen to 15,887. Also according to the CRS, the total value of earmarked funds increased from about $35 billion for 6,000 earmarks in 2000 to over $72 billion for nearly 16,000 earmarks in 2006.

Earmarks get out of control when there is no effective check on total spending. At the same time, earmarks lead to overspending. Committee chairmen kindly say to the Members who have earmarks in bills or who want earmarks in bills: Are you going to vote for this appropriations bill if we put your earmark in? That sort of thing should never be a determination whether or not a Member votes for an appropriations bill.

So you shouldn’t feel pressured to support a vicious cycle of increased spending on bills the Members want because it includes earmarks, especially in this time of the pandemic. Congress should be focused on targeted spending to continue to help the American people who are suffering to recover, not finding ways to load up a bill with sweeteners that may be problematic on their own.

According to a 2016 Economist/YouGov poll, 63 percent of Americans approve the ban on earmarks; only 12 percent disapproved.

This quote by Citizens Against Government Waste President Tom Schatz to this publication, Just the News, makes a strong argument for not lifting the earmark ban. He said:

Earmarks are the most corrupt, costly, and inequitable practice in the history of Congress. They led to members, staff, and lobbyists to hire lobbyists to chase after Federal dollars in hopes of getting an earmark.

You know, there are people who went to jail because of how some of this stuff was handled. In the form of legalized bribery, Members of Congress vote for tens or hundreds of billions of dollars in appropriations bills in return for a few million dollars in earmarks for their State or congressional district.

Earmarks go to those in power, as shown during the 111th Congress when the 81 members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, who constituted 15 percent of Congress, got 51 percent of the earmarks and 61 percent of the money. Restoring earmarks will lead to the same result.

I have heard the argument that earmarks are needed to pass bills in a bipartisan manner. I have consistently been ranked among the most bipartisan Senators by the Georgetown University Lugar Center. Check it out for yourself. I know from experience that true bipartisanship doesn’t come from voting for legislation that I might otherwise have concerns about because an earmark or a pet project is included in the bill. True bipartisanship comes from reaching out across the aisle to reach common ground. There are disagreements on other issues, to really get things done for the American people.

President Biden, in his inaugural speech, called for “Bringing Americans together. Uniting our people. And uniting our nation.” He also recognized that Americans have serious disagreements. Everyone knows that our country is deeply divided politically. I know from my time in the Senate that President Biden knows that people of good will can have honest disagreements about policy, so he knows that unity does not mean dropping deeply held beliefs and accepting his policy agenda. He said:

Every disagreement doesn’t have to be a cause for total war.

Disagreements must not lead to disunion.

Real unity requires true bipartisanship and working together to discover what binds us together as Americans, even when we disagree politically. Earmarks are not a way to bring this unity, and, in fact, would make this unity more difficult by attempting to paper over fundamental disagreements with window dressing while bypassing the real work of compromise.

Now, in a similar vein, some people argue that earmarks are needed to help pass bills in a timely manner. In 2006, at the height of earmark spending in appropriations bills, only two appropriations bills were passed. In the 10 years prior to the earmark ban, Congress never enacted more than four standalone appropriations bills on time.

This holds true for reauthorization bills as well. Most, then, as you know the practice is, we just simply extend them for 1 fiscal year at a time.

In the case of the past several highway reauthorization bills, which were notorious for earmarks before the earmark moratorium, all needed multiple extensions before they were signed into law.

I have also heard the argument that article I of the Constitution says that Congress holds the power of the purse and that Congress has ceded its own power without strongly disagreeing that Congress now cedes its own power but not by not having earmarks. Rather, Congress cedes its power by failing to follow the budget process and stick to a budget.

Now, the greatest sin: Congress can be fairly accused of lazy legislation by drafting vague provisions granting authority to Agency heads to work out the details, and most of those details are worked out through massive regulation writing.

Congress can reclaim its legislative authority by including specific guidelines for implementing programs in both authorization and appropriations bills. In appropriations bills, Congress can review Federal programs to ensure that funding criteria reflect the needs of the Americans and engage in robust oversight of Departments and Agencies to ensure congressional intent is met. Careful oversight of the enactment of legislation that clearly sets out congressional intent for how a program should be administered is the constitutional job of Congress.

A good example of Congress not keeping the power of the purse and delegating significant authority to unelected bureaucrats at the programmatic level is the Affordable Care Act, sometimes called ObamaCare, which was rammed through Congress on a party-line vote. The text was around 2,700 pages long, but the regulatory implementation of ObamaCare required well over 20,000 pages. That is a bad way to implement public policy, particularly considering that the law redirected one-fifth of the U.S. economy.

On top of the law are tens of thousands of pages of Federal rules and regulations administered by a score of Federal Departments, Agencies, and Boards. This isn’t how our Founding Fathers envisioned Congress protecting the American people, and it is a bad way to do business.

As a matter of fairness, earmark project funding should be merit-based and competitive or allocated by formula. Earmarks undermine State decision making over funds that are allocated through formula-based grants. Political decisions should not preempt State and regional decision making. Earmarks should not be a shortcut for State and local governments engaging in long-term planning and budgeting for anticipated needs.

And, furthermore, State and local governments and other organizations should not be spending time and money to hire lobbyists to chase after Federal dollars in hopes of getting an earmark.

The money spent on lobbying and travel to pursue an earmark should be diverted toward the local project itself. If a Federal Agency or program isn’t working, then Members of Congress should fix it instead of seeking a carve-out. Highway authorization bills are a perfectly good example of the problems with earmarks.

In 1987, President Reagan vetoed the Transportation bill because of—guess what—too many earmarks. That bill included only 152 earmarks. In 1998, the Transportation bill, called TEA-21, included 1,850 earmarks. The State of Florida challenged the earmarks included for the State, arguing that the allocated funding did not address the actual transportation needs of the
State. The U.S. Department of Transportation overruled Florida’s objections.

In the 2005 bill—so I am going to another Transportation bill; it was called the SAFETEA-LU—included 6,371 earmarks. I think I was over that again about that when we go back. In 1987, President Reagan vetoed a bill because there were only 152 earmarks. Ten years later, TEA-21 included 1,850 earmarks and then, 2005, 6,371 earmarks.

However, under the earmark ban, the last Transportation bill distributed 92 percent of the funding to the States through formulas. And then, you know, that gives States and local governments control over the funding decision based on the needs of the 50 different States, based on safety, engineering, and other objective criteria, as opposed to politically directed earmarks that totally sweep aside those criteria. It was almost a political decision where that money ought to be spent. It should also be pointed out that the majority of the earmark funds in the past came straight out of the allocated formula dollars for each State, which then further eroded merit and State and local decision making. In other words, political considerations would be making decisions better made by the nonpartisan boards in State capitols and local communities. And when I say “nonpartisan boards,” I don’t suppose it is that way in all 50 States, but I know in most Midwestern States it is that way.

I know that a lot of good has come from projects that I have helped support in Iowa, when we had our earmarks, and I certainly did not want Iowa to miss out on funding just because of a Washington dysfunction that we called earmarks. However, I also know that many of these earmarks disrupted our State and regional planning efforts. I have no way of knowing what good might have been done had we not had earmarks banned earlier. I do know that I have faith that the Federal money that goes back to Iowa for Iowans and the Iowans deciding how it is to be spent is being spent thoughtfully and well and not with a lot of political consideration.

Any good that might come from my being able to direct small amounts of Federal taxpayer dollars to some worthwhile pilot project would be dwarfed by the negative effects of restarting the mad scramble for earmarks.

So I hope, my colleagues, the rumors I have been hearing about the Appropriations Committee wanting to reinstitute earmarks, I hope that those people would pay some attention to the history of it and particularly pay attention to what President Obama said in 2010 about earmarks and not go through another process, maybe starting out with just a few earmarks but getting more than a few years, more than 10,000 earmarks in various appropriations bills, and then all of a sudden then have a mandate that came from the electorate, like it did in 2010, and both Republicans and Democrats come back to these halls where we have debate and make policy, saying no more earmarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

NOMINATION OF MIGUEL A. CARDONA

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I couldn’t be prouder to stand in the Senate Chamber today and speak on behalf of Miguel Cardona, shorty to be confirmed by this body as the next Secretary of Education.

Miguel Cardona is a man of deep commitment to his community and, with pride, a product of the Connecticut education system. I couldn’t be prouder to support him because President Biden couldn’t have made a better choice to be the next Secretary of Education.

Miguel Cardona’s story is inspiring and compelling, a testament to the extraordinary support he has enjoyed from his parents, from the community of Puerto Rico, who lived in Meriden, the support he enjoyed from the public schools and institutions of higher education in Connecticut. His powerful words and leadership have been inspiring to all America because he has lived the American dream. And for anyone whose language may be something other than English as their first language, he has shown that people can and should learn to speak English as their second language, should see no bounds to what they can accomplish.

He came to the public schools of Meriden as a second-language learner of English. He was raised in Meriden by Puerto Rican parents. He found an early passion for education. And his skill and dedication went beyond his own life. He did extraordinarily well and attended two Connecticut institutions of higher education—Central Connecticut State University and the University of Connecticut—eventually earning his doctorate in education. But he went back to Meriden. He dedicated his life to the education of others, beginning as a fourth-grade teacher in Meriden and then becoming principal—the youngest in the State—and eventually assistant superintendent before just about a year ago being appointed as commissioner of education in the State of Connecticut.

For all of his accomplishments and that meteoric rise, he has remained deeply rooted in the Meriden community, deeply committed to his roots in Puerto Rico, and deeply committed to his family. His parents, who should be so proud of him, are an inspiration to all our schools, who have seen their work in Meriden continue. Even as he has climbed the professional ladder, they have remained rooted and active and energetic in benefiting others in Meriden.

So to his parents, I say thank you for sharing with us Miguel. To his family, thank you for supporting him throughout his enormous journey and adventure.

His extraordinary accomplishments have led him to this place of consumermate prominence in the educational professional community, and now he will do great things for the cause of education in our country, not just Connecticut.

His service never stopped in the classroom. He brought that knowledge of what happens in the classroom to establish policy in Connecticut in an enormously challenging time. He took over as commissioner of education on February 26, 2020, at the time of COVID–19 lockdowns and school closures, which began just a couple of painful period. Disadvantaged students who lack support and resources at home have been left behind. His bold vision and dedication to students and their families is exactly what we need now in an Education Secretary, providing direction and support to our Nation’s public schools—direction and support after a time when leadership was so sorely lacking and commitment to public education was so unfortunately inadequate.

As we know, COVID–19 has challenged educators, students, families, and school administrators, day in and day out, during this very difficult and painful period. Disadvantaged students who lack support and resources at home have been left behind. Teachers are strained and stressed by changing environments and a lack of resources. Parents are concerned and overwhelmed managing their children’s schooling and their own work at home. Students in higher education are drowning in student debt that has left them crippled financially and unsure about their future.

These challenges pose a grave threat to the future of our children and our educational system, and we need a leader just like Dr. Cardona—one whom we have lacked, one who can reestablish faith in the leadership of our educational system, especially students who have been potentially left behind. His bold vision and dedication to students and their families is exactly what we need now in an Education Secretary, providing direction and support to our Nation’s public schools—direction and support after a time when leadership was so sorely lacking and commitment to public education was so unfortunately inadequate.

As we know, COVID–19 has challenged educators, students, families, and school administrators, day in and day out, during this very difficult and painful period. Disadvantaged students who lack support and resources at home have been left behind. Teachers are strained and stressed by changing environments and a lack of resources. Parents are concerned and overwhelmed managing their children’s schooling and their own work at home. Students in higher education are drowning in student debt that has left them crippled financially and unsure about their future.

These challenges pose a grave threat to the future of our children and our educational system, and we need a leader just like Dr. Cardona—one whom we have lacked, one who can reestablish faith in the leadership of our educational system, especially students who have been potentially left behind. His bold vision and dedication to students and their families is exactly what we need now in an Education Secretary, providing direction and support to our Nation’s public schools—direction and support after a time when leadership was so sorely lacking and commitment to public education was so unfortunately inadequate.

He is someone who will put students back on their feet, in their confidence and their trust that the future is someone who will put teachers, parents, and students first, above special interests, because he has lived American education as the American dream. In Connecticut, he has seen firsthand in his own life how education can transform futures and enable all of us, through our children, to live the American dream just as he has done. And he
will do it in a way that is inclusive, that respects the drive for racial justice, because he has lived that movement in his own life—the movement for racial justice. To end disparities and inequities are part of Miguel Cardona’s agenda. Mr. Cardona, he is part of our DNA, and it is part of his heritage and his family. And that is the reason why I am so proud of his success, but also of his vision and his dedication to the future of American education.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes for his confirmation. You will be proud you did, just as I am proud to stand here in support of him. He has lived the American dream, and he will open it through his vision and his courage for countless other young people who desperately need that faith in their country and its schools.

Today, American public education has a future that is bright and promising with Miguel Cardona’s leadership. I am proud he is a product of Connecticut. His roots are there, and so is his vision and hope and faith. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last Friday, I joined Governor Abbott, fellow Members of the Texas congressional delegation, and several State and local leaders and joined President Biden on his first trip to Texas since taking office on January 20. We only wish it could have come under better circumstances.

Texans, of course, are still reeling from the deadly winter freeze that crippled our critical infrastructure and left millions without power and water. Thousands of Texans are still without clean water and under a boil instruction, and countless others are dealing with the damage caused by burst pipes. I truly appreciate the President and the First Lady coming to Houston to learn more about the ongoing response and recovery efforts, and I thank the President for considering the request of Senator Cruz, Governor Abbott, and myself to order a national disaster declaration.

During times of crisis, Texans are always eager to lend a hand to their neighbors, and the last couple of weeks have proved to be no exception. I am always encouraged by those heartwarming stories of folks helping others in ways big and small: welcoming people at warming centers, checking on their elderly neighbors, delivering hot meals to those in need, and much more.

So I am glad the President and First Lady were able to see the incredible work also of one of the Houston area’s most trusted institutions and that is the Houston Food Bank. For more than 40 years, the Houston Food Bank has fought hunger in the Houston region through a variety of programs serving Texans of all ages. When COVID-19 hit last year, the need for that assistance skyrocketed, as you might imagine. I was able to visit the food bank last summer to learn more about how they have adjusted their operations to keep up with the demand, while implementing precautions to keep their volunteers safe and healthy. So I was glad to join the President and First Lady to learn more about the incredible ways the Houston Food Bank has continued to serve the community in the wake of this winter storm.

As I have said before and, as the President reiterated on Friday in Houston, there is no blue team or crisis. Federal resources are vital to sustaining hospital operations and supporting the most vulnerable Texans while power and water were being restored.

Senator Cruz and I also wrote to the President urging him to grant the Governor’s request for a major disaster declaration, recognizing that a significant portion of our infrastructure has been damaged. The remaining generators were overloaded by the sky-high demand of these subzero temperatures, and much of Texas went through rolling blackouts and more.

In the aftermath of these widespread outages, of course, two questions jump out at you: One is, What happened? And, two, how do we prevent it from ever happening again?

We know now, at least so far, that there isn’t a simple answer. But where it has to do with the power, this was the result of failures in equipment across the State that weren’t properly winterized. Natural gas lines, wind turbines, and other power equipment froze, cutting off a huge percent of our power capacity. The remaining generators were overloaded by the sky-high demand of these subzero temperatures, and much of Texas went through rolling blackouts and more.

This storm claimed the lives of nearly 80 Texans. It left millions without power and water for several days. It destroyed homes and businesses and created a sense of fear across the State.

We need to do what we can now to establish that Texas’s critical infrastructure will be able to withstand anything Mother Nature sends our way. It is not just about Texas. It is really about the critical infrastructure throughout the United States.

I am working on a measure to build grid resiliency, so we can maintain reliable power throughout any type of extreme weather. Whether it is a polar vortex or a heat wave or a hurricane or tornado, our grids and energy sources across the country can operate without disruption. This should be a bipartisan priority for folks from every corner of the United States.

Texas, as we are accustomed to our infrastructure being able to withstand the high temperatures we are used to during the summer, but not the rare subzero temperatures that paralyzed the State 2 weeks ago. In other parts of the country, grids may face the opposite problem: They are able to operate during freezing temperatures but not during a heat wave. I am trying to work on a way to get funding to the States to help build grid resiliency in a way that makes sense for each of those specific needs.

Our Nation has had issues with funding grid resiliency and modernization efforts, and this is a good opportunity to make an investment in that infrastructure. My hope is that this will be a big bipartisan effort, including fellow Members of the Texas delegation and colleagues on both sides of the aisle here in the Senate. We need to do everything we can as Americans and Senators to strengthen and modernize our grid before it is tested again. Team Texas will do everything we can to get our neighbors on the road to recovery and prevent us from experiencing widespread outages in the future.

In conclusion, I want to thank everyone who has supported our State in ways big and small over the last couple of weeks and who will no doubt work with us in our efforts to come back stronger in the days that lie ahead.

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. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. COONS. Madam President, it has long been said that “neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays” our U.S. postal “couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.” These words, in fact, are chiseled in granite above the entrance to the post office on 8th Avenue in New York City—one of the grandest post offices in our Nation. It is the adopted creed of the faithful and hard-working letter carriers and frontline workforce of our Postal Service.

As I have said before, I have no beef with the front-line employees of our Postal Service, but I have real and deep concerns about how the Postal Service is being run under the current Postmaster General.

President Biden doesn’t get to choose a new Postmaster General just because he is the new President. In fact, the current officeholder, Louis DeJoy, was chosen by the Board under the previous administration.

Weeks ago, I joined with many colleagues and with Chairman Peters of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, which is responsible for the Postal Service, to send a letter to Postmaster General DeJoy to restore on-time delivery and stop the harmful systemic changes that have caused unacceptable mail delays.

Sadly, that is not the first time I have had to reach out, with Senators in this body, to the Postmaster General. In fact, on separate occasions, we have written the Postmaster General, between August and February, last year to this year. We have demanded transparency. We have insisted on the restoration of mail sorting machines. We have asked for assistance with vote-by-mail delivery and wrote for just simple answers to pending constituent inquiries.

In my hometown of Wilmington, DE, last August, I joined our attorney general, my senior Senator, Tom CARPER. Congresswoman Lisa BLUNT ROCHESTER, and a series of union leaders for a day of action to save the Postal Service.

A few days later, I drove myself to our mail distribution center in New Castle after leadership of the Postal Service denied my request to visit. Thanks to having been alerted by some frontline employees, I drove around back and was able to see a dismantled massive piece of mail handling equipment left outside in the rain.

In January and February alone, my office received hundreds of messages from constituents complaining about mail issues. Since last April, I have heard from nearly 5,000 Delawareans—folks asking for robust funding for the Postal Service, wanting stronger vote-by-mail initiatives, and hundreds and hundreds of them reporting delays in the mail.

I want to take a few minutes, if I might, and just go through some of these concerns I have heard, which, I have also heard from colleagues, are being replicated across our Nation.

Gloria Farmer, a longtime turkey grower in Sussex County, said that mail that previously took just 3 to 4 days is now taking her 4 to 6 weeks. Her bills are due before she even gets the statements. And her husband’s VA medication took a month to arrive from the date they mailed it.

Jim Nichols of Milford wrote concerned about the delay in getting his newspapers, his magazines, and his other periodicals.

And Jim is not alone. I have heard from local and regional newspapers that rely on the Postal Service to deliver out-of-State and out-of-area subscribers.

We have a beach area with a lot of homeowners who live here in our Nation’s Capital or elsewhere throughout the region. And Chris Raush, who is with the Cape Gazette, which gets mailed to folks all over our region, told me some of their out-of-State subscribers don’t receive the paper for a month, and then, when they do, they get a big bundle of old papers. And now with papers not showing up weeks at a time, they have had to tell subscribers this is just out of their control and offer refunds.

Megan Stibbe, of the Delmarva Farmer, another local paper, said that she has “been having a lot of trouble with Delmarva deliveries. The postal system,” as she wrote in a recent letter to the Postmaster General, “is very screwed up right now. Delmarva Farmers have not received their newspapers at all in January.”

I have received dozens and dozens more emails, and phone calls, messages from frustrated constituents. Dianne Boyle, of Magnolia, DE, felt so strongly about this ongoing debacle of delayed delivery in the Postal Service that she hand delivered her own letter of concern to my Dover office.

Richard Billski of Selbyville, a gentleman with real and significant heart concerns.

Our veterans shouldn’t be going without lifesaving medication. Our farmers shouldn’t be going without fresh eggs for local farmers markets. Bill has experienced significant losses with turkey and chick deliveries and called my office with concerns.

And I want, before I close, to mention one last story, from Trebs Thompson of Newark, an egg farmer with Whimsical Farms. Trebs wrote: Largerly our postal system has been a jewel. It handles a large volume of mail cheaply with a high degree of speed and accuracy. Many of us depend on it for government paperwork, medications, orders, payments, and for farmers like me, seeds [and] day-old chicks.

The Post Office has been shipping day-old chicks to farms like mine for over 100 years. All 20 baby birds are lifeless. I cried [as I opened the box]. The [postal] supervisor cried. The gentleman who normally delivers my mail apologized profusely, but [it] is not his fault.

Whatever one feels about mail-in ballots or politics, I am asking you to put this aside and do what you can to restore the Postal Service.

Trebs Thompson is right. No farmer should have to open a box of dead chicks. No constituent should have to hand deliver a letter to their Senator. Our veterans shouldn’t be going without lifesaving medication.

Postmaster DeJoy appeared before Members of the House last week and apologized for the slow mail delivery and said he has a forthcoming plan, which I am concerned includes further cuts to delivery service.

So let me summarize. My understanding is that DeJoy’s plans for the future of the Postal Service include higher prices and slower delivery. Delmarva farmers are tired, and our Postal Service workers are tired, too, of the constraints placed on them. How will we solve this problem? In my view, we need to confirm as quickly as possible President Biden’s nominees to the Postal Board of Governors: Ron Stroman, Amber McReynolds, and Andrea Hazar—three who have had deep experience in the postal system. They could get us back on track.

We also have to prioritize investments in the Postal Service. Congress secured $10 billion for the Postal Service in the unanimously passed CARES Act to provide the resources to maintain operations at a time when families are relying on mail service more than ever during this pandemic.

We will continue to fight that the Postal Service will continue to petition the Postmaster General, and I won’t stop until there is a solution to this critical and pressing issue. Our letter carriers
and our customers shouldn’t suffer because of toxic leadership at the highest levels of our Postal Service. I yield the floor to my colleague from the State of Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, last week, I was pleased to join my colleague from West Virginia, Senator Joe Manchin, in introducing the Advancing Uniform Freedom Transportation Opportunities for Veterans Act, better known as the AUTO for Veterans Act. I am pleased that Senators Boozman, Hassan, and Blunt have joined as original cosponsors.

Our bill would lessen the financial burden on severely disabled veterans who require special adaptive equipment to drive a motor vehicle. It would do so by increasing access to the Department of Veterans Affairs automobile grant program.

The current program provides eligible veterans with a one-time grant of approximately $21,400 to be used to purchase a new or used automobile and necessary adaptive equipment, such as specialized pedals and switches. This grant is in conjunction with the VA’s special adaptive equipment grants, which help our veterans purchase additional adaptive equipment, such as powered lifts, for example, for an existing automobile to make it safe and feasible for a veteran with disabilities.

Although veterans can receive multiple special adaptive equipment grants over the course of their lives, for some reason they are limited to just a single automobile grant. The current limitation fails to take into account that a veteran is likely to need more than one vehicle in his or her lifetime. In fact, the Department of Transportation reports that, in 2019, the average age of a household vehicle was 11.8 years, and a vehicle that has been modified structurally tends to have a shorter useful life.

According to the VA independent budget prepared by Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the VFW, the substantial costs of modified vehicles, coupled with inflation, present a financial hardship for many disabled veterans who need to replace their primary mode of transportation. Yet a van or truck reaches its lifespan. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates that a new vehicle modified with adaptive equipment will cost anywhere from $20,000 to $80,000. These are significant costs for a veteran with disabilities to incur to replace his or her primary mode of transportation. That is why veterans should be eligible to receive a vehicle grant every 10 years and our legislation, the Collins-Manchin bill, would do just that.

A Maine veteran whom I know well, Neal Williams of Shirley, ME, used a VA automobile grant in 1999 to purchase an adaptive vehicle, a Ford Econoline van. He has also had to purchase several adaptive vehicles since 1999, with each one lasting over 250,000 miles until they simply were no longer roadworthy. His current vehicle now has over 100,000 miles, and soon he will need to purchase a new van. I told him that purchasing a new van will cost him well over $50,000, which is more than he paid for his home in rural Maine. This is an enormous burden on our disabled veterans who need to purchase expensive adaptive equipment in order to drive safely or to drive at all.

Madam President, I feel like I am preaching to the choir here. Our Nation owes our veterans such an enormous debt. It is a debt that truly can never be fully repaid. Let’s honor our commitment to our veterans by continuing to support their needs, including the needs of veterans who are disabled and need this adaptive technology for their vehicles long after they have been discharged or retire from Active Duty.

This is a simple bill, but it is a bill that would make such a difference for so many of our disabled veterans who need vehicle grants so that they can drive themselves and drive safely. The AUTO for Veterans Act is an important step that we can take to meet this need and help those who have made so many sacrifices to serve our Nation.

I urge all of my colleagues to join us in helping our Nation’s veterans by supporting this bill.

Thank you.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, after 4 years of Secretary DeVos’ efforts to promote greater privatization of our education system and dismantle the civil rights of students, Miguel Cardona is the person we need to restore the promise of America’s schools.

A former public school teacher who went on to be a leader in the same district where he was once an English teacher, Mr. Cardona has demonstrated a lifelong commitment to our public schools and the belief that all children are entitled to a quality education in a safe and nurturing learning environment. He also has a proven track record of effectively responding to the pandemic, helping students overcome the digital divide, and safely reopening schools as the Connecticut Education Commissioner.

The pandemic has upended our education system, disrupting learning and teaching. Every classroom was closed for months, and the country has been faced with an enormous challenge.

Mr. Cardona is making life harder, the ways it has set back students from where they would be in a typical year, denied them access to critical school resources, deepened longstanding inequities, and so much more.

From early education to higher education, we need to make sure students and their families have the support they need to not only get a high-quality education but to make sure every student can try.

Democrats want to get students safely back in the classrooms for in-person learning as soon as possible. So I am glad the Biden administration put forward a clear, science-based, public health guidance schools have long needed. There is no one solution that will ensure safety on its own as our country ramps up vaccine distribution.

Congress has to do its part and pass the American Rescue Plan to provide vital funding for schools—to secure adequate PPE, to reduce class sizes to increase social distancing, to improve ventilation and contract tracing, and to take all the steps they need to do so that our students can safely—person—person learning or provide high-quality distance learning if it is not safe in their community to return to the classroom and so that they can assess and address the damage this pandemic has done, especially the way it has deepened inequities that have hurt students of color, students of families with low incomes, students with disabilities, LGBTQ students, women, English learners, students experiencing homelessness, and so much more.

At this moment of crisis, Mr. Cardona is exactly the leader we need at the Department of Education to tackle these challenges. During his confirmation
Cardona, and I couldn’t be more ex-
cited on behalf of my constituents, on
behalf of the people of Meriden, CT, to
be here on the floor to tell you just a
little bit about why Miguel Cardona
makes so much sense for this moment.
As Senator MURRAY laid it out for us,
this is a time of crisis in American
education. Kids have been distance
learning or in and out of classroom
settings for the last year. We have
had so many children fall behind,
especially those with learning needs.
We have had a lot of kids in crisis.
For a lot of kids, home is not a safe
place. There is trauma today amongst
America’s children, and our education system is
going to have to bear a lot of the brunt
of making sure that these kids are
taken care of.
We have a crisis in higher education
without students in the classroom,
without sources of revenue flowing into
institutions of higher learning. We
need to make sure that we don’t lose
classroom slots in colleges and univer-
sities, which, of course, is the only
thing that allows us to be able to see a
bright economic future for our coun-
try—expanding access to higher edu-
cation.
Miguel is made for this moment be-
cause he knows how important college
is. He was the first member of his fam-
ily to complete college. He knows how
important community is. He came right
back to his community of Meri-
den after completing college and went
to work as a principal, assistant super-
tintendent, and former English learner himself who
knows we have a responsibility to
make sure every single student has ac-
tess to high-quality public education.
At our hearing, he made clear he will
fight against longstanding inequities
and for every student, including those
who have not had a champion at the
Department for the last 4 years. He
spoke about his commitment to accom-
plishing President Biden’s goal of safely
reopening the majority of our K-8
schools for in-person learning within
his first 100 days in office.
He showed he understands the chal-
lenge the Department is facing is larg-
er than just seeing schools and stu-
dents and parents and educators safely
through this pandemic. It is making
sure we come back stronger and fairer.
Accomplishing that means ensuring
childcare and early education is avail-
able and affordable for every family;
ensuring every student can get a high-
quality public education no matter
where they live or how much money
they or their families have; rooting out
longstanding inequities from our edu-
cation system by tackling racism,
sexism, ableism, and bigotry head-on;
and ensuring that higher education is
accessible, affordable, accountable, and
safe for every student.
We have a lot of work to do for our
schools and students. We have an excel-
ent candidate to get it done, and we
have no time to waste. I urge all of our
colleagues who have heard from a par-
cent who wants to get their child back
in the classroom safely—I am sure
everyone has—to join us and vote to con-
firm Dr. Cardona as Secretary of Edu-
cation.
I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
or from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous con-
sent to complete my remarks before
the vote.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I
come to the floor to echo Chairwoman
MURRAY’s comments, to suggest and
commend to my colleagues the nomi-
nation of Miguel Cardona to be the
next Secretary of Education.
There is no one better suited for this
job in this moment than Miguel
Cardona, and I couldn’t be more ex-

unions to come up with a plan to safely
reopen our schools. Connecticut re-
opened our schools faster than many
people thought we could, ahead of the
curve nationally. He was able to do
that because consensus building is a
skill that Miguel Cardona has been
working on for a very long time.
In 2013, one of his jobs, while he was
helping to lead the Meriden school sys-
tem, was to implement a new teacher
evaluation system. You know this can
always be very, very controversial, a
new system evaluating teachers’ per-
formances, but he brought everybody
to the table and developed a model
that became used statewide. His model
and his consensus approach became
the standard in our State. He is the
Secretary of Education we need right
now—somebody who has experience in
our classrooms, somebody who knows
the value of college, especially to first-
generation college families, and some-
body who knows how to bring people
together to solve a problem.

This is an incredibly important mo-
tment for America’s educational sys-
tem. We need to maintain and expand
our commitment to equity in our K-12
system to make sure that every single
child, no matter the level of income, no
matter the ethnic background, no mat-
ter the race, no matter if one is dis-
abled or not—gets a quality education.
This is a moment to invest in ac-
cessibility in higher education, and
make sure that we are not wasting tax-
payer dollars funding programs and de-
grees that don’t work, that may make
money for for-profit investors but that
don’t end up in skill sets that are going
to power our economy. Miguel Cardona
is the right person to meet this mo-
ment. He is whip-smart. He is a con-
sensus builder. He is a passionate advo-
cate for kids and for teachers and for
parents. He is the perfect person for
this job and for this moment.

Lastly, let me just talk with you
about how I got to know Miguel Cardona,
which, maybe, will serve as a final ad-
vertisement for his unique qualifica-
tions. This was my old congressional
district, and Meriden was part and is
still part of the Fifth Congressional
District. One of the biggest weekends
in Meriden has become the Puerto
Rican Heritage Festival, but that fes-
tival had sort of hit hard times. It was
a decade ago when, maybe, only a cou-
ples hundred people came to it until the
Cardona family took it over. Miguel
Cardona and his family took over the
Puerto Rican Heritage Festival in
Meriden, CT. Today, 6,000 or 7,000 peo-
ple come to this festival. You can find
Miguel Cardona out driving around on
his golf cart, organizing a packet
of letters from all of his classmates
to be sent to him so that he could still
have a connection back to Meriden.
He was such an amazing teacher that
he was promoted just after a few years
in the classroom. He was actually Con-
necticut’s youngest principal when,
at age 28, he took over Hanover. Soon
thereafter, he was promoted to help
run the city’s school district, and he
was promoted again to be the commis-
sioner of education in Connecticut.
It has been his work over the last
year that, I think, taught the atten-
tion of educational policy leaders and
advocates all across the country be-
cause Connecticut was one of the first
States to reopen its schools. We did it
through a consensus-building exercise
that Commissioner Cardona led. He
brought together students and parents,
administrators, teachers, and teachers

The Puerto Rican Heritage
Festival, but that fes-
tival had sort of hit hard times. It was
a decade ago when, maybe, only a cou-
ples hundred people came to it until the
Cardona family took it over. Miguel
Cardona and his family took over the
Puerto Rican Heritage Festival in
Meriden, CT. Today, 6,000 or 7,000 peo-
ple come to this festival. You can find
Miguel Cardona out driving around on
his golf cart, organizing bus transpor-
tation, working on the entertainment acts, and making
sure that Meriden is able to do its
Puerto Rican heritage proud. I then offer
something really constructive, really
fun, and really empowering for the
community.

There is no one better suited for this
job in this moment than Miguel
Cardona, and I couldn’t be more ex-


The Puerto Rican Heritage
Festival, but that fes-
tival had sort of hit hard times. It was
a decade ago when, maybe, only a cou-
ples hundred people came to it until the
Cardona family took it over. Miguel
Cardona and his family took over the
Puerto Rican Heritage Festival in
Meriden, CT. Today, 6,000 or 7,000 peo-

Even as commissioner of education, it wasn’t beyond him or above him to invest in his community in that way. It is, I hope, an indication of who he is and whom he will remain if the Senate chooses to confirm him into this role, as I hope we will do with a big bipartisan vote today.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON CARDONA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all post cloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Cardona nomination?

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Baldwin
Benet
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Burke
Cantwell
Capito
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Cassidy
Collins
Cortez Masto
Cory
Cotn
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Fischer
Gillibrand
Grassley

NAYS—33

Barrasso
Boozman
Brown
Carran
Crapo
Cruz
Ernest
Graham
Hagerty
Blackburn

NOT VOTING—3

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar No. 8, Gina Marie Raimondo, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Charles E. Schumer, Sherrod Brown, Sheldon Whitehouse, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert Menendez, Patrick J. Leahy, Alex Padilla, Jacky Rosen, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Baldwin, Jack Reed, Chris Van Hollen, Richard Blumenthal, Tim Kaine, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Maria Cantwell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Gina Marie Raimondo, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of Commerce, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Ex.]

YEAS—84

Baldwin
Benet
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Burke
Capito
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Cassidy
Collins
Cortez Masto
Cory
Cotn
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Fischer
Gillibrand
Grassley

NAYS—15

Barrasso
Boozman
Brown
Carran
Crapo
Cruz
Ernest
Graham
Hagerty
Blackburn

NOT VOTING—1

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 84, the nays are 15.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Gina Marie Raimondo, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of Commerce.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JOHN ROBERT LEWIS AND COMMENDING JOHN ROBERT LEWIS FOR HIS TOWERING ACHIEVEMENTS IN THE NON-VIOLENT STRUGGLE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, as if in legislative Session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 82, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 82) honoring the life and legacy of John Robert Lewis and commending John Robert Lewis for his towering achievements in the nonviolent struggle for civil rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 82) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s Record under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

Mr. OSSOFF. I yield.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

FEDERAL FUNDING

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, from the streets of Portland and Seattle to right here in our Nation’s Capital, lawlessness has ensued all too often across our Nation over the past year. I have consistently called it what it is—anarchy. And, folks, we need to be absolutely clear on this: Anarchy cannot be tolerated in our Nation.

The mayhem that we have seen over the last year has put our families, our communities, and our law enforcement in danger, and tragically it has led to death and destruction.

In what will probably come as no shock to the American people, a nonpartisan watchdog organization found that the Federal Government has spent more than $14 billion of our taxpayer money, our hard-earned dollars, on Federal contracts and grants in five major cities where civil unrest, also known as anarchy, goes unchecked and police are unable to do their jobs—14
billion with a “b” dollars paid to local leaders and city officials who are failing to do their jobs.

Let’s keep talking about these dollar figures, folks. According to recent reports by local media in Oregon, left-wing protests in Portland have caused roughly $2.3 million in damage to Federal buildings since they broke out last summer. The near-nightly standoffs with police involved graffiti, broken windows, firecrackers, as well as Molotov cocktails. According to one U.S. attorney in Oregon, cleanup at the courthouse and four other government buildings has cost more than $2 million, and that number could keep going up because the repairs are ongoing.

Last year, I pushed for a review of any Federal funding that was going to the cities and States that were allowing anarchy to run rampant. It was a simple ask: Scrutinize any future Federal funding that might flow into these lawless jurisdictions.

Specifically, yesterday I asked the Office of Management and Budget to look into and report to the American people the amount of taxpayer dollars local officials used to either sustain these lawless zones or the amount needed to repair the damage done during the chaos. Thankfully, last year, the Federal Government began to do just that, but, folks, just last week, President Biden reversed this effort, and I would like to know why.

I agree with our new President that peaceful protests are a cornerstone of our democracy, but smashing windows is not protesting and neither is looting. Burning small businesses that are the modest nest eggs of hard-working Americans and actions like those are totally unacceptable. I don’t think there is anyone in the Senate who would disagree. So why, then, is President Biden reversing course and preventing this review from going forward? There is anyone in the Senate who would disagree. So why, then, is President Biden reversing this effort, and I would like to know why.
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TRIBUTE TO CHRISTINA NOLAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to a great Vermonter, Christina Nolan, a most dedicated public servant who has served as U.S. attorney for the District of Vermont since November 2017. She will be resigning her post at the end of this month, 11 years since she first joined the U.S. Attorney’s Office, but her work and the strong partnerships she forged will carry on for many years to come.

A profile of Christina recently appeared in Vermont Business Magazine under the headline “A Born Advocate for Justice.” And she has been just that. During her tenure, Christina worked to stem the deadly surge of heroin and fentanyl in our small State, and she has joined with Federal partners to slow the illegal trafficking of firearms. She has also used her voice to shine a spotlight on domestic violence and human trafficking, not only pressing criminal charges but also highlighting the plight of victims who are caught in the path of such heinous crimes. Her personal approach to each and every case, signing off on every charging document in the office, as well as her commitment to victims and her dedication to upholding the rule of law are evident to anyone who has witnessed her work and her work ethic.

While Vermont’s U.S. Attorney’s Office is among the smallest in the country, it is fair to say that under Christina’s leadership, the team has punched well above their weight. In one instance, her office set out to investigate kickbacks and fraudulent billing practices involving the electronic health records industry, unraveling a scheme that resulted in an $8 billion national settlement with Perdue Pharma, which admitted to needlessly and shamelessly promoting the prescribed use of OxyContin, a highly addictive opioid.

During her time as U.S. attorney, Christina has forged strong relationships with her partners in Federal, State and local law enforcement circles, many of whom have shared with me how much they appreciated her engagement. In the courtroom, colleagues on both sides of the bench have lauded her fairness. A Federal judge, interviewed for the aforementioned magazine profile, spoke of her “quiet confidence” and her “natural courtroom presence: graceful and commanding.”

I am proud to have worked with Gov. Phil Scott to recommend Christina Nolan for the position of U.S. attorney back in 2017. She has served Vermonters very well during her tenure. I will miss Christina and her longtime partner, Jill, and their family our very best in future endeavors.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, just barely a year ago, I was here making a similar statement. Impeachment is one of the most solemn matters to come before the Senate, but I worry that it’s also becoming a common occurrence. Before getting into the merits of this impeachment, it is important to reiterate that January 6 was a sad and tragic day for America. I hope we can all agree about that.

What happened there at the Capitol was completely inexcusable. It was not a demonstration of any of our protected, inalienable rights. It was a direct, violent attack on our seat of government. Those who swore under police carbines, defied the emotions, and desecrated our monument to representative democracy flouted the rule of law and disgraced our Nation. Six people, including two U.S. Capitol Police officers, now lie dead in the wake of this assault. The perpetrators must be brought to justice, and I am glad to see that many such cases are progressing around the country.

While the ultimate responsibility for this attack rests upon the shoulders of those who unlawfully entered the Capitol, everyone involved must take responsibility for their destructive actions that day, including the former President. As the leader of the Nation, all presidents bear responsibility for the actions that they inspire—good or bad. Undoubtedly, then-President Trump displayed poor leadership in his words and actions. I do not defend those actions and my vote should not be read as a defense of the former President. I am a member of a Court of Impeachment. My job is to vote on the case brought by the House managers. I took an oath to render judgment on those actions and my vote should be based on the merits of the case presented.

First and foremost, I don’t think this impeachment is proper under the Constitution. This is the first time the Senate has tried a former President. Whether or not it can do so is a difficult question. The Constitution doesn’t say in black and white “Yes, the Senate can try a former President” or “No, it can’t.” In contrast, many State constitutions at the time of the founding specified that their legislatures could, so it’s notable that our Federal charter did not. In order to answer this question it’s therefore necessary to look at the text, structure, and history of the Constitution. That’s what I have done. In the end, I do not think we have the ability to try a former President.

I start always with the Constitution, which gives Congress the power of impeachment. As I mentioned, impeachment was a feature in many State constitutions at the time, and it came from a power enjoyed by the English Parliament.

Impeachment in England was a powerful tool whereby Parliament could...
Congressional Record — Senate

March 1, 2021

S925

The House managers tried to prove that President Trump incited an insurrection. That is a difficult argument to make. There were many other articles over which they could have impeached President Trump, but this is what the House of Representatives chose. They didn’t meet their burden.

Before getting to the merits of the charge, I need to point out that this impeachment trial has not aligned with principles of due process of law. Other legal experts noted significant fact-finding in the House, where proper legal formalities are followed, witnesses are heard from and cross-examined, and hard evidence is reviewed. Here there were no hearings in the House. The evidence presented was mostly video montages and news reports. We even had the unusual spectacle of voting to call witnesses for the first time as the trial was ending only to immediately reverse course and call none. Given the seriousness of the situation, I think it’s important when the House exercises its constitutional duty of impeachment.

This issue involves complicated legal questions. In our legal system, though, it is very difficult for speech to rise to the level of incitement. "Incitement" is a legal term of art. Usually it takes place in the context of incitement to violence. Incitement, in our legal system, doesn’t mean "encouraging" violence or "advocating" violence or even "spousing" violence intentionally causing likely violence. Because the Article of Impeachment uses the word "incitement," I need to evaluate President Trump’s actions under the rubrics of the law of incitement, which were set out in the Supreme Court case of Brandenburg v. Ohio. In that case the Court held that incitement required speech that, first, encourages "imminent lawless action" and, second, "is likely to incite or produce such action." In other words, in order for the House managers to make their case, they must have shown that President Trump’s speech was intended to direct the crowd to assault the Capitol and that his language was also likely to have that effect.

As I said before, what happened on January 6 was tragic. We can’t let it happen again. But the House managers have not sufficiently demonstrated that President Trump’s speech incited it. While I will have more to say about President Trump's conduct, the fact is that he said this: "I know that everyone here will soon be marching over to the Capitol building to peacefully and patriotically make your voices heard." That speech is not an incitement to imminent lawless action as established in the case law. I wish the crowd would have listened to him.

Just because President Trump did not meet the definition of incitement does not mean that I think he behaved patriotically. In fact, I opposed any的样子 of lockstep to proceed, and we went to trial. As I’ve said, even though I think this is inappropriate, I kept an open mind during the process, and I listened to both sides as they presented their evidence.
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with elections, not with violence. Whether the violence comes from the left or the right, it’s wrong. The same goes for speech that claims to define enemies by political views or affiliations.

We’re all Americans, always trying to form a more perfect union. We have more in common than what divides us. It’s high time those of us who have been elected to serve lead by example. We can take the high road. We can tone down our rhetoric. We can be respectful even when we disagree strongly. If we don’t, we’ll be betraying the trust that the American people have placed in us, and we’ll endanger the democracy and the freedom that so many of us have worked to preserve.

These are difficult issues I have considered over the past week, but in the end, I am confident in what I think is the correct position. We do not have the authority to try a private citizen like former President Trump. Even if we did, we have been careful to protect the protections of due process of law in his trial. And even if we assume he has been, the House managers still did not prove that he committed incitement to insurrection, the specific crime of which he was accused. This does not excuse President Trump’s conduct on and around January 6 of this year, it satisfies my oath as a U.S. Senator in this Court of Impeachment. I therefore voted to acquit.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my opinion memorandum in the impeachment trial of President Donald J. Trump be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPINION MEMORANDUM OF UNITED STATES SENATOR JOHN F. REED IN THE IMPEACHMENT TRAIL OF PRESIDENT DONALD JOHN TRUMP

I. FINDINGS

On January 13, 2021, the United States House of Representatives passed House Resolution 25, “Impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors.”

Based on the evidence in the record, the arguments of the House Impeachment Managers, and the arguments of President’s Counsel, I conclude as follows: Mr. Trump has violated his oath to take care that the laws be faithfully executed and has acted in a manner that is fundamentally incompatible with the constitutional order. The House Impeachment Managers have proven that Mr. Trump’s conduct, in excess of impeachment jurisdiction, amounts to the constitutional standard of “high Crimes and Misdemeanors” for which the remedy of conviction and disqualification is warranted.

II. THE CONSTITUTIONAL GROUNDS FOR IMPEACHMENT

‘The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments.’ With these few words in the Framers’ Constitution, the Framers trusted the Senate with the most awesome power within a democratic society: whether to remove an impeached president from office.

A. High Crimes and Misdemeanors

The Constitution states, “The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other High Crimes and Misdemeanors.” “Treason” and “Bribery” are foundational impeachable offenses. No more heinous example of an offense against the constitutional order exists than betrayal of the nation to personal enrichment. A President commits treason when he levies war against the United States or gives comfort or aid to its enemies. As the framers explained, a President engages in impeachable bribery when he “offers, solicits, or accepts something of personal value to influence his own and others’ official conduct.”

In interpreting “high Crimes and Misdemeanors,” we must not only look to the Federalist Papers and the records of the Constitutional Convention, but also to the contemporary and foundational writings on impeachment available to the Framers. Sir William Blackstone, whose influential Commentaries on the Laws of England were published from 1765-1770, discussed a classification of crimes he termed “public wrongs, or crimes and misdemeanors.” He defined as breaches of the public duty an individual owed to the nation’s entire community.

Blackstone viewed treason, murder, and bribery as “public wrongs,” not only because they cause injury to individuals but also because they “strike at the very being of society.”

Richard Wooddeson, a legal scholar who published from 1765–1770, discussed a classification of crimes he termed “public wrongs.” Sir William Blackstone included the dual components of abuse of public trust and national harm in his definition of impeachable crimes and misdemeanors. In Federalist Paper No. 65, Hamilton defined an impeachable offense as “those offenses which proceed from the misconduct of public men, or in other words from the abuse or violation of some public trust. They are of a nature which may with peculiar propriety be denominated POLITICAL, as they relate chiefly to injuries done immediately to the society itself.”

Much the same as Blackstone and Wooddeson, Alexander Hamilton included the dual components of abuse of public trust and national harm in his definition of impeachable crimes and misdemeanors. In Federalist Paper No. 65, Hamilton defined an impeachable offense as “those offenses which proceed from the misconduct of public men, or in other words from the abuse or violation of some public trust. They are of a nature which may with peculiar propriety be denominated POLITICAL, as they relate chiefly to injuries done immediately to the society itself.”

This line of reasoning is buttressed by the careful and thoughtful work of the House of Representatives during the Watergate proceedings. The Democratic seats of the House Judiciary Committee concluded that, “[b]ecause impeachment of a President is a grave step for the nation, it is to be predicated only upon conduct seriously incompatible with either the constitutional form and principles of our government or the proper performance of constitutional duties of the presidential office.”

The deliberations at the Constitutional Convention also demonstrate a conscious movement to narrow the terminology as a means of raising the threshold for the Impeachment process to require an offense against the State.

Early in the debate on the issue of presidential impeachment in July of 1787, it was suggested that Impeachment and removal could be founded on a showing of “mal-practice,” “neglect of duty,” or “corrupt transactions.” By September of that year, the concept of impeachment had been referred to the Committee of Eleven, which was created to resolve the most contentious issues. Committee hearings considered whether the grounds for Impeachment should be “treason or bribery.” It was significantly more restricted than the amendments to the threshold of raising the threshold for the Impeachment process to require an offense against the State.

By the summer of 1787, the Constitution of the United States itself further clarified the standard for replacing “State” with the “United States.”

At the conclusion of the substantive deliberations on the constitutional standard of Impeachment, it was obvious that only serious offenses against the State system would justify Impeachment and subsequent removal from office. However, the Committee of Style applied the final stylistic touches to the Constitution. The Committee had no authority to alter the meaning of the carefully debated language and
could only impose a stylistic consistency through, among other things, the elimination of redundancy. In its zeal to streamline the text, the words ‘against the United States’ was deemed as unnecessary to the meaning of the passage.\textsuperscript{22}

The weight of both authoritative commentary and the history of the Constitutional Convention compels the conclusion that the impermissible exercise of the powers of his office to stop the constitutional order. Moreover, since the essence of Impeachment is removal from office, punishment for offenses, there is a strong inference that the improper conduct must represent a continuing threat to the American people and the Constitution.

C. An Impeachable Offense is Not Limited to Criminal Liability or a Defined Offense

Article I, Section 3 of the United States Constitution provides that, “The President, Vice President and all Civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.” The President’s Counsel argued in Federalist Paper No. 65, that Impeachments “can never be tied down by such strict rules . . . as in common cases serve to limit the discretion of courts in favor of personal security.”\textsuperscript{29} In this regard, Hamilton further distinguished Impeachment from criminal trials, Alexander Hamilton argued in Federalist Paper No. 65, that Impeachments “can never be tied down by such strict rules . . . as in common cases serve to limit the discretion of courts in favor of personal security.”\textsuperscript{29} In this regard, Hamilton further distinguished Impeachment from criminal trials by stressing that an impeached official could be subject to the criminal prosecution after Impeachment.\textsuperscript{30}

However, what exact constitutional standard should be used remains debateable. Pragmatic concerns related to the utilization of the Impeachment power should be considered when determining the standard of proof required. Too low of a standard may lead to removal, even if significant doubts exist. A ... ‘criminal’ standard of proof could mean, in practice, that a man could remain president if he was only believed to be guilty of corruption, just because his guilt was not shown ‘beyond a reasonable doubt.’”\textsuperscript{33}

When uncertain about the standard of proof to apply, it is worth reviewing the writings of eminent scholars. In doing so, I have found a closer approximation to what the standard should be in many Impeachment trials as compared to those used in general legal practice: “(i)overwhelming preponderance of the evidence” . . . “Yet, I believe that the standard used by a president of the United States warrants an even higher bar. As such, a definition slightly modified, but modeled on that proposed by the Federalist Societies, clearly and convincingly clear and convincing evidence. This standard more closely comports with historical analysis of the Founders’ desire to separate criminal law and Impeachment and the arguments made by scholars, while reflecting the serious constitutional harms alleged in the Article of Impeachment before the Senate.

V. CONSTITUTIONALITY OF IMPEACHMENT TRIAL

The President’s Counsel has argued that an Impeachment trial conducted after a president leaves office is unconstitutional. Specifically, they have claimed that the Senate was also common in the early state governments, which included former officials.\textsuperscript{45}

Indeed, the language of the U.S. Constitution proves this out. Article I, Section 3, Clause 6 states, “The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments.” That is, the Senate has the power to conduct a trial for any Impeachment commenced by the House of Representatives without qualification regarding its timing. The House impeached Mr. Trump, and it is now in the constitutional power of the Senate to conduct the trial. The President’s Counsel outlined two possible penalties in any Impeachment trial: removal and disqualification.
The Senate cannot exceed those penalties, nor are these penalties necessarily linked by the language of the text. The Senate has the power to remove a president without also disqualifying him from future office. Likewise, legal scholars assert that disqualification from office need not follow removal from office.44 Such a reading would neutral the ability of the Senate's disqualification power to deny future office to a former president.45

Most scholars agree that the Senate in January of 1798 with the intention of disqualifying former President John Adams from holding office was acting properly.46 In July of 1797, the House brought five articles of impeachment against Senator William Blount of Tennessee on the charge of conspiracy. After his trial and conviction, he was not disqualified from future office.47 Most scholars agree that the Senate dismissed the case on the grounds that the impeachment power does not extend to Members of Congress.48 The Senate did not, however, dismiss the case on the basis that Blount was a former official.49 The Senate once again asserted its right to conduct an impeachment trial of a former official in the 1876 case of Secretary of War William Belknap. The House voted to impeach Belknap after he resigned. The Senate then debated the constitutionality of late impeachment before asserting in a 37-29 vote that it had the power to try an ex-officer.50 Although Belknap was not ultimately convicted, the Senate had decided that it had the power to convict and disqualify an ex-official. Congress acted once more in the 1926 case of federal judge George English. The House of Representatives impeached him after he dismissed the Senate from holding office.51 As these cases demonstrate, the Senate has repeatedly declared its late-impeachment powers, though it has rarely chosen to pursue impeachment proceedings.

Finally, the denial of late impeachability promotes the dangerous and unconstitutional idea of a “January Exception.” One of the central concerns of the Framers was the diffusion of power across branches in a system of checks and balances to prevent any one branch, but particularly the executive, from gaining too much power. Impeachment is the last line of defense created to hold officials accountable for their abuse of those powers. Hence the time between election and inauguration of a new president is not a proper time to bring the Senate back into session immediately in order to receive the Article of Impeachment. However, the Senate Majority Leader managed to bring the Senate back into session immediately after the 2020 election.52 Impeachment power does not extend to the presidential scandal component of the Impeachment power. Hence the time between election and inauguration of a new president extends beyond his tenure of office. The president has the constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and in subversion of the constitutional order, I find that there is overwhelmingly clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Trump committed impeachable conduct. As I will further explain, Mr. Trump must be convicted and disqualified from holding office for the conduct described in H. Res. 24.

VIII. IMPEACHMENT LAW

As explained in Section III, Congress is bound neither by civil nor criminal law in determining whether an offense meets the standards of “high Crimes and Misdemeanors.” However, existing legal frameworks for “incitement” are helpful for analyzing and putting Mr. Trump’s words and conduct into context.

Black’s Law Dictionary defines incitement generally as “the act or an instance of provoking, urging on, or stirring up.”53 Specifically, in regards to criminal law, Black’s Law Dictionary defines incitement as “the act of persuading another person to commit a crime.”54 A group of constitutional law scholars explained that, for the purposes of Impeachment, a determination of whether a president’s speech or conduct is protected must primarily take into account whether a president’s words are consistent with the Constitution and the oath to “faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and . . . preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.”55 For example, if a president said “I no longer pledge my support and defend the Constitution of the United States” or “I no longer recognize Congress as a co-equal branch of government,” such statements would certainly be inherently antithetical to the constitutional order that the president swore to uphold. While these statements may be lawful and protected by the Constitution in another context, they would certainly be impeachable.

Turning to the definition of “insurrection” itself, the Corpus Juris defines it as “the act of rising in open resistance against established authority or government, or as any open and active opposition of force to the power of permitting, the laws of the United States of so formidable a character as to deny, for the time being, the authority of the government, even though not accompanied by bloodshed and not of sufficient magnitude to render success probable.”56

In his “Save America” rally? 2021 speech, Mr. Trump sought to instill his supporters to believe his election lies, and know that his supporters would take action based on these lies?
(3) Did Mr. Trump’s speech or conduct drive his supporters to commit unlawful or violent acts on January 6th?

(4) What steps did Mr. Trump take once the rioters breached the Capitol?

B. Leading Up to January 6, 2021, Mr. Trump Propagated a False Narrative that the Election Had Been Stolen and Supported Violent Acts to Reverse the Results

To determine whether Mr. Trump engaged in incitement, it is instructive to look at a timeline of Mr. Trump’s statements, direct acts, and actions taken at his behest, leading up to January 6th.

a. Statements and Conduct Regarding Voter Fraud Before the 2020 Election

Even before the November 2020 election, Mr. Trump gave credence to the idea that mass voter fraud was inevitable, and the only way he would lose was if the election were stolen. For example, in July, Mr. Trump tweeted “With Universal Mail-In Voting (not Absentee Voting, which is good), 2020 will be the most INACCURATE & FRAUDULENT Election in history.” At an August rally in Wisconsin, Trump said “The only way we’re going to lose this election is if they steal this election. People are entitled to an election that is rig­ged, remember that. . . . It’s the only way we’re going to lose this election. So we have to be very careful.”

In September, he told reporters, from the White House lawn, “I’m not sure that it [the election] can be [honest], I don’t know that it can with this whole situation, unsolicited ballots being sent to everybody.”

b. Statements and Conduct Regarding Voter Fraud After 2020 Election

Once the 2020 election was over, Mr. Trump made it clear that he would continue under no circumstances to concede his 3rd loss. He filibustered court press urging Americans not to accept the election results. In a statement after Mr. Biden was projected the winner, Mr. Trump said, “The simple fact is this election is far from over . . . Beginning Monday, our campaign will start prosecuting our case in court to ensure election laws are fully upheld and the rightful winner is seated.” Mr. Trump’s clear intention was to discursively самом politician to use any means necessary to prevent a peaceful transfer of power.

Mr. Trump also made statements and used rhetoric that Mr. Trump forcefully pushed these lies, no matter how divorced from reality they became. In the weeks after the election, it became painfully clear that Mr. Trump continued to sow distrust in individuals at all levels of government to use their authority to reject, and in some cases alter, the electoral votes for Mr. Biden. Mr. Trump said, “They’re not going to take the White House. We’re going to fight like hell.”

In addition to his dishonest rhetoric on election fraud, Mr. Trump took concrete steps to bend reality to match what he wanted. As I will explain in more detail in Section VIII, Mr. Trump used any means necessary to protect the election results. He even praised his supporters’ actions, saying, “Did you see the way our people, they were, ya know, protecting this bus . . . because they’re nice . . . They had hundreds of people on Mr. Trump! Mr. Trump and the American flag.”

After Mr. Biden was declared the winner, Mr. Trump focused his ire in the following weeks in crafting a new slogan, “STOP THE STEAL,” to challenge the Electoral College vote. Mr. Trump even praised his supporters’ actions, saying, “They’re not going to take the White House. We’re going to fight like hell.”

As late as January 4th, Mr. Trump held a rally before the Georgia Senate runoff saying, “When you win in a landslide and they steal it and it’s rigged, it’s not acceptable. Not acceptable.”

The day before the Capitol insurrection, even Vice President Mike Pence told Mr. Trump that he had a constitutional duty to certify the true winner of the election, which was Mr. Biden.

Yet, throughout all of this and despite undeniable evidence to the contrary, Mr. Trump doggedly claimed that he had won the election, and that his supporters should help vindicate him. He lied to the American people, and did so knowingly and deliberately.

c. Mr. Trump Invoked Violent Means to Further His Re-Election

Leading up to January 6th, Mr. Trump supported—either tacitly or outright—the use of violence to reverse election results. For example, in the spring of 2020, Mr. Trump embraced the backlash against COVID–19 policies to aid his re-election. Furthermore, in November 2020, Mr. Trump appeared to defend the movement. On August 19th, Mr. Trump tacitly endorsed QAnon at a press conference, saying, “We have a move­ment, other than I understand they like me very much. I think I like them a lot.”
hall on October 15th. Mr. Trump praised QAnon members again, this time saying, “Let me just—let me just tell you, what I do hear about it, is they are very strongly against me. I don’t know if I trust them with my life, but I mean, I do agree with that. And I agree with it very strongly.”

d. Mr. Trump Organized the January 6th “Save America” Rally

In the days leading up to January 6th, Mr. Trump sent out numerous tweets promoting the “Save America Rally” and gave his supporters specific instructions on when and where to converge. On December 23rd, he tweeted, “Big protest in D.C. on January 6th . . . Be there, will be wild!” On December 27, he tweeted, “See you in Washington, DC, on January 6th. It’s going to be wild! Information follows.” On January 1, 2021, he tweeted, “The BIG PROTEST Rally in Washington, D.C. will take place at 11:00 A.M. on January 6th. Locational details to follow. StopTheSteal!”

Mr. Trump not only knew, but actively coordinated the January 6th rally in order to disrupt the electoral process that day. First, Mr. Trump chose to convene a rally on the same day as the electoral certification, and then explicitly urged his supporters to descend upon D.C. under the rubric of a “wild” and “historic” day. Manager Plaskett underscored that it was only after Mr. Trump chose that day that the Pro-Trump group, Women for America First, obtained a permit for what became the “Save America” rally at the Ellipse. The day after Women for America First announced the rally, Mr. Trump reposted their announcement and replied “I will be there Historic day!”

Manager Plaskett stated that Trump campaign event became directly involved with every aspect of the event, including the speaking line-up and even the music to be played and brought in the same people who spoke at the second Million MAGA rally to help.”

The evidence showed that Mr. Trump’s promotion of the “Save America” rally succeeded in convincing his supporters to show up at the Ellipse on January 6th. Many of Mr. Trump’s supporters said that they felt summoned to Washington, D.C. to take retaliatory action. In a Twitter post before the insurrection, a supporter shared one of Mr. Trump’s tweets and wrote, “This isn’t a joke, this is where and when we make our stand. #January6th, Washington DC. Be there, no matter what. Nothing is more important.”

In a statement taped on a livestream video taken during the insurrection, a man is heard saying, “Our president was not able to do the orders from our president.” In court papers and interviews given after the insurrection, pro-Trump rioters said they joined the march because the president encouraged them to do so.

I find overwhelmingly clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Trump and his allies foreseeably and recklessly solicited his supporters to help him overturn the election results—including most prominently by attending the January 6th rally to disrupt the Electoral College certification.

d. Mr. Trump’s Supporters Committed Unlawful Acts of Insurrection on January 6th

a. Trump Speaks at the “Save America” Rally

After months of fomenting anger over his false claims of voter fraud, Mr. Trump gathered his supporters at the “Save America” rally on January 6th. Once there, Mr. Trump told the crowd “We’re going to walk down Pennsylvania Avenue, take back our country with weakness. You have to show strength and you have to be strong.”

This was a continuation of a pattern of Mr. Trump leading up to the events at the Capitol. For example, Mr. Trump had previously told followers to “Fight like Hell” at rallies. He repeated this theme in a video tweet on January 6th stating, “[W]e fight. We fight like hell.”

His supporters got the message. By 12:39pm, a large group of Trump supporters approached a fenced off area in front of the Capitol and began to engage with Capitol police officers, many of whom were armed with masks on their side arms.
d. The Rioters Target Vice President Pence and Speaker Pelosi

As members of Congress moved to secure locations or sheltered in place, rioters walked through the Capitol, vandalizing the building, and breaking into congressional offices, including the office of Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi. One rioter was later arrested for breaking into Nancy Pelosi’s office door and that “Crazy Nancy probably would have been torn into little pieces but she was nowhere to be seen.” The rioter’s comments are significant, for this is Mr. Trump’s nickname for the Speaker of the House. Vice President Mike Pence was another primary target of the mob. “Once we found out Pence turned on us and that they had stolen the election, like, officially, the crowd went crazy,” said one rioter.

Throughout the Capitol, Members and their staff barricaded themselves in offices, hid under tables, called loved ones, and prayed for safety.140

e. The President Fails to Respond to or Condemn the Violence at the Capitol

President’s Counsel argue that the President did not intend or anticipate for violence to take place. However, one would expect—that as soon as it was clear that the rioters had begun engaging in unlawful or violent acts—Mr. Trump would quickly issue both a denunciation and a call to take every action possible to stop further violence. Arguably, once the lawbreaking began, it was only Mr. Trump that had the most potent power at that point to get his supporters to stop. However, instead of acting expeditiously, it took him more than two hours after the rioters stormed the Capitol to make a statement. In this time, it is reported that lawmakers and Trump advisors pleaded with him to call off the angry mob and denounce the violence. Mr. Trump was famously unmoveable by these pleas for help, and it is even reported that he was pleased by the actions of his supporters. Rather than call off his supporters, it is reported that Mr. Trump called a Member of the Senate asking him to raise additional objections to certifying the Electoral College results. Not until 4:15pm did Mr. Trump finally record a memo to the outgoing administration, telling supporters to go home. The video statement did not condemn the rioters’ actions at the Capitol.

Mr. Trump’s delay in responding to the insurrection is unsurprising, for many of the rioters thought they were “answer[ing] the call of my President.”146 In a live-streamed video from inside the Capitol, one rioter declared that “[o]ur president wants us here. . . . We wait and take orders from our president.”147 Another rioter claimed that she “thought I was following my President. He asked us to fly there, he asked us to be there, so I was doing what he asked us to do.”148 One supporter’s argument was later argued for in court, with the court finding that he, “acted out of the delusional belief that he was a ‘patriot’ protecting his country . . . He was responding to the entreaties of the then-commander in chief, President Trump. . . . The President maintained that the election had been stolen and it was the duty of loyal citizens to ‘stop the steal.’”147 To paraphrase the House Managers, Mr. Trump sold his followers the big lie of a stolen election and then provoked those followers to violent action to “stop the steal.”

In his late statement on the events at the Capitol, Trump urged his followers to “Please support Police and enforcement stay peaceful.” Of course, the insurrection was never peaceful, and the Capitol Police were treated cruelly by the mob. Over the course of the insurrection, 140 police officers were injured and one officer, Brian Sicknick, was killed. Four rioters also died. In the course of the events, occupied the Capitol bore the marks of bullets, monuments were destroyed, windows were smashed and broken in, Members and staff were terrorized, Senate desks were ransacked, and smoke hung in the air. Mr. Trump should have pleaded with the crowd to stand down and leave the Capitol. The President’s delay in speaking is significant, for this is Mr. Trump’s nickname for the Speaker of the House. Vice President Mike Pence was another primary target of the mob. “Once we found out Pence turned on us and that they had stolen the election, like, officially, the crowd went crazy,” said one rioter.

f. The Capitol is Cleared and the Election Results Are Certified

It took more than four hours after the rioters entered the building to secure the Capitol and another three hours before the Joint Session could resume.148 Nevertheless, Joseph R. Biden Jr. was confirmed the winner of the 2020 election at approximately 4am.149

E. The First Amendment Is Not a Defense to Mr. Trump’s Incitement of Insurrection

President’s Counsel argued at trial that Mr. Trump was exercising his First Amendment rights by his views at the “Save America” rally, and thus cannot be convicted in this proceeding. I conclude that there is overwhelming clear and convincing evidence that the First Amendment does not inculcate him from the current Impeachment charge.

a. The First Amendment Is Not a Bar to Impeachment

As I explained in Section II, the relevant standard in an Impeachment trial is whether a president committed impeachable “high Crimes and Misdemeanors.” An impeachable offense need not violate a criminal or other established law. Indeed, even an action that is lawful or otherwise protected by the Constitution can still be an impeachable offense. The First Amendment does not inoculate the President from the standard of proof in an Impeachment, and as discussed in Section IV, there is no defined standard for the appropriate standard in an Impeachment trial. Therefore, the standard in an Impeachment trial should be the same standards as in a criminal prosecution.

As a result, in an Impeachment trial, the Senate is simply not bound by a determination of whether Mr. Trump is protected by the First Amendment, nor must the Senate adhere to either the constitutional form and principles of our government or the proper performance of the constitutional duties of the presidential office.150 In addition, as I explained in Section IV, there is no defined standard of proof in an Impeachment, and there are no requirements to adhere to the same standards as in a criminal prosecution.

b. Mr. Trump’s Speech Likely Still Satisfies the Standard of Incitement

Although I have concluded that the First Amendment does not necessarily serve as a shield in this proceeding, I find it persuasive that the bedrock principle of free speech has a long history in our country. Therefore, I undertook an examination of the governing principles and principles of our government or the proper performance of the constitutional duties of the presidential office.150 In addition, as I explained in Section IV, there is no defined standard of proof in an Impeachment, and there are no requirements to adhere to the same standards as in a criminal prosecution.

As a result, in an Impeachment trial, the Senate is simply not bound by a determination of whether Mr. Trump is protected by the First Amendment, nor must the Senate demand a showing that every element of a criminal charge has been met.

Mr. Trump’s Speech Likely Still Satisfies the Standard of Incitement

Although I have concluded that the First Amendment does not necessarily serve as a shield in this proceeding, I find it persuasive that the bedrock principle of free speech has a long history in our country. Therefore, I undertook an examination of the governing principles and principles of our government or the proper performance of the constitutional duties of the presidential office.150 In addition, as I explained in Section IV, there is no defined standard of proof in an Impeachment, and there are no requirements to adhere to the same standards as in a criminal prosecution.

As a result, in an Impeachment trial, the Senate is simply not bound by a determination of whether Mr. Trump is protected by the First Amendment, nor must the Senate demand a showing that every element of a criminal charge has been met.

The First Amendment prohibits any law “abridging the freedom of speech.”151 However, even at our country’s founding, it is clear that Congress was not intended to provide absolute protection for every utterance. Of the fourteen states that ratified the Constitution by 1792, thirteen had laws limiting libelous or blasphemous speech.152 In addition, the Supreme Court has recognized specific categories of speech that may still be regulated in the interest of protecting the democratic process and which the government may regulate because of their content. These categories are “obscenity, defamation, fraud, incitement, sedition, and child pornography.”153

The relevant legal framework for incitement was established by the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1969 case of Brandenburg v. Ohio.154 In that case, a Ku Klux Klan leader, Charles Evers, was convicted of making a speech after making a speech at a Klan rally that apparently broke an Ohio law against “advocat[ing] crime, sabotage, violence, or disorderly methods of accomplishing industrial or political reform.”155 The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the state’s standard for First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocacy for violence or lawbreaking could be criminally prosecuted. The Brandenburg test defines unprotected incitement as speech that is “directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to produce such action.”156

Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana,157 a Ku Klux Klan leader, Gregory Hess, was attending an anti-Vietnam war protest when the police moved a group of protesters from the street onto the sidewalk.158 Hess said, “We’ll take the [effing] street later” and was convicted for disorderly conduct.159 The Supreme Court reversed Hess’ conviction, concluding, “Since the uncontroverted evidence showed that the movement was not directed by any person or group of persons, it cannot be said that he was advocating, in the normal sense, any action. And since there was no evidence, or rational inference from the import of the language, that his words were intended to produce, and likely to produce, imminent disorder; those words could not be punished by the State on the ground that they had ‘a tendency to lead to violence.’”156

The Supreme Court subsequently explained that “finding of ‘imminence’ requires a time, place, and manner analysis, looking upon the context and timing connecting speech and subsequent acts of lawbreaking. In NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Company, a boycott of businesses owned by African Americans for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) organized a boycott of white-owned stores in Mississippi.158 The boycott was lawfully supported by the Commission encouraging nonviolent picketing—including by boycott organizer Charles Evers—but some acts and threats of violence did occur. The Court concluded, ‘There are three separate theories that might justify holding Evers liable . . . First, a finding that he authorized, directed, or ratified specific instances of violent activity would render him responsible for the consequences of that activity. Second, a finding that his public speeches were likely to incite lawless action could justify holding him liable for unlawful conduct that in fact followed within a reasonable period. Third, the speeches might be taken as evidence that Evers gave other speeches or writings that advocated or incited threats.’”160 In the specific case of Evers’ speech, the Court concluded “In the course of [Evers'] plea, strong language was used. The language had no tendency to lead to violence, a substantial question would be presented whether Evers could be held liable for the consequences of that unlawful conduct. . . . The manner identified in 1966 occurred weeks or months after [his] April 1, 1966, speech.”161
The discussion of the risks of violent incidents occurring in the United States. In Mr. Trump's case, it would be difficult to argue that he gave a political speech at the "Save America" rally outside the course of performing his official duties. The purpose of the speech was to use his role as president to urge his supporters to stop the certification of Biden's electoral win. In addition, there is evidence that members of the crowd had already decided to attend the rally, and his insisting that they head to the Capitol, as instructions coming from the president. Moreover, as Manager Raskin explained, a president takes an oath to uphold the laws, the Constitution, and the principles of our republic.158 In exchange, the president is given tremendous power and prestige—more so than any other person in the country. That is why, in an instant, a president's words can calm, agitate, or otherwise change the landscape on issues ranging from foreign affairs, to the economy, to the rule of law. Not only can the president's words have an expansive impact, but the president is likely to succeed in inciting action from the public. These potent powers can be wielded by the president for the good of the country, or can be exploited to subject it to the gravest abuses. That is why—for the protection of our laws and democratic institutions—a president's primary obligation is to uphold the oath of their expression must yield to that higher duty. In this case, Mr. Trump did not have a First Amendment right to fuel a mass disinformation campaign to discredit the flames of political division, and then direct a mob to disrupt a congressional proceeding.

VII. CONSTRUCTION OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE

In inciting the insurrection on January 6th and attempting to overturn the 2020 election, Mr. Trump attempted to destroy our democratic system and negate the will of the American people. The Electoral College process is laid out in the Twelfth Amendment of the Constitution, which states:

"The Electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least . . . they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least . . . they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;—the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted."

Just as the Electoral College has been carried out and affirmed since the first presidential election in 1789, it was carried out in 2020 to elect the President of the United States. However, Mr. Trump's actions were not in line with the Constitution. He attempted to undermine the legitimacy of the electoral process and prevent the lawful ascension of a president. This could have led to widespread political division and instability, as many states were left in the dark about the outcome of the election.

VIII. THE ROLE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

Throughout the Electoral College process, Mr. Trump attempted to interfere and nullify the results. The process was discussed in Section VII. Mr. Trump was at the head of the mass disinformation campaign to discredit the election results before the election had even taken place, and then filed dozens of lawsuits alleging widespread voter fraud.159 In addition, as I will outline, he worked with federal agencies to try to cause riot and intimidate members of federal, state, and local government to start investigations, file lawsuits, and reject electoral results. This is why, for the protection of our laws and democratic institutions, it is critical that the president is held accountable for his actions.

A. Mr. Trump Attempted to Use Federal Law Enforcement Agencies to Carry Out Investigations and File Lawsuits

After losing the 2020 election, Mr. Trump pushed the Justice Department to investigate alleged election irregularities.160 He also pushed the Justice Department to ask the Supreme Court to invalidate Mr. Biden's victory, which his appointees refused to do, citing the lack of evidence.161 Mr. Trump even disparaged his own FBI and DOJ, implying that they were working against him. In an interview, Mr. Trump said, "This is total fraud. And how the F.B.I. and Department of Justice—I don't know, maybe they're involved—but how people are allowed to get away with this stuff is unbelievable. This election was stolen and there's no doubt about it."

Succumbing to this pressure, Attorney General William Barr issued a memorandum to U.S. attorneys across the country allowing them to pursue any "substantial allegations" of voting irregularities before the 2020 presidential election. The memorandum gave prosecutors the ability to sidestep longstanding Justice Department policy of not taking overt steps on possible election fraud before results are certified. In response, career DOJ prosecutors called on Mr. Barr to rescind the memo, because it was not based on fact and there was no evidence of widespread voter fraud.

After Mr. Barr stepped down as Attorney General, Mr. Trump then reportedly pressed Barr's successor, Acting Attorney General Jeffrey Rosen, to file legal briefs seeking to overturn his election loss.162 He wanted Mr. Rosen to appoint special counsels, including a counsel who would look into Dominion Voting Systems—which is at the center of a right-wing conspiracy theory accusing the company of conspiring with the Venetian government to steal the election to favor Mr. Biden. Mr. Rosen refused the president's entreaties. Mr. Trump then plotted with Jeffrey Clark, a Trump loyalist and the head of the DOJ's civil division, to oust Mr. Rosen and replace him with Mr. Clark, who was willing to do Mr. Trump's bidding in trying to overturn the Georgia election results. This plan was only unsuccessful because Mr. Trump's advisors convinced him the move could potentially lead to mass resignations within DOJ's leadership and lead to congressional investigations.163

B. Mr. Trump Exerted Inappropriate Pressure on State Electors

Article II, Section 1, Clause 2 provides that each state shall appoint electors "in such Manner as the Legislature of each State may di-
rect."164 However, the decisions on how and when to choose electors is left up to the states. The Electoral Count Act only requires the states to re-elect the president if their elections at least six days before the elections meet to vote.165 After his loss on Election Day, Mr. Trump sought to exploit the ambiguity of the Electoral Count Act that gives states discretion in choosing electors. Most state laws require the appointment of electors who vote according to the outcome of the popular vote.166 However, Mr. Trump sought to use the weight of his office to persuade and, in some
cases, intimidate state officials. For example, he invited GOP members of the Michigan state legislature to the White House, in a brazen bid to get them to throw out the state’s electoral votes.128 He also supported members of the Wayne County Board of Canvassers, including its Republican chairwoman, who voted to certify that Joe Biden won their county.129 Within 24 hours of the call, the Republican chairwoman announced that she wanted to “re-scan” the votes, an obvious attempt to undermine Mr. Trump’s claims that the election may have been rife with fraud. In another instance, he called the speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, Bryan Cutler, and inquired about the electoral process. According to Cutler’s spokesperson, Mr. Trump bluntly asked, “I’m hearing about all these issues in Philadelphia, and these issues with your law What can we do to fix it?”130

Mr. Trump’s effort hit its crescendo when the Trump campaign convinced supporters in several states to create an alternate slate of electors to send for the congressional certification.131 The Trump campaign organized alternate Electoral College meetings in Wisconsin, Arizona, Pennsylvania, Georgia, New Mexico, and Nevada.132 However, election officials rejected the validity of these false electors, which had “neither been certified by state executives nor purportedly appointed by state legislators.”133

Mr. Trump’s extra effort to influence the outcome of the Georgia election, a fierce battleground state. In early December, he called Governor Brian Kemp and asked him to hold a special session of the Georgia legislature to appoint Trump electors to reverse Mr. Biden’s win. Mr. Trump also wanted Kemp to “do his homework” on signing ballot signatures. When Kemp told the former president he would not be complying with either demand, Mr. Trump told a crowd of supporters that Kemp “can’t even sign a sheet. I mean, just look at that error could stop it very easily if he knew what the hell he was doing . . . so far we haven’t been able to find the people in Georgia willing to do the right thing.”134

In the most extraordinary example of his inappropriate interactions with state lawmakers, Mr. Trump outright threatened Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger, “to find” 11,780 votes—which would amount to the one vote margin he needed to win the state.135 Mr. Trump all but threatened him with arrest if he did not go along with what he was asking. Specifically, he told Raffensperger, who will be up for re-election in 2022, “[T]hey hate the state, they hate the state secretary of state. I will tell you that right now. And the only people that like you are people that will never vote for you. You know that, Brad, right?”136

Mr. Trump even suggested that Raffensperger and Germany—two men who amassed too much power might repudiate the abuses of a monarchy. At the Constitutional Convention, James Madison emphasized the risks of executive power in particular: “saying ‘loss of capacity or corruption was more within the compass of probable events, and either of them might be fatal to the public.’”137 Two delegates, William Richardson Davie and James Wilson, highlighted the importance of safeguarding against a corrupt president by what Mr. Trump stated, “‘[i]f he be not impeachable whilst in office, he will spare no efforts or means...
Whatever to get himself reelected.’ [Davis] considered this as an essential security for the good behaviour of the Executive.”223 Wilson concurred with Davis ‘in the necessity of making the Executive impeachable while in office.’224

Without mechanisms to keep an out-of-control president in check, there was little binding force in law. This led the Framers to design the system of checks and balances and Congress’s Impeachment power. Another intentional hallmark of the Constitution is the prevention of one person from holding all powers, which is especially important when an incumbent loses re-election.225 This assures that an executive acquires and maintains only the lawful powers given by the law; it also ensures that power is given to a president, and taken back, according to the will of the people. It began when President John Adams—defeated by his bitter political rival Thomas Jefferson—quietly left the White House on the morning of the new president’s inauguration.226 Since then, no president has ever refused to accept an election result or defied the lawful processes for resolving electoral disputes, until Mr. Trump.

Mr. Trump accepted the will of the people, categorically rejected the decision of Americans as expressed in the 2020 election. Even more than refusing, he repeatedly sought to undermine the processes at the federal, state, and local level that would advance a peaceful transfer of power. As the House Managers noted, Mr. Trump tried to obstruct the peaceful transition process through non-violent means.227 When these attempts failed, he directed a mob to power by launching an attack on the legislative branch.

X. VIOLATION OF SEPARATION OF POWERS

One of the key principles rooted in our democratic system is the separation of powers between the co-equal branches of government. The Federalists, in Federalist Paper Number 47, ‘The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judicial, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.’228

Therefore, when any one branch of government seeks to obstruct an essential function of another branch, it threatens the separation of powers.229 In a case where a president seeks to derogate the authority of another branch, it can also undermine the president’s constitutional obligation to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.”230

In inciting the armed assault on the Capitol, Mr. Trump irresponsibly and recklessly threatened a constitutional proceeding of the Congress. In all this, Mr. Trump gravely endangered the security of the United States and the lives of its citizens, and impelled a coequal branch of government.

X. OATH OF OATH OF OFFICE

Manager Castro outlined the numerous ways that Mr. Trump abandoned his post as the protector of the Constitution and the impartial arbiter of it as it was supposed.231 Capitol Police were overwhelmed and violently assaulted by the armed mob. Members of Congress and congressmen fled their chambers, fearing for their lives. Some of them hiding or barricaded in offices, as the mob wreaked mayhem on the Capitol grounds. It was all unfolding on television, leaving little doubt that Mr. Trump saw it happening in real time.

Manager Castro emphasized that Mr. Trump had openly told the rioters to stop and leave the Capitol.232 As I explained in Section VII, Mr. Trump did not acknowledge the attack for nearly two hours, while the Capitol was still under siege. Instead, he implored him to call off the attack. Instead, he tweeted out criticism of Vice President Pence. When he finally acknowledged the mob’s presence, he did not ask the rioters to stop. Three and half hours in, he released a video reaffirming the same violent threats, and told his supporters, “We love you. You’re very special.”233 While Mr. Trump did tell the rioters to go home this time, he still refused to disavow the ongoing attack or the attackers themselves.

In addition to inciting the insurrection, Mr. Trump abandoned his duties to defend American people, even after the events of the day. The Managers also noted that he did not deploy the National Guard, nor any other law enforcement.234 He was so eager to disengage his duty to the President of the United States about deploying the National Guard that Vice President Pence had to intervene to help move the request forward.235

Taken together, this conduct was an astonishing and willful dereliction of duty. He had sworn an oath to “faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and to the Constitution of the United States.”236 Yet on that day, he commanded his supporters to inflict grave harm to the constitutional order of the House, disrupt the electoral certification and the peaceful transfer of power. He sat back and watched as his supporters took part in an attack on the government institutions that he swore to defend. Then, he entirely failed to stop or condemn the widespread lawbreaking that his supporters took part in. As such, I find that there is overwhelming evidence and convincing evidence that Mr. Trump violated his oath of office.

XI. CONCLUSION: CONVICTION AND DISQUALIFICATION

Conviction and disqualification of a president from office requires a high standard and should only be arrived at when there are no other remedies available.

First, I would refuse several assertions by President’s Counsel that the Impeachment proceedings, and the remedies thereof, are not the appropriate way to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.237 Yet on that day, he commanded his supporters to inflict grave harm to the constitutional order of the House, disrupt the electoral certification and the peaceful transfer of power. He sat back and watched as his supporters took part in an attack on the government institutions that he swore to defend. Then, he entirely failed to stop or condemn the widespread lawbreaking that his supporters took part in. As such, I find that there is overwhelming evidence and convincing evidence that Mr. Trump violated his oath of office.
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The question of Senate jurisdiction should start with the text of the Constitution itself. The impeachment process is described in article I, which delineates the respective powers of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Section 2 plainly states that the House “shall have the sole Power of Impeachment.” In this matter, there is no dispute that impeachment occurred before former President Trump’s term expired, and, therefore, there is no dispute that the House had jurisdiction to impeach him.

What is at issue is whether the impeachment trial can occur in the Senate now that former President Trump is no longer in office. Again, I look to the text of article I. Section 3 states that “the Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachment Cases.” It does not mention former Federal Judges. Judge Michael McConnell has observed, the key word here is “all.” Sections 2 and 3 read together lead to the inescapable conclusion that, if the House presents the Senate with a valid impeachment article, the Senate has jurisdiction to conduct the trial.
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under article II, section 4, is removal from office. Because former President Trump cannot be removed, they argue that the Constitution requires he not be tried. But article I, section 4, authorizes the Senate to impose the penalty of disqualification from holding office in the future if it chooses to do so. And, notably, a vote on whether or not to disqualify can only be taken after conviction, at which point any defendant would have been removed and no longer an office holder.

If the defense’s argument were to be followed to its logical conclusion, it would lead to a constitutional absurdity—the Senate would have the sole power to apply the disqualification penalty, but it would never have jurisdiction to do so. If the Senate were unable to consider disqualification after a President is no longer in office, the second penalty would lose its meaning. A more sensible reading of article I, section 4, would hold both penalties, removal and disqualification, are equally significant, and therefore, the Senate has jurisdiction in this matter.

For all the reasons I have set forth, I believe that the Senate must exercise jurisdiction and vote to begin its impeachment proceedings.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following statement regarding the impeachment trial of the former President be printed in the Record:

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE SECOND IMPEACHMENT TRIAL OF THE FORMER PRESIDENT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, the former President’s conduct during and after the 2020 Presidential election was indefensible and dangerous. By inciting an insurrection against Congress and pressuring government officials across our Nation to overturn the will of the people, he directly threatened the integrity of our democratic system, interfered with the peaceful transition of power, and imperiled a coequal branch of Government.1 As long as he is in office, the United States, he will remain a grave threat to our national security and our Constitution. For these reasons, I again voted to convict the former President on the House of Representatives’ Article of Impeachment.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE TRIAL

As a threshold question in this trial, the former President’s legal team and several Republican Senators have argued that the Senate cannot hold an impeachment trial against a President who is no longer in office.2 This argument is just another conventional effort to avoid accountability. The democratic system, interfered with the peaceful transition of power, and imperiled a coequal branch of Government.3 As long as he is in office, the United States, he will remain a grave threat to our national security and our Constitution. For these reasons, I again voted to convict the former President on the House of Representatives’ Article of Impeachment.
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falsehoods, the former President claimed—without evidence—that there were “900,000 Fraudulent Votes” in Pennsylvania,31 that Dominion Voting Systems switched 221,000 votes from the former President to Joe Biden in Pennsylvania,32 and that “Fraud and Ille-gality” were a “big part” of his election lawsuits in Pennsylvania.33 The Pennsylvania election was adminis- tered safely and securely by thousands of Republi-can and Democratic election officials and selfless volunteers across the Common-wealth. It was overseen by three distinct judges, Managers highlighed in their trial brief, “[o]ur legal system affords many ways in which to contest the outcome of an election.”34 The former President did not merely contest the election in Pennsylva-nia, but also in Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, and Wisconsin.35 In total, the former President and his allies filed 62 law-suits in state and federal courts regarding the 2020 election and they lost every case, ex- cept for one minor lawsuit in Pennsylvania.36

Furthermore, despite the President’s public claims of widespread illegalities, his legal team rarely attempted to allege fraud in his lawsuits.47 The former President, through his attorney Rudy Giuliani, explicitly confirmed that the Cam-paign was not alleging fraud during one high profile case in Pennsylvania by stating “[t]he case is fraud, but not this fraud case.”38 Despite these facts, the former President continued to spread a different narrative—a Big Lie regard-ing a rigged election—on Twitter.48

In a February 2016 rally in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, we saw the former President tweet “They’d be carried out on a stretcher, safely! See them, talk to them, make a foundational principle of our democracy.”39 The case for incitement is about far more than just the former President’s speech on January 6. This was about a pattern of con-duct. It was about the former President’s autocratic leadership and calls for political violence throughout his Presidency. It was about a President who once bragged: “I have the tough people [supporting me], but they don’t play it tough until they go to a certain point, and then it would be very, very bad.”40

I, as well as public officials in both parties, talk about fighting for public policy goals. We fight for our rights. We fight for equity and justice. How- ever, when the former President tells his supporters to fight, it means something different. It means regularly condoned and encouraged violence against protestors and members of the press since he became a candidate in 2015. As Lead House Manager Jamie Raskin told us during the trial: “January 6 was a culmination of the President’s actions—not an aberration from them.”41 It was the former President’s pattern and practice of condoning and en-couraging violent action.

For example, during remarks in October 2018, the former President told his supporters to “Knock the hell out of protestors and then promised to pay their legal fees resulting from any alterca-tion.”42 In March 2016, a supporter of the former Presidentucker punched a Black man being escorted out of a campaign rally.43 The former President’s supporter was later re-ported to have said: “If we see something we don’t like, we might have to kill him.”44 Just days later, the former President defended those at his rallies assaulting protestors by calling their actions “very, very appropriate.”45 In another 2016 rally in Las Vegas, the former President commented that he would like to punch protestors in the face if they were “reminding about the fictional ‘old days’” when violent behavior was allegedly more prevalent.46 “You know what I mean do guys like that when they were in a place like this?” he asked the crowd. “They’d be carried out on a stretcher, safely.”47

This abhorrent behavior did not change when the former President entered office. In August 2017, after a rally of white supremacists resulted in three deaths and over 330 injuries in Charlottesville, Virginia, the former President offered perhaps the most concerning comment of his presidency when he suggested that there was “blame on both sides” and that there were “very fine people on both sides.”48 In October 2018, we saw the former President praise and glorify the actions of current Governor of Montana, Greg Gianforte, after then-candidate Gianforte had body slammed and hospital-ized a journalist in May 2017.49 Mr. Gianforte had already pleaded guilty to the assault.50

In 2020, the former President further glor-ified his allies by indicating that the rioting starts’’ in relation to the civil rights protests occurring after George Floyd’s murder at the hands of law enforcement in Minnesota.51 Later, we saw the former President direct federal agents to forcibly move hun-dreds of peaceful protestors outside of the White House so he could pose for a photo op in front of St. John’s Church in Washington, D.C.52

In April 2020, in what turned out to be a dress rehearsal for the January 6 insurrec-tion, we saw the former President tweet “LIBERATE MICHIGAN!” after the Gov-ernor of Michigan imposed mitigation measures to address the COVID-19 public health crisis.53 Nearly two weeks later, on April 30, armed protestors dressed in tactical gear sieged the Michigan State Capitol, waving the Confederate flag and wearing MAGA hats.54 Rather than condemn those who had seized the state capitol waving Confederate flags, the former President encouraged the Governor of Michigan to nego-tiate with them: “The Governor of Michi- gan should give him a little more fire. These are very good people, but they are angry. They want their lives back again, safely! See them, talk to them, make a deal!”55 Just a few months later, as the capitol siege in Michigan, the FBI arrested thir-teen men for “plotting to storm the Michi- gan State Capitol building, launch a civil war, kidnap Governor Whitmer, transport her to Wisconsin, and then try and execute her.”56

The former President’s pattern of conduct is indisputable. A reasonable person cannot dispute that the former President knew ex-actly what he was doing by perpetrating the “Big Lie” and using the mob as a “threat point” and as he had predicted in the past—it was “very, very bad.”57 There is simply no way to excuse the former President’s ac-tions in this case.

An Attack on Our Democracy

By encouraging his mob of insurrectionists to march on the Capitol and obstruct the constitutional process of certifying the election, the former President attacked the foundational principles of our democracy and the peaceful transfer of power. He did so in front of the United States Capitol, the seat of our government and the Presidential line of succes-sion. His actions led to at least five deaths,
injuries to nearly 140 members of law enforcement and untold collateral damage resulting from the carnage of that day.\(^7\) He endangered the lives of countless Congressional staff and employees, members of the press and members of Congress. He put a target on the back of his own Vice President and his Vice President’s family. His actions jeopardized the United States’ national security by tarnishing the United States’ reputation abroad and emboldening violent extremists at home.

Furthermore, he has shown absolutely no remorse for any of it, even going as far to glorify the insurrection in the immediate aftermath of the election. After the election, he had secured his position as the leader of the Republican Party. Therefore, he failed to release a statement. He did not denounce the violent insurrection, but rather he chose to continue to spread his Big Lie that the election was stolen from him and to call the insurrectionists “great patriots.”

“These are the things and events that happen when a sacred landslide election victory is so badly & unfairly treated for so long. Go home with love & in peace. Remember this day forever.”

Ultimately, after carefully reviewing all of the evidence put forward in this case, I found that the House Managers more than exceeded their burden of proof. The former President’s conduct violated his oath of office, endangered our democracy and jeopardized the United States’ national security. Through this conduct, the former President committed a high crime against our Constitution. I voted to convict him in the most bipartisan Presidential impeachment proceedings in our Nation’s history.\(^6\)
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Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, as Senators in this proceeding, we were bound by two oaths, to support and defend the Constitution and to pursue impartial justice as we considered the Article of Impeachment filed against former President Donald Trump: a charge of incitement of insurrection.

The Framers of our Constitution gave us the tools to respond to a moment like this. Having lived under the tyrannical King George III, they were well aware of the risks of a President willing to abuse his or her power. William Davie, one of North Carolina’s representatives at the Constitutional Convention, argued that impeaching a President who would spare “no efforts or means whatever to get himself reelected.”

Our system of checks and balances as laid out in our Constitution provides that the Congress can impeach a President for committing “Treason, Bribery, or other High Crimes and Misdemeanors.” The phrase was meant to encompass any offenses that, as Alexander Hamilton explained in Federalist No. 65, include an “abuse or violation of public trust” and “injuries done immediately to society itself.” Impeachment is a remedy for this public harm.

Some of my colleagues argue that the Senate could not sit as a court of impeachment for a former President. But constitutional scholars from across the political spectrum agree that the plain language of the Constitution and the historical precedent are clear that the Senate has the power to hold former officers accountable for offenses committed while in office. The question was debated on the Senate floor, we had a vote, and a bipartisan majority decided that we should proceed. As Manager Jamie Raskin said, “[t]he jurisdictional constitutional issue is gone. . . . We are having a trial on the facts.”

President Trump’s actions on January 6 were consistent with a years-long effort to undermine faith in our democratic system. After spending months trying to delegitimize our elections and despite losing by more than 7 million votes, President Trump filed dozens of unmerited lawsuits and sowed confusion in the election results across the country. In court after court, the President’s claims were rejected. As Judge Bibas, who was appointed by President Trump, wrote for the Third Circuit, “there is a very strong (if not conclusive) argument that calling an election unfair does not make it so. Charges require specific allegations and then proof. We have neither.”

In an attempt to delay the certification of the results, President Trump privately pressured State election officials, including asking Georgia’s Secretary of State to “find” 11,780 votes, a number that would flip the State in his favor. Thankfully, election officials followed the law, and by December 11, 2020, all States had certified the results of the election.

Despite the results being final, however, President Trump convinced his supporters that there was one last opportunity to interrupt the peaceful transfer of power: preventing the Congress from counting the electoral college votes. And they responded to his call. During the trial, we saw a video of a rioter yelling, “We were invited by the President of the United States!” and examples of the rioters’ social media posts telling President Trump they were there for him, including a photo of rioters storming the Capitol steps captioned, “This is me.”

Law enforcement, sworn to protect the Capitol, were repeatedly assaulted defending our temple of democracy and our very republic. We will never forget the shrieks of the police officer pinned in between the doors at the hands of the rioters, pleading for help. We will never forget Officer Harry Dunn, who fought against the violent mob for hours and, after it was over, broke down in tears, telling fellow officers he had been called the N-word numerous times that day. He asked: “Is this America?” Or Officer Eugene Goodman who ran to take on a growing group of the rioters by himself, diverting them away from the Senate Chamber and allowing Senators to move to a secure location.

Tragically, the attack on the Capitol also cost the lives of three brave officers, including Officer Brian Sicknick who died from injuries sustained while engaging with rioters. Two other officers died by suicide following the events of January 6. D.C. Metropolitan Police Officer Jeffrey Smith and U.S. Capitol Police Officer Howard Liebengood.

While much of the trial rightfully focused on what President Trump did on January 6, it is important to consider in many ways what he did not do was even more dangerous. After he sent the mob to the Capitol, putting law enforcement
in danger and threatening the safety of the Vice President. President Trump did nothing to stop the violence. Despite calls from Republican leaders across the country, President Trump did not even send a tweet to defend our democracy. Hours after the rioters first breached the Capitol, he finally released a video and told the rioters: “we love you; you’re very special.”

President Trump betrayed his oath of office to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. He incited a mob to attack the Capitol and prevent the peaceful transfer of power, and for that, he should be impeached.

On January 6, we were all awakened to our responsibilities as Americans and as Senators. I will never forget walking to the House Chamber around 4 a.m., with shattered glass from broken windows strewn in the hallway, joined by Senator BLUMENTHAL, Vice President Pence, and alongside two young women who carried the mailboxes holding each State’s electoral votes. We knew we had to return to do our jobs, and that night, we made clear to all: Democracy will prevail.

Thank you, Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, on January 6, 2021, the heart of American democracy was attacked by a violent mob seeking to stop the counting of electoral votes in Congress and the peaceful transition of power. The peaceful transition of power is the hallmark of any healthy democracy and the foundation of our government by the people. That tradition has endured in our country since the “Revolution of 1800” when John Adams lost his election to Thomas Jefferson, marking the first peaceful change of Executive party in the United States. Years later, Jefferson would write about the “Revolution of 1800” and say, “for that was as real a revolution in the principles of our government that of 76 was effected indeed by the sword... but by the rational and peaceable instrument of reform, the suffrage of the people.”

Sadly, the attack on the Capitol was an attempt to return to the “sword”, and it was incited by the President of the United States.

Donald Trump’s actions leading up to and on January 6 demonstrated what I believed following his first impeachment: He was unfit for the Presidency and betrayed his oath to faithfully execute the office of President and preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution. Donald Trump engaged in a months-long campaign of lies and misinformation about voter fraud in the 2020 election to mislead the American people and maintain power. This campaign was waged with a singular purpose: to overturn a free and fair election through any means necessary. It included calls to State election officials in Georgia where he urged them to “find the votes” that would allow him to win the State; wild conspiracy theories that voting machines had been rigged against him; and baseless lawsuits that were rejected more than 60 times by Federal courts at all levels. This insidious effort culminated at the “Save America” rally on January 6 when the former President urged his supporters to “fight like hell” and directed them to march on Congress where the counting of electoral votes had begun.

The House Managers presented a detailed timeline of the former President’s actions before, during, and after the January 6 insurrection. They demonstrated that the President knew that his actions could subvert the Constitution and defy the will of the American people. The evidence presented against the former President demonstrated that he sought to undermine and ultimately overturn the results of the 2020 election. It showed that when his challenges in court had failed and the electoral results had been certified, he turned his attention and all the power of the Presidency to January 6. He encouraged his supporters to come to DC to “stop the steal” and pressured former Vice President Pence to assert power he did not have under the Constitution to overturn the election. Trump amassed a crowd of individuals waiting for his direction, including armed individuals who were on the grounds for weeks in response to the President’s claims that the election was stolen.

The former President’s actions had deadly and destructive consequences. Insurrectionists breached the Capitol building, desecrating the seat of American Government and the physical manifestation of freedom for people across the world. The insurrectionists viciously beat police officers defending our democracy, vandalized the building, and terrorized those inside. All the while, the mob chanted “hang Mike Pence.” “President Trump sent us” and “traitor, traitor, traitor.” When the attack was over, hundreds of police officers and others were injured, and five police officers and a Capitol staff member lost their lives defending our Capitol. The attack was viewed across the world and has undeniably tarnished America’s reputation as a beacon of freedom and democracy.

What was the former President’s response to this treasonous attack on our constitutional process? It was to repeat the sinister lies that had led to the attack in the first place and refer to the insurrectionists as “our patriots” whom he loved. The House Managers showed that the President could have stopped the attack, but he chose instead to continue his effort to obstruct the counting of the electoral votes. According to the testimony of Congresswoman HERRERA BEUTLER submitted to evidence, the former President responded to House Minority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY’s pleas for help by saying, “Well, Kevin, I guess these people (the insurrectionists) are more upset at the election than you are... These are not the actions of a President trying to defend the Constitution and uphold his oath of office; they are the actions of an individual intent on retaining power by any means necessary.

The actions of Donald Trump before, during, and after the attack on the Capitol reflected our Constitution’s Framers’ greatest fear: a President would do anything to retain power contrary to the will of the people. They knew well the dangers of a despotic and the capacity of power to corrupt the Republic they had established. That is why the Framers provided that the President could not be convicted as a former President to protect our system of government from those who would use their office to undermine our Constitution. Senate precedent, history, and tradition clearly demonstrate that a former President could be convicted having been impeached by the House while still in office.

The former President’s legal team made no persuasive argument as to how his remarks on January 6 would be considered protected speech under the First Amendment or why he could not be convicted as a former President. As House Manager RASKIN said during his argument, “if this is not impeachable conduct then what is?” I believe it fits squarely within the high crimes and misdemeanors identified as grounds for offense for impeachment in the Constitution. Thus, I exercised my responsibility as a juror to vote to convict and ensure that the actions of the former President would not go unchallenged.

Donald Trump betrayed his oath of office and he betrayed the American people. His actions must not go unanswered. The oath that I took and my allegiance to it require that I preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution by voting to convict a former President whose zealous pursuit of unchecked power will forever be remembered as one of the darkest days in American history. As a U.S. Senator, I will continue to take a stand against actions that violate the fundamental norms and ideals of American democracy.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, for the second time in over a year, events compelled the Senate to hold an impeachment trial for President Donald Trump. By once more acquitting the President despite overwhelming evidence of his guilt, the Senate has again abdicated its responsibility to the American people and our democratic Republic.

The Founders fashioned our constitutional system to at once defy history and reflect its enduring lessons. They understood that since the first human societies, rule of the strong had prevailed across ages of warlords, monarchs, emperors, and tyrants. From the examples of ancient Greece and Rome, they also knew that rule by the people was the fragile, flickering exception.

To ignite America’s experiment in self-government, the Founders handed us a constitutional system unique in human history, with inalienable rights for the people, free and fair democratic elections, the rule of law, and coequal
branches of government to check the unbridled ambitions that risked dragging us into tyranny. Our system was never perfect—far from it—but over 234 years, Americans have fought and sacrificed to make it more democratic, more fair, and more free.

The Founders also understood that, however well-crafted the Constitution may be, its fate would inevitably depend on the public officials sworn to protect it. They could give the Senate the weight to convict a President, but they could not guarantee Senators would exercise that power when the moment required it.

Their fears were realized on February 13, 2021, when the Senate failed to convict President Trump, a man who defied every standard of conduct and decency the Founders expected of public officials.

Months before Americans cast their ballots, Donald Trump made our democracy—manufactured false claim after false claim to undermine the 2020 election. He warned the election would be stolen or rigged, dead people would vote, and voting machines were not trustworthy. He repeated these claims incessantly on social media, at his rallies, and in interviews after on cable news. He repeats these lies to this day.

When Donald Trump lost the election by over 7 million votes, he refused to concede. Instead, he waged a months-long, desperate battle to subvert the peaceful transition of power. First, he challenged the election results in court. He lost 61 out of the 62 cases, often being howled out of court by Federal judges, many appointed by the President, for failing to produce any evidence of widespread fraud. Former Attorney General William Barr, one of the President’s most steadfast allies, confirmed that there was no such evidence.

So the President changed course. He threw the weight of his office against State and local officials hoping he could coerce them into overturning their States’ lawfully conducted election. He called election officials in Wayne County, MI. He summoned State senators from Michigan and Pennsylvania to the White House to urge the legislature to intervene. His aides hounded the Governor of Arizona to echo the President’s baseless claims about the election. Most notoriously, he browbeat Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger in a recorded phone call to “find” another 11,780 “illegal” votes and badgered the Vice President to reject the certification of the electoral results. In my view, these actions alone warranted impeachment. But he didn’t stop there.

In the end, President Trump stopped at nothing. As Congress gathered on January 6 to certify the electoral college results, he incited a mob to invade the Capitol and “stop the steal.” They scaled, as if it were an enemy rampart, the platform built for President-elect Biden’s inauguration and the peaceful transition of power. They chanted President Trump’s name as they smashed doors, broke windows, and looted private offices. They repeated the President’s lies as they cursed, speared, and bludgeoned the men and women of law enforcement who defended our freedom.

At virtually every step of the way, our constitutional system held its ground because patriotic Americans fulfilled their obligation to our Republic. From the Capitol Police to the non-partisan Electoral College, the State and Federal judges, to the Vice President of the United States—all refused to bend to the President’s lawless demands. We should shudder to think how events would have unfolded if Americans had made a different choice.

Yet somehow, confronted with these examples of individual patriotism and the overwhelming evidence of the President’s impeachable offenses, 43 Senators still voted to acquit, including the Senator minority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL.

The minority leader refused to contest the case laid out by the House Managers. But President Trump was “practically and morally responsible” for provoking the events” of January 6, committing what he called “a disgraceful dereliction of duty.” Instead, the Senator hid behind a sophist sleight of history and dodged his duty to hold President Trump accountable on the feeble ground that the Senate lacked jurisdiction. Through this sophistic sleight of hand, the minority leader tried to place one foot on the right side of history without taking the hard vote it actually required. In doing so, he provided cover to every Republican Senator who joined him to acquit President Trump, including many who have failed to denounce the former President for anything he has done to undermine American democracy.

The Constitution grants the legislative branch authority to hold accountable and punish those who seek to undo our democratic system of government. This Senate’s refusal to exercise this authority and convict Donald Trump is a stain on this body. We had the responsibility to serve as a check on his anti-American actions and reassert the standard of government our Founders imagined. We chose otherwise.

With the permission of the Senate’s acquittal, Donald Trump refuses to limit his defeat and continues to mislead his supporters that the election was stolen. In so doing, he continues to perpetuate, in another form, the insurrection he unleashed on January 6.

Our government did not fail as a result of our actions, but those of law enforcement officials at the Capitol and State and local officials in Michigan, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Arizona, and Wisconsin—men and women who didn’t surrender to President Trump’s tyrannical demands.

Nearly 2 months later, the U.S. Capitol remains ringed with razor-wire. As I have walked through the perimeter each morning, I have reflected on those who kept us safe from the President’s anti-democratic mob—the law enforcement officials, the people who maintain and clean the Capitol, congressional staff. They risked life and limb, namely, to defend the American people and the representatives but to defend basic American principles of our constitutional order: free elections, the peaceful transition of power, the rule of law, and the separation of coequal branches of government.

And then I think about the State and local officials, many Republicans, who held their ground under pressure from the President of the United States, often accompanied by threats from angry citizens caught up in his “Big Lie” that an election he lost by over 7 million votes was somehow stolen from him. These brave men and women did their duty to protect our constitutional system.

There are true patriots no different than the millions of other citizens who have done their part to defend the way of life we share under our Constitution. They join the African-American regiments who defended the Union in the Civil War, the code talkers in World War II, and the sons and daughters of immigrants who have defended our country from Yorktown to Normandy to Kandahar.

The Constitution of the United States is not a machine that runs itself; it is an exercise in self-government. American citizens—including those elected to serve them in the Senate—must keep it working and always ensure that it becomes more democratic, more fair, and more free.

As Americans, we should take comfort that there have been many, from Frederick Douglass and Susan B. Anthony to the other courageous citizens who rose to moments far more difficult than our own to protect the Republic and push it closer still to our highest ideals.

They are why the United States remains, for now, the longest lasting government by the people in human history. But as the Founders understood, democracy will always be vulnerable to demagogues who stop at nothing to hold on to power. History will record the names of those who stood on the side of the Constitution, passing down to the next generation the high standard of citizenship they demanded. Hopefully, a future Senate will meet that standard.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL: Mr. President, in this impeachment trial, every Senator was a juror; but also a witness and victim of the violent insurrection Donald Trump incited. The case was straightforward. Former President Trump instigated an armed riot seeking to overthrow a lawful election and possibly even injure or assassinate elected officials.

I spent most of my career enforcing laws, including two decades as Connecticut’s attorney general. In this
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role, I learned the power and the signif-

icance of accountability. When wrongdoers enjoy impunity for their actions, they and others like them are emboldened.

The first time former President Trump was impeached by the House, he had pressured a foreign government to corrupt the American election process, extorting a vulnerable, fledgling democracy to help him cheat in a Presidential election.

This time former President Trump’s attack on American democracy was more direct and violent. The insurrectionists forced us to flee for our lives, to place desperate, seemingly final calls to loved ones. A Capitol police officer died protecting us.

I have the same fear now, only greater, that I felt at the close of former President Trump’s last impeachment. By again refusing to hold former President Trump accountable, the Senate is paving the way for another would-be tyrant to break laws and norms to retain power.

We in the Senate are obligated to uphold our oaths to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Our oaths obligate us to hold former President Trump to account for his incitement of a violent attack on the U.S. Capitol, the symbol of American democracy around the world.

The case against Donald Trump was proven convincingly with videos and voice recordings so powerful that this printed word can never capture their force. The former President’s offense in this case is as dangerous as it is straightforward. He spent months of his Presidency telling and retelling the “Big Lie.” The lie that no matter how the American people voted at the ballot box, he was the only legitimate winner of the 2020 Presidential election. That the election was stolen from him, that anyone who disagrees with him is un-American, a traitor.

As Manager Lieu explained at trial, at a certain point in his efforts to undermine the 2020 election, “Trump ran out of non-violent options to retain power.”

Donald Trump encouraged, emboldened, and even helped build a mob of violent extremists that he invited to Washington, DC, at Trump’s invitation, inciting to Washington, DC, and inciting to storm the Capitol. While some Members of Congress were serving the President by objecting to vote counting, Trump was imploring them that he would be going with them.

They did not lift a finger to help anyone threatened with violence, including his Vice President. As a result of former Donald Trump’s incitement, certain key election officials in the Capitol with every intent to harm elected officials and disrupt the peaceful transfer of power. Not only has the world lost Brian Sicknick, two other Capitol Police officers have died by suicide. Several members of the mob were killed.

The Senate’s failure to convict increases the specter of another would-be tyrant to break laws and norms to retain power. We must dedicate ourselves to restoring the rule of law, the protections of rights, and the integrity of institutions. And they know that former President Trump incited the insurrectionists to attack the Capitol on January 6. Democracy is not our default state of being. Democracy thrives only so long as the institutions that support it thrive. And democratic institutions will only thrive and persist through hard work, active work, dedicated work of our elected officials. For 4 years, former President Trump continuously attacked our basic norms and institutions of democracy. For 4 years, he normalized chaos. Our job now—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—must dedicate ourselves to restoring the rule of law, the protections of rights, and the integrity of institutions. And that task starts with accountability for all those who perpetrated the damage.

I rise today regarding the second impeachment of Donald Trump.

The House managers made their case. Based on the evidence they presented and the events we all experienced, Donald Trump should be convicted and prohibited for holding office ever again for inciting a violent insurrection at the U.S. Capitol on January 6.

Through video, pictures, and quotes, they outlined how the President of the United States engaged in a months-long campaign to discredit the legitimate election results of the 2020 election—a deranged campaign that began before a single vote was cast.

This unprecedented campaign of misinformation, pushing the “Big Lie,” infected a significant contingent of the President’s supporters. They came to Washington, DC, at Trump’s invitation, and inciteful rhetoric. They followed his directive on January 6 to storm the Capitol and tried to stop us from carrying out our constitutional duty to certify the election for the lawful winner of the Presidential election, Joe Biden.

The evidence presented by the managers is solid and irrefutable, and the President’s lawyers made almost no effort to try. Given the jury they were facing, I don’t blame them. Almost every Senator in this Chamber was there that day. Senators Ossoff, Warnock, and Padilla weren’t sworn in until January 20. We all experienced the unthinkable that day, and we are processing it daily. The violent insurrection shook many of us to the core. For some of us, the events of that day were so chaotic that the full magnitude of what was happening wasn’t clear at the time. But as part of the trial evidence and through interviews and statements, we have learned more fully the measure of danger we faced as Donald Trump’s murderous mob assaulted the Capitol campus. The managers’ case and other media has given us all a better picture of the terror.

There are stories of bravery, like that of Officer Eugene Goodman and his U.S. Capitol Police colleagues. The footage of Officer Goodman misdirecting the mob marauding through these halls is remarkable. Put yourself in his shoes. How many of us would have acted as quickly in the face of the force being wielded? He has rightly been commended for his decisive, nearly superhuman response. All across the complex, his colleagues battled with insurrectionists who assaulted them with bats, bear spray, and other weapons in close quarters—these were scenes from a war zone, not the heart of the U.S. Government. While their bravery is commendable, Capitol Police and the other law enforcement agencies that eventually assisted to restore order should never have been in that position. But for the President of the United States sending a mob of violent insurrectionists to the Capitol, they would not have.

There are other chilling stories that should make every American’s heart race. The audio of the Speaker’s staff barricaded in their office, whispering into the phone, voices trembling, begging for help. The silent Capitol security footage showing just how close the Vice President, Senators, Representatives, and staff came to harm. The videos of chanting, gleeful, rioters demonstating their horrifying fealty to
Donald Trump’s lies as they broke down doors and ransacked offices and the Senate floor. The story that my friend Senator MURRAY has told of being trapped in her office with her husband. The mob pounding on the door while he tried to hold it shut with his feet. They were closer than a whisper from where they stood to the door that had been locked and that help would come quickly. They were inches away. The rest of us there that day were at least feet away. I am sure that we all called, texted and thought of loved ones. Try ing to reassure them but not actually knowing if that was true. Feeling from far away their helpless anguish for us and the utter terror and disbelief that something like this could happen in our country. To the U.S. Capitol, of all places.

The U.S. Capitol is the heart of our democratic system of government. While we may disagree vociferously, debate passionately, and represent people and communities with deeply divergent views, Congress exists to find common ground without resorting to violence. This simple fact—that as a country we solve our problems through democratic institutions and debate—is a source of our strength and global democratic institutions and debate—is a source of our strength and global democratic system of government. I have strong disagreements with a number of my colleagues. I know many of them disagree with me. But each day we come to the Senate floor and voice those disagreements without fear for our safety. On January 6, the 6th of January, the thing that separates our country from so many others—was shattered by the assault on the Capitol. And worst of all, that insurrection was exactly what the former President intended. That is a basic level of understanding if that was true. Feeling from far away their helpless anguish for us and the utter terror and disbelief that something like this could happen in our country. To the U.S. Capitol, of all places.

In some respects, it is difficult to know how best to move forward from that awful day. We came back. We did our jobs. And we are still here doing our jobs with deep and durable divisions and deep and durable disagreements without fear for our safety. On January 6, the 6th of January, the thing that separates our country from so many others—was shattered by the assault on the Capitol. And worst of all, that insurrection was incited by a sitting President of the United States.

Again, to turn to the words of my friend Senator MURRAY the bipartisan actions shown in Congress in the wake of the September 11 attacks helped to restore some semblance of safety and security. That common response is absent today.

To begin to heal, we need accountability. We need to live up to our constituents bestowed on us when we were elected: to uphold the law, to stand for their values, and, when necessary, to stand for our own. We can only start to heal when we have accountability and justice for what happened. To achieve this, we need those who are in leadership positions to lead. Republicans failed to lead last year when they voted to acquit Donald Trump for his corrupt actions in dealing with Ukraine by conditioning military aid on receiving political dirt on Joe Biden. Their failure to lead, to hold Trump accountable, and frankly to constrain his mania, emboldened him to push the boundaries of our political discourse further.

Republicans have another chance to stand up for our democracy and against authoritarianism. They have a chance to accept the reality that has been run through video, audio, and their own experiences. They can make a strong statement that political violence is unacceptable in the United States. They can—and should—vote to convict Donald Trump and bar him from ever holding office again. This is not a step that we can take to achieve the unity that we all claim to want.

I will vote to convict. I hope that this time, more than one of them will be brave enough to lead by standing up and doing what is right.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I would like to enter a statement into the record.

The President swears an oath to faithfully execute the Office of the Presidency and to “preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.” At the very core of that oath is a commitment to democracy, to government of the people, for the people, and by the people. President Trump flatly rejected that commitment. Americans endured a pandemic while casting their votes in the November 2020 election. Following that election, the outgoing President baselessly sowed doubt about its legitimacy and refused to commit to a peaceful transition of power. In the days leading up to January 6, 2021, President Trump agitated his most dangerous supporters, who had already shown a propensity for violence, and called on them to interfere with Congress’ duty to formally count the votes of the electoral college. Donald Trump wanted a riot to take place on January 6. We know because he said so. And when police officers defending the Capitol were over powered by what was just hours away. On that day, the President who called for peaceful transition, the outgoing President baselessly sowed doubt about its legitimacy and refused to commit to a peaceful transition of power. Of promulgating the “Big Lie” that the election was stolen. He agitated his supporters who falsely and wrongly believed that the election was rigged.

Donald Trump beckoned a mob to Washington for a rally when he knew the Congress would be counting the electoral ballots. Trump’s people knew from law enforcement bulletins and intelligence that the mob was armed and dangerous. Yet, he riled them up and then sent them up Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol. That rally became an orgy of violence and hate. Mayhem and destruction ensued, all in Donald Trump’s pursuit of staying in office beyond his term. Of ignoring our Constitution’s separation of powers, of preserving the peaceful transfer of power. Of promulgating the Big Lie. Donald Trump did not express horror or outrage at the scenes playing out live on television. He did not quickly and decisively urge his supporters to stop. He did not immediately call out the National Guard. He did not show any concern for the law enforcement officers being beaten, maimed, and even killed at the Capitol. He reportededly delighted in what was happening, unable to comprehend why other people did not share his perception of what was. And he has never shown any remorse or an ounce of contrition or taken any responsibility. Instead, he
The Senate of the United States sat as an Impeachment Court, with Democrats and Republicans serving as jurors. The vast majority of those Republicans were inserts to fealty to Donald Trump than loyalty to our country. They were more concerned about Trump’s base than basic justice. They were willing to ignore the truth to embrace the Big Lie. I had hoped House managers would call witnesses. Clearly, there were individuals with direct knowledge of Trump’s state of mind during the insurrection, the danger at the Capitol as it unfolded, and its support of it. But even before we debated potential witness, Republicans had made up their minds. They were unmovable in their fealty to Trump. Republicans were willfully blind to the truth and the facts of the case.

The rioters wanted to kill Vice President Mike Pence and House Speaker Pelosi. They told us so. We know that the west side of the Capitol was breached around 2 p.m. and that the rioters had overrun the Capitol. We know that the mob was approaching the Senate floor when our session was recessed at 2:13 p.m. We know that Vice President Pence was whisked off the Senate floor and that he was in mortal danger, as were all Members of Congress in their Chambers doing their constitutional duty. We know that all this was playing out in real time on television and that Donald Trump had to know it was happening. And yet, about 10 minutes later, at 2:24 p.m., knowing all this, Donald Trump tweeted an attack at his own Vice President. “Mike Pence did not have the courage to do what should have been done to protect our Country and our Constitution.” And we know that around 2:26 p.m., Donald Trump called Senator Tuberville not to ask what was happening, not ask how the Vice President was or to offer certain what was happening, not ask why I cast my vote, on February 13, 2021, to acquit former President Trump on the single Article of Impeachment, “incitement of insurrection.”

The primary purpose of impeachment in our constitutional system is to remove an official from office—to, according to Justice Story, divest an official “of his political capacity.” The House’s single Article of Impeachment emphasized this need to remove President Trump from office. Regarding this case before the Senate, President Donald Trump had already been removed from office by a vote of the American people this past November. Thus, pursuing impeachment in this case creates a troubling precedent in which former Presidents who are private citizens, from any future elected office based on the House’s single article of impeachment—incitement of insurrection.

The House and Senate have never before claimed or exercised such impeachment jurisdiction over a former President. I do not believe that the Constitution empowers the Senate to have such impeachment jurisdiction. In his renowned “Commentaries on the Constitution,” Justice Story comes to the same conclusion, although to be fair, there are others who do not. I believe that the precedents set in claiming that the Senate can try former Presidents who are private citizens have the very real potential to do significant long-term damage to our constitutional order, individual liberties, and the proper functioning of our Republic in a way that we will come to regret as a nation.

Additionally in this case, the House undertook a “snap impeachment” in 48 hours with no hearings, no witnesses, no record, and no defenses presented. When asked about this during the Senate trial, the House managers stated that constitutional due process protections for a defendant in an impeachment are “discretionary” or, in other words, not required. This troubling declaration is now a precedent in the House. Combining this “No Due Process snap impeachment” precedent with the Republican Party’s decision to try former officials, who are now private citizens, amounts to a massive expansion of Congress’ impeachment
power never contemplated by our Founding Fathers. The temptation to use such power as a regular tool of partisan warfare in the future will be great and has the potential to incapacitate our government.

The provision expanding impeachment jurisdiction to include the former President primarily point to the potential for Presidents or other officials to commit impeachable acts near the end of their term or shortly before resigning. The House managers called this a “January exception” to impeachment. They argued that this would allow such individuals to escape culpability and would frustrate the purpose of impeachment to hold public officials accountable. This is a legitimate concern. However, there are other remedies available to punish such conduct of a former President through the judicial system, if warranted. The Constitution explicitly provides that former officials can be subject to criminal prosecution for their actions while in office, regardless of impeachment. Moreover, even if such conduct eludes judicial review, the American people are well equipped to judge political conduct and pass their judgement upon it. In my judgement, and as emphasized last year following the previous impeachment trial, I believe it can be left to the wise judgement of the American people on whether or not the former President should be disqualified from future office.

Even if this Senate was empowered by the Constitution to hear this case, I do not believe that the House managers met their burden in proving the critical issue at trial—whether the former President intended there to be violence at the Capitol as a result of his speech at the Ellipse on January 6. Furthermore, the House managers claimed, in arguing their incitement charge, that First Amendment political speech protections only apply to elected officials in impeachment proceedings. A conviction based on this breathtaking precedent has the potential to significantly further undermine core constitutional protections for Americans and their ability to undertake political speech in the future.

Finally, laced throughout the House managers’ presentations were subtle and not-so-subtle indictments, not just against the Capitol rioters who fully deserved their fate but against all supporters of the former President, which of course includes many Alaskans. This sentiment is one that cannot and should not be allowed to be perpetuated. In my view, this will not bring about the kind of unity that our Nation needs now. In contrast to what some of the House managers implied at this trial, the vast majority of Americans and Alaskans who had supported President Trump were appalled by the violence on January 6. Such Alaskans support the President because of policies that helped our State. I will continue to work to make sure that these Alaskans’ voices are not silenced and that this dispiriting chapter in American history won’t deter them from speaking out in defense of their beliefs.

This has been a difficult time for our Nation. My vote on February 13 was not in belief President Trump’s conduct on January 6 with which I fully disagreed, particularly his twitter attacks on Vice President Pence, as the Vice President undertook his constitutional duties to preside over the electoral college vote at the Capitol. At the outset of this trial, the object of the investigation is to rise above the passions of the moment and to carefully consider the decisions we make today and the ramifications they will have for our country’s future. I believe that my vote to acquit fulfills that obligation. I want Alaskans and Americans to know that throughout all of this, my guiding light has been both fidelity to Alaska and to our Constitution.

Mr. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, during this impeachment trial, I have adhered to the oath I swore at the trial’s outset to “do impartial justice,” and I have listened with care to the facts and law presented to me as a juror.

These facts compel me to conclude that Donald Trump is guilty of inciting an inscription against our Republic. As the evidence presented by the House impeachment managers has made clear, Donald Trump used the powers at his disposal to ensure he could keep his grip on the Presidency even though he lost the election. As the sitting President and a candidate for reelection, Donald Trump cast doubt on the results of that election for months, arguing that the only way he would lose at the polls was by fraud. Then, after losing to Joe Biden by a margin of 7 million votes in a free and fair election, Donald Trump claimed it was a “fraudulent election.” As the Constitution allows, Donald Trump turned to State and Federal courts to hear his allegations of widespread fraud. Some of those courts were presided over by judges who Donald Trump himself had selected. Again and again, those courts rejected the allegations of fraud as baseless.

Even Trump’s own Attorney General, William Barr, publicly declared that he had found no evidence of fraud that could change a different outcome in the election.”

Faced with defeat in the courts, Mr. Trump nevertheless pressed officials at every level of both State and Federal government, including his own Vice President, Mike Pence, to change the election results.

When those efforts failed, he encouraged his supporters to come to Washington, DC, on January 6, the day when Congress would certify the electoral college votes for Joe Biden. He claimed that the stolen election was stolen andweeted “We have just begun to fight,” promising that on January 6, it would be “wild.” On December 11, 2020, Donald Trump released two campaign ads claiming the election was a “fraud” and instructing his supporters to “stop the steal.” His campaign paid $50 million dollars for the ads and ran them up to and until January 5, 2021.

On January 6, a well-funded call understood what President Trump was asking. They didn’t just come with protest signs; they came with handcuffs and rifles, bear spray and tactical gear, Molotov cocktails and crossbows, and walkie talkies for communication. On January 6, before noon, Donald Trump asked the large crowd assembled before him to march on the Capitol. He asked them to fight “like hell” because “if you don’t fight like hell, you’re not going to have a country anymore.”

Despite knowing that there had been concerns for months about potential violence surrounding the election, Donald Trump urged those at the rally 20 times to “fight.” He also called on those at the rally to “stop the steal” with the cry “you’ll never take back our country with weakness.”

Inspired by President Trump’s words, his supporters began streaming toward the Capitol, where they eventually breached its defenses and threatened those inside. Those in danger included the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, Members of Congress, countless staffers, and thousands of members of law enforcement.

On January 6, Donald Trump saw that his supporters were battling U.S. Capitol Police officers and DC police, he said nothing to stop them for more than 2 hours, even when he knew that Vice President Pence, one of his most loyal political allies, was in danger. More, he tweeted further criticism of Mr. Pence as the Vice President’s Secret Service detail was laboring to whisk Mr. Pence to safety.

Donald Trump was willing to do anything to stop the certification of Joe Biden as President-elect.

The vast majority of legal scholars agree that the First Amendment does not permit ex-Presidents to be tried for impeachment and that the First Amendment protects his right to encourage an attack on our democracy. These arguments are lawfully fig leaves. Mr. Trump relies on them so heavily because his own behavior is indefensible.
not apply in this instance because the incitement of an insurrection is not protected speech under the Constitution. They also believe the Constitution allows for the impeachment and trial of public officials after they leave office, particularly when, as in this case, the House of Representatives voted by the House of Representatives while still in office.

Otherwise, all an office-holder would have to do to protect him or herself from punishment would be to resign just before impeachment. The Senate has implicitly or explicitly agreed with this view three times in our Nation’s history: first, in the very first impeachment trial against former Senator William Blount of Tennessee, held during the lifetime of the Founders; second, in 1876 when Secretary of War William Belknap resigned just hours before the House voted to impeach him for bribery and corruption; and finally, in this impeachment trial of Donald Trump. The bipartisan majority of the Senate agreed that this trial could proceed in spite of the defendant’s objections to its constitutionality.

My colleagues understand that the Constitution gives Congress the power to impeach, convict, and disqualify a former officeholder. This is true because otherwise, the country would be vulnerable to a President of either party who could flout any law but resign at a time that suits them. As the House managers have argued, if anything is impeachable, it is a President inciting his followers to violence to overturn a legitimate election.

Our Founding Fathers held democracy sacred. They feared a demagogue, a leader who would pervert the Constitution in order to keep power, and they sought to protect the new Republic from such a president.

Donald Trump is the person the Framers feared. He poses an existential threat to democracy. He has shown himself willing to use almost every measure at his disposal to gain and retain power, even if it means overturning a free and fair election through violence.

We can have no doubt what our Founding Fathers would have made of him: He was exactly the kind of person they wanted to prevent from holding and wielding power.

We have seen over the course of this election the myriad risks of trifling with our democracy and undermining the legitimacy of our elections. We cannot let future candidates of either party believe that in America, the way to win is to lie and cheat, to whip a crowd into a frenzy, to turn it on public servants and law enforcement like we have to reestablish in our politics our absolute commitment to the idea that we resolve our disputes in our courts and in Congress, not by wielding weapons against lawmakers.

Our Founding fathers made clear in the very preamble to the Constitution that “We the people . . . in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution.” America cannot be tranquil unless its leaders forsake violence and stand up for democracy. That is why I voted to convict Donald J. Trump of high crimes and misdemeanors against the American people.

Unfortunately for our country, many of my colleagues did not agree. I know this is difficult news for many American patriots, who, just as I do, love and cherish our democratic traditions, and rule of law. But that is the tradition of the peaceful transfer of power. To that majority of Americans, I want to say: We must not lose faith in our system of government. We must work all the more diligently to protect it.

Right after Supreme Court decided the Dred Scott case—the most odious case in our long legal history—the great abolitionist and orator Frederick Douglass gave a speech. He turned to this speech to the people of Nevada and all Americans to decide for themselves what the principles of our Constitution are. He believed that the world would see what a “scandalous tissue of lies” the Supreme Court’s decision in Dred Scott was. And he was right. History holds that Court case as one of the most shameful in our history, and I believe it will likewise condemn Donald Trump’s incitement of the Capitol attack.

So today I remain hopeful because the people of Nevada and all Americans have been able to see the truth for themselves, and they understand that Donald J. Trump must never again be trusted to protect our sacred democracy.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, the facts and the evidence were overwhelming: Former President Donald Trump lied for months to his supporters, summoned them to Washington, and incited a violent insurrection against our government and our democracy. I voted to convict because no reasonable person can listen to all the evidence presented and believe otherwise.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I would like to submit this statement for the record regarding the impeachment trial of former President Donald Trump. The statement reflects my thoughts about that constitutional matter and its implications for future impeachments.

In 1787, the Articles of Confederation were failing, and our young Nation was struggling to address the many challenges it was being confronted with in its infancy. A collection of independent States, the newly formed country experienced much difficulty with the regulation of trade and commerce, foreign affairs, and other basic domestic civil issues. With calls for division multiplying, delegates to the Constitutional Convention met to deliberate and forge a new government and with it an Executive to help centralize the powers necessary to form a strong republic. Having just shed the bonds of the British Monarchy and its infringements upon the liberties the delegates so desperately wanted to protect, there was much skepticism toward this idea. In order to abate these concerns, the Constitution’s Framers provided for a means of removing an Executive, a Presidential impeachment.

After much debate over particular wording, article II, section 4 of the Constitution adopted by the delegates reads: “The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.”

This is the fundamental impeachment provision contained in the Constitution and provides the primary evidence as to why the lone Article passed out of the House as well as the subsequent trial in the Senate, was unconstitutional. As this section shows, impeachment refers to “the President” and other officials, not that they shall be “removed from Office.” Donald J. Trump is no longer the President of the United States and therefore can no longer be removed from office. He is a private citizen.

Further evidence that Donald Trump is no longer the President and therefore that this trial is unconstitutional can be found within the Senate’s impeachment authority: Article I, section 3 provides that “When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside.” Chief Justice John Roberts did not preside over the impeachment trial, and instead that role was filled by the senior Senator from Vermont, PATRICK LEAHY. In a statement, Senator LEAHY himself stated that the Senate, “in a recent trial, was unconvinced that Donald Trump was a non-presidents.” These facts demonstrate that Chief Justice Roberts declined to preside over the trial because he did not believe that he had a constitutional role and that Senator LEAHY acknowledged that Donald Trump was no longer an officeholder. Finally, article I, section 3 provides, “Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor.” This reiterates that removal from office must occur before that person is disqualified from holding an office again. If the Founders had intended that the disqualification extend to a separate judgment, then the Constitution would have clearly stated “or” rather than “and.” The Constitution does not give the Senate the authority to try a private citizen or to remove him from an office that he no longer occupies. It also does not authorize the Senate to disqualify him from office so that he was not removed from.

I voted to acquit former President Donald Trump of the charge of inciting
an insurrection for the January 6 Capitol riot because of these basic concerns surrounding the constitutionality of the proceeding. The impeachment of a private citizen, driven by political obsession, sets a very dangerous precedent. What would prevent a Republican-controlled Congress from impeaching former President Barack Obama or Secretary of State Hillary Clinton? What about historical Presidents such as George Washington, whose pivotal legacy no longer appears to matter under standards of contemporary times? While the political retaliation against the President is certain to continue now that he is out of office, I am proud to have been a part of the minority in the Senate to stand up to this type of unconstitutional behavior and to acquit Donald Trump.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND SPENDING OVERSIGHT RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the proceedings of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 26, 2021, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs‘ Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

117th Congress

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND SPENDING OVERSIGHT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AS ADOPTED

February 26, 2021

1. Subcommittee rules. The Subcommittee shall be governed, where applicable, by the rules of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Quorums.

A. Transaction of routine business. One-third of the membership of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, provided that one Member of the Minority present. For the purpose of this paragraph, the term “routine business” includes the convening of a meeting and the consideration of any business other than the Subcommittee other than reporting to the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs any memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials at a meeting, provided that the Chair may subpoena attendance or production of witnesses, as well as documents and records, may be authorized and issued by the Chair, or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by him or her, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, provided that the Chair may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member that, in the opinion of the Chair or a staff officer designated by him or her, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

B. Taking testimony. One Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony.

C. Rules in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

3. Subcommittee subpoenas. The Chair of the Subcommittee, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, is authorized to subpoena the attendance or production of witnesses, or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials at a hearing, provided that the Chair may subpoena attendance or production under the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member that, in the opinion of the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair, is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

When the Subcommittee or its Chair authorizes a subpoena, the subpoena may be issued upon the signature of the Chair or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chair.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND BORDER MANAGEMENT RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On February 26, 2021, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs‘ Subcommittee on Government Operations and Border Management adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee on Government Operations and Border Management.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Subcommittee Rules. The Subcommittee shall be governed, where applicable, by the rules of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Quorums. For public or executive sessions, one Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business other than the administration of oaths and the taking of testimony in any given case or subject matter. One-third of the Members of the Subcommittee constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business other than the administration of oaths and the taking of testimony, provided that one Member of the minority is present. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

3. Taking Testimony. In any hearings conducted by the Subcommittee, the Chair or the Chair’s designee may swear in each witness prior to their testimony.

4. Subcommittee Subpoenas. Subpoenas for witnesses, as well as documents and records, may be authorized and issued by the Chair, or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by him or her, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, provided that the Chair may subpoena attendance or production without the approval of the Ranking Minority Member where the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair has not received notification from the Ranking Minority Member that, in the opinion of the Chair or a staff officer designated by him or her, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

A written notice of intent to issue a subpoena shall be provided to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, or staff officers designated by them, by the Subcommittee Chair, or a staff officer designated by him or her, in writing in the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs waives the two-calendar day waiting period or unless the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs waives the two-calendar day waiting period or unless the Subcommittee Chair certifies in writing to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs that, in his or her opinion, it is necessary to issue a subpoena immediately.

When the Subcommittee or its Chair authorizes a subpoena, the subpoena may be issued upon the signature of the Chair or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chair.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedure of the Committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On March 1, 2021, a majority of the members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs‘ Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the rules of procedure of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:
1. No public hearing connected with an investigation may be held without the approval of either the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member or a Majority of the Members or staff. In all cases notice to all Subcommittee Members of the intent to hold hearings must be given at least 7 days in advance of the date of the hearing, and the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member shall be kept fully apprised of preliminary inquiries, investigations, and hearings. Preliminary inquiries may be initiated by the Subcommittee Majority staff or through the approval of the Chair of notice of such approval to all Subcommittee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour. If the Chair is not present at any regular, additional or special meeting, the Ranking Majority Member present shall preside.

2. Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of Subcommittee business other than the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony, provided that at least one member of the minority is present.

3. One-third of the Members of the Subcommittee shall notify the Chair of the Subcommittee in writing to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs (the “Committee”) approves of such public hearing by a majority vote. Senate Rules will cover all closed sessions convened by the Subcommittee (Rule XXVI, Sec. 5(b), Standing Rules of the Senate).

4. Subpoenas for witnesses, as well as documents and records, may be authorized and issued by the Chair, or any other Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chair, with notice to the Ranking Minority Member. A written notice of intent to issue a subpoena shall be provided to the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, or staff officers designated by them, by the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair, immediately upon such authorization, and no subpoena shall be issued for at least 7 calendar days from the date it is served, from delivery to the appropriate office, unless the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee waive the 7 days notice for good cause. At least 7 days before sending a subpoena to a witness, the Chair may request the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, or the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to serve the subpoena on the witness, or the witness’s legal representative, for the witness. The failure of any witness to appear, or answer, or produce any record, document, or thing as may be requested, upon a subpoena issued by the Chair, or any other Member of the Committee, or the Special Subcommittee, may be punished by a fine of not more than $100 for each day of such failure.

5. For public or executive sessions, one Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of Subcommittee business other than the administering of oaths and the taking of testimony in any given case or subject matter.

6. All witnesses at public or executive hearings who testify to matters of fact shall be sworn.

7. If, during public or executive sessions, a witness, witness counsel, or any spectator conducts themselves in such a manner as to prevent, impede, disrupt, obstruct, or interfere with the orderly administration of such hearing, the Chair or presiding Member of the Subcommittee present during such hearing may request the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, or the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to serve the subpoena on the witness, or the witness’s legal representative, for the witness. The failure of any witness to appear, or answer, or produce any record, document, or thing as may be requested, upon a subpoena issued by the Chair, or any other Member of the Committee, or the Special Subcommittee, may be punished by a fine of not more than $100 for each day of such failure.

8. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of such witness and public explanation of witness, and to advise such witness while the witness is testifying of the witness’s legal rights; provided, however, that in the case of any witness who is an officer or employee of the government, or of a corporation or association, the Chair may rule that representation by counsel from the government, corporation, or association, of another witness, creates a conflict of interest, and that the witness may only be represented during interrogation by Subcommittee staff or during testimony before the Subcommittee by personal counsel not from the government, corporation, or association, or by personal counsel not representing another witness. This rule shall not be construed to excuse a witness from testifying in the event witness counsel is ejected for conduct preventing, impeding, disrupting, or interfering with the orderly administration of the hearings; nor shall this rule be construed as authorizing counsel to coach the witness or answer for the witness. Any witness who secures counsel shall not excuse such witness from complying with a subpoena or deposition notice.

9. Notice. Notices for the taking of depositions in an investigation authorized by the Subcommittee shall be authorized and issued by the Chair. The Committee and the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee shall be kept fully apprised of the authorization for the taking of depositions. Such notices shall include time and place of examination, and the name of the Subcommittee Member or Members or staff officer or officers who will take the deposition. The deposition shall be in private. The Subcommittee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement proceedings for a witness’s failure to appear unless the deposition is not taken or accompanied by a Subcommittee subpoena.

9.2 Counsel. Witnesses may be accompanied by counsel of their own choosing. The appearance of counsel shall be noted for the record. The Chair or the Ranking Minority Member, or the Chair or the Ranking Minority Member’s counsel, may request the appearance of counsel at a subsequent time, seek a ruling by telephone or other means on the objections made by the witness or by the Counsel of the witness or the Counsel of the Chair or such Subcommittee Member as designated by the Chair. If the Chair or designated Member overrules the objection, these Members may refer the matter to the Subcommittee or may order and direct the witness to answer the question, but the Subcommittee shall not initiate procedures leading to civil or criminal action unless the witness refuses to testify after being ordered and directed to answer by the Chair or designated Member.

9.4 Filing. The Subcommittee shall see that the testimony is transcribed or electronically recorded. If it is transcribed, the witness shall be furnished with a copy for review pursuant to the provisions of Rule 12. The individual administering the oath shall certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn in the individual’s presence, that the transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the transcript shall then be filed with the Subcommittee clerk. Subcommittee staff may prepare calendars in advance of the hearing. The Subcommittee or any other Member of the Committee may request copies of the transcript of any hearing.

10. Any witness desiring to read a prepared or written statement in executive or public hearing shall file a copy of any statement with the Chair, Staff Director, or Chief Counsel 48 hours in advance of the hearings at which the statement is to be presented unless the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member waive this requirement. The Subcommittee shall determine whether such statement may be read or placed in the record of the hearing.

11. A witness may request, on grounds of distraction, harassment, personal safety, or physical discomfort, that during testimony, testimony, testimony, motion pictures, television or motion cameras, and direct observation by visitors and the public be limited at a subsequent time, seek a ruling by telephone or other means on the objection from the Chair or the designated Chairman or Ranking Minority Member overrules the objection, these Members may refer the matter to the Subcommittee or may order and direct the witness to answer the question, but the Subcommittee shall not initiate procedures leading to civil or criminal action unless the witness refuses to testify after being ordered and directed to answer by the Chair or designated Member.

12. An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings. The record of a witness’s own testimony, whether in a public or executive session, shall be made available for inspection by the witness or witness counsel under Subcommittee supervision; a copy of any testimony given in public session or that part of the testimony given by the witness in executive session and subsequently quoted or made part of the record in testimony proceedings shall be available to any witness at the witness’s expense if requested.

13. Interrogation of witnesses at Subcommittee hearings shall be conducted on behalf of the Subcommittee by Subcommittee Members and authorized Subcommittee staff personnel only. Any person who is the subject of an investigation in public hearings may submit to the Chair questions in writing for the cross-examination of other witnesses called by the Subcommittee. With the unanimous approval of the Members of the Subcommittee present and voting, these questions, or paraphrased versions of them, shall be put to the witness and the questioning of the witness to be not directed by the Chair of the Subcommittee, or by counsel of the Subcommittee.  
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15. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified, and who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at a public hearing, or comment made by a Member or counsel, tends to defame the person or otherwise adversely affect the person’s reputation, may (a) request to appear personally before the Subcommittee, or in the alternative, (b) file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony or other evidence or comment complained of. Such request and such sworn statement shall be submitted to the Subcommittee for its consideration and action.

If a person requests to appear personally before the Subcommittee, the request shall be referred to the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member. If the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member agree to allow the appearance, the person may be permitted to appear. If the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member disagree, the person may still be permitted to appear if it is agreed to by a majority of the Members of the Subcommittee.

16. All testimony taken in executive session shall be kept secret and will not be released for public information without the approval of a majority of the Members of the Subcommittee.

17. No Subcommittee report shall be released unless approved by a majority of the Subcommittee and to testify concerning the matters contained in the person’s sworn statement, as well as any other matters related to the subject of the investigation before the Subcommittee.

18. The Ranking Minority Member may select for appointment to the Subcommittee staff a Chief Counsel for the Minority and such other professional staff and clerical assistants as the Ranking Minority Member deems advisable. The total compensation allocated to such Minority staff shall not be less than one-third the total amount allocated to the Committee staff salaries during any given year. The Minority staff shall work under the direction and supervision of the Ranking Minority Member. The Minority Staff Director and the Minority Chief Counsel shall be kept fully informed as to preliminary inquiries, investigations, and hearings, and shall have access to all material in the files of the Subcommittee.

19. When it is determined by the Chair and Ranking Minority Member, or by a majority of the Subcommittee, that there is reasonable cause to believe that a violation of law may have occurred, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member by letter, or the Subcommittee by resolution, are authorized to report such violation to the proper State and local and/or Federal authorities. Such letter or report may be the basis for the determination of reasonable cause. This rule is not a policy for release of documents or testimony.

ENDNOTE

1. Throughout these rules, the Chair and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee is referred to simply as the “Chair” and the “Ranking Minority Member.” These rules refer to the Chair and

59TH INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to thank the staff who worked tirelessly to ensure the 59th inaugural ceremonies were a success even under extreme and extraordinary circumstances.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, also known as JCCIC, was created by the U.S. Congress to plan and execute the inaugural ceremonies of the President-Elect and Vice President-Elect of the United States at the Capitol. This ceremony is the culmination of 244 years of a democracy. It is the moment when our leaders promise to be faithful to our Constitution. It is the moment when they become, as we all should be, the guardians of our country.

I would like to thank the chair of JCCIC, Senator Blunt, for his outstanding work to ensure that the inauguration was an extraordinary success. It was a pleasure to work with Senator Blunt and his extremely professional staff.

I want to commend the entire JCCIC staff, especially Maria Lohnmeyer, the Chief of Inaugural Ceremonies, for their remarkable accomplishment. I also want to thank Vincent Brown, who works for me on the Senate Rules Committee for his work while detailed to JCCIC, as well as my chief of staff, Lindsey Kerr, who worked diligently with JCCIC and many other agencies and offices to ensure a smooth Inauguration.

Maria, Vincent, Lindsey, and the entire committee staff have shown that, through hard work and determination, the entire world can see our democracy prevail.

This year’s inauguration was the 59th in our country, and it may have been one of the most challenging ever to design. Planning an inauguration under normal circumstances is difficult, but this year’s event occurred in the midst of a global pandemic, just 2 weeks after rioters climbed the inaugural stage to seize the Capitol.

The inauguration is an important symbol in our democracy. It has marked the peaceful transfer of power for more than 200 years. It sends an important message to the American people and the world, of unity and a commitment to our democratic principles.

Inauguration day represents a new beginning for the country. It marks the beginning of healing, of unifying, of coming together to get through this crisis.

This inauguration was the result of Democrats and Republicans working together to bring about this important symbol of our determined democracy. And this spirit of bipartisanship, of working together, was certainly present on the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE FOR THE BLIND AND PRINT DISABLED

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the National Library Service for the Blind and Print Disabled on its 90th anniversary. The National Library of Congress, an institution that has long been committed to serving readers with disabilities. The concept of a national library for the blind was introduced, or, I would say, the seventh Librarian of Congress, John Russell Young, who established a reading room for the blind that included more than 500 books and music items in raised characters.

In 1913, Congress began to require that one copy of each book be made in raised characters and deposited in the Library of Congress for public use; but, as impressive as this collection was, it was only available to people who were able to visit in person. In 1931, legislation led by Representative Ruth Pratt of New York and Senator Reed Smoot of Utah we now know as the National Library Service for the Blind and Print Disabled to help provide services to blind readers across the country through a national network of cooperating libraries, in braille or audio formats, mailed directly to patrons or available through instant download. Since its establishment, the service has grown to expand service to children, serve people with physical and reading disabilities, and encompass an accessible music materials collection that is now the largest in the world.

I also want to recognize the central role local libraries play in connecting the national NLS program to constituents in my State. NLS and the Minnesota Talking Book and Braille Library provide service to nearly 6,000 people and over 1,600 institutions in Minnesota, each day working to make the NLS mission “that all may read” a reality.

The National Library Service for the Blind and Print Disabled has long had an innovative approach to meeting the needs of Americans with disabilities, with an institutional history that encompasses: hot lines, loose leaf tape, cassette tapes, flash memory cartridges, and the Internet while it continually supplies hard-copy and digital braille materials. Today, I congratulate the National Library Service for the Blind and Print Disabled and its dedicated staff on its 90th anniversary and express my appreciation of their continued commitment to ensuring that all may read.
ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF ENIAC DAY

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the electronic numerical integrator and computer. This anniversary, formally known as ENIAC Day, marks the 1946 dedication at the University of Pennsylvania of the first all-electronic, programmable computer.

Invented by John Mauchly and J. Presper Eckert of the University’s Moore School of Electrical Engineering, construction of the computer began in July 1943. After several years of tireless work, Mauchly and Eckert produced a 27-ton computer that occupied 1,800 square feet of floor space and could complete complex calculations near instantaneously. Also due credit are the original programmers of ENIAC: Kathleen McNulty Mauchly Antonelli, Jean Jennings Bartik, Frances Betty Snyder Holberton, Marilyn Wescoff Meltzer, Frances Bilas Spence, and Ruth Lichterman Teitelbaum, without whom the operation of the machine would not be possible. After ENIAC, Mauchly and Eckert continued to be industry pioneers and went on to invent UNIVAC, the first commercial computer. Today’s Unisys Corporation, which I am proud to note is headquartered in Blue Bell, PA, is a modern-day successor of the work of these tireless pioneers.

As we mark this 75th anniversary, we marvel at the impact of ENIAC and how far computers have come. While ENIAC was originally intended as a tool to further our national defense, we have come to rely on later iterations of the computer in all aspects of life. Computers enable us to be more efficient, more connected and have transformed the way we work, live and collaborate. Continuous Composites has been an industry pioneer and business professional, attracting talent from across the country to Coeur d’Alene. Last September, Alvarado and Swallow announced the remodel and opening of a 7,500-square-foot manufacturing demonstration facility in downtown Coeur d’Alene. This historic building is now being used for advanced research, development, and commercialization of CF3D. The expansion will provide high-paying, in-demand jobs of the future to the Coeur d’Alene community.

Continuous Composites is an outstanding example of a small, trailblazing Idaho business that is leading the way in technological innovation. Congratulations to Tyler, John, Ken, and the whole Continuous Composites team for their outstanding achievements.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:39 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5, An act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill and joint resolution were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 461. A bill to create a point of order against legislation modifying the number of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of nine justices.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

ETC-528. A communication from the Program Analyst, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls, Fourth Report and Order” ((CG Docket No. 17-59) (FCC 20-187)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ETC-527. A communication from the Program Analyst, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fees for Production of Records; Other Amendments to Procedures for Disclosure of Information Under the Freedom of Information Act” ((16 CFR Part 1015) (Docket No. CPSC–2020–0011)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-529. A communication from the Attorney General Analyst, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991” ((CG Docket No. 02–278) (FCC 20–186)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 23, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ETC-529. A communication from the Attorney General, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Drawbridge Operation Regulation; New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, Atlantic City, New Jersey” ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2020–0215)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-1. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio urging the United States Congress to enact H.R. 1566, the Sunshine Protection Act of 2019 which would extend daylight savings time; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
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Whereas, The Congress of the United States first adopted daylight saving time during World War I to support war industries; in addition, continuous daylight saving time was adopted during World War II, referred to as War Time, and during the 1973 oil crisis; and whereas, The benefits of daylight saving time include additional daylight in the evening hours, increased outdoor playtime for the children and youth, expanded economic opportunities, energy savings, improved traffic safety, and crime reduction; and whereas, States are currently precluded from establishing permanent daylight saving time by federal law, which requires the United States Secretary of Transportation to enforce uniform application of that law across all time zones (certain states, such as Arizona, previously opted out of daylight saving time); and whereas, The Sunshine Protection Act of 2019 (H.R. 1556), introduced in the 116th Congress, would institute permanent daylight saving time nationwide; now therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the 113th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, urge the Congress of the United States to enact The Sunshine Protection Act of 1998 (H.R. 1556); and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Ohio Congressional delegation, and the news media of Ohio.

POM-2. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-3. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to constitutional conventions; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

POM-4. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to credit inquiries; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Special Report entitled “Activities of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs” (Rept. No. 117-1).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Merrick Brian Garland, of Maryland, to be Attorney General.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. SCHULTZ):

S. 490. A bill to modernize the technology for determining unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLeNS):

S. 491. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain river segments in the State of Maine as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 492. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of New Mexico to provide for the issuance of exemption facility bonds for zero-emission vehicle infrastructure; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 493. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the issuance of exempt facility bonds for zero-emission vehicle infrastructure; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit for zero-emission buses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 495. A bill to prioritize the allocation of H-2B visas for States with low unemployment rates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 496. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from taxable income any student loan forgiveness or discharge; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MUKLENCIK, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MARKY, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 497. A bill to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist in the awarding of fisheries research and development grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 498. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to limit the authority to reserve water rights in designating a national monument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HASSAN, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SMITH, Mr. Tester, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. KAINES):

S. 499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility for the refundable credit for energy property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 500. A bill to prohibit the transfer or sale of certain consumer health information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DAINES, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ERNST, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 501. A bill to provide protections to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 502. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 49, United States Code, to incorporate zero-emission fueling technology into the definition of “capital project”; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 503. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States to use incentive payments available under the child support enforcement program to improve parent-child relationships, increase child support collections, and improve outcomes for children by supporting parenting time agreements for noncustodial parents in uncontested agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HINICH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 504. A bill to establish Green Spaces, Green Vehicles Initiative to facilitate the installation of zero-emissions vehicle infrastructure on National Forest System land, National Park System land, and certain related land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHULTZ, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HINICH, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. KAINES, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. PADILLA, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. Lujan, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. OSWALD):

S. 505. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 506. A bill to establish the Clean School Bus Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 507. A bill to increase deployment of electric vehicle charging infrastructure in low-income communities and communities of color, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HINICH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 508. A bill to establish a working group on electric vehicles; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mrs. MURKOWSKI):

S. 509. A bill to establish a program to assist States in establishing or enhancing community integration network infrastructure for health and social services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
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By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKNEY, Mrs. GILLHANDB, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. HIROKO)

S. 510. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on the net value of assets of a taxpayer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN

S. 511. A bill to establish the Bronzeville-Black Metropolis National Heritage Area in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBuchar, Mr. MARKKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. ROBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN)

S. 512. A bill to require the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to collect and report certain data concerning COVID-19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. CORNYN)

S. 513. A bill to improve access to economic injury disaster loans and emergency advances under the CARES Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. KLOBuchar (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HINCHIc, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. Cortez Masto, Ms. HIROKO, Mrs. SHAHBER, Ms. DUCKworth, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. ROBIN)

S. 514. A bill to obtain and direct the placement in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds of a monument to honor Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. KLOBuchar, and Mr. BOOKER)

S. 515. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to States and political subdivisions of States to hire, employ, train and dispatch mental or an intellectual or developmental dis- ability that is affected by a mental illness; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. Moran (for himself and Ms. Sinema)

S. 516. A bill to plan for and coordinate efforts to integrate advanced air mobility aircraft into the national airspace system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HASSAN

S. 517. A bill to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCHUMER

S. Res. 7. A resolution notifying the President of the United States of the election of the Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER

S. Res. 79. A resolution notifying the House of Representatives of the election of the Secretary of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BOOKER)

S. Res. 80. A resolution establishing the Senate Human Rights Commission; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ)

S. Res. 81. A resolution honoring Las Damas de Blanquicentena, a women-led nonviolent movement in support of freedom and human rights in Cuba, and calling for the release of all political prisoners in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. WARNock, Mr. REED, Mr. CARDE, Mr. FROMAN, Mr. ROSENN, and Mr. WYDEN)

S. Res. 82. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of John Robert Lewis and commending John Robert Lewis for his towering achievements in the nonviolent struggle for civil rights; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Ms. COONS, Mr. BARRASO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BROOKER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBuchar, Mr. MARKKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. ROBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN)

S. Res. 83. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 20 through February 27, 2021, as National Black History Month.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. BARRASO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNyn, Mr. CONSET MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CHAMBER, Mr. CRAPo, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERS, Mr. HASSAN, Mr. HAYWEL, Mr. HORVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUCAN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MOHAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUHIO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STAPLES, Mr. Tester, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida)

S. Con. Res. 7. A concurrent resolution recognizing the heroism of the United States Capitol personnel and journalists during the insurrectionist attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 172

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 209

At the request of Mrs. SHAHBER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBuchar) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to provide for assistance to rural water, wastewater, and waste disposal systems affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 215

At the request of Mr. WIcker, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 215, a bill to establish a $120,000,000,000 Restaurant Revitalization Fund to provide structured relief to food service or drinking establishments, and for other purposes.

S. 348

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to provide an earned path to citizenship, to address the root causes of migration and responsibly manage the southern border, and to reform the immigrant visa system, and for other purposes.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to provide redress to the employees of Air America.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to establish the Commission on the Coronavirus Pandemic in the United States.

S. 437

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 437, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of State from issuing B1 and B2 visas to nationals of the People’s Republic of China for periods of more than one year unless certain conditions are met.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.
Hirono) was added as a cosponsor of S. 419, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a full annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. Sullivan, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Tillis), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. Sinema), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Risch) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Wyden) were added as cosponsors of S. 437, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. Burr, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Hagerty) was added as a cosponsor of S. 450, a bill to award posthumously the Congressional Gold Medal to Emomalii Rahmon, President of the Republic of Tajikistan.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. Scott of Florida, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to promote integrity in voter registration, the casting of ballots, and the tabulation of ballots in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. Rubio, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cornyn) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Van Hollen) were added as cosponsors of S. 460, a bill to extend unemployment benefits for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. Padilla) was added as a cosponsor of S. 465, a bill to establish and support public awareness campaigns to address COVID-19-related health disparities and promote vaccination.

S. 465

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven) was added as a cosponsor of S. 475, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

S. 475

At the request of Mr. Wicker, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. Feinstein) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. Hagerty, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. Murkowski) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to provide for congressional review of actions to terminate or waive sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.

S. J. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. Lee, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) was added as a cosponsor of S. J. Res. 7, a joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Minor Consent for Vaccinations Amendment Act of 2020.

S. 450

At the request of Mr. Cotton, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Scott), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Braun) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 72, a resolution opposing the lifting of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran without addressing the full scope of Iran’s malign activities, including its nuclear program, ballistic and cruise missile capabilities, weapons proliferation, support for terrorism, re-taking of gross human rights violations, and other destabilizing activities.

S. 460

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. Thune:

S. 495. A bill to prioritize the allocation of H-2B visas for States with low unemployment rates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. 495

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 “Bronzeville-Black Metropolis National Heritage Area Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(a) HERITAGE AREA.—The term “Heritage Area” means the Bronzeville-Black Metropolis National Heritage Area designated by section 3(a).

(b) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—The term “local coordinating entity” means the local coordinating entity for the Heritage Area designated by section 3(a).

(c) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term “management plan” means the plan developed by the local coordinating entity under section 5(a).

(d) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(e) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Illinois.

SEC. 3. BRONZEVILLE-BLACK METROPOLIS NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Bronzeville-Black Metropolis National Heritage Area in the State.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The Heritage Area shall consist of the region in the city of Chicago, Illinois, bounded as follows:

1) 16th Street on the North to 22nd Street on the South, from Lake Michigan on the East to Wentworth Avenue on the West.
2) 22nd Street on the North to 35th Street on the South, from Lake Michigan on the East to the Dan Ryan Expressway on the West.
3) 35th Street on the North to 47th Street on the South, from Lake Michigan on the East to the B&O Railroad (Stewart Avenue) on the West.
4) 47th Street on the North to 55th Street on the South, from Cottage Grove Avenue on the East to the Dan Ryan Expressway on the West.
5) 55th Street on the North to 67th Street on the South, from State Street on the West to Cottage Grove Avenue/South Chicago Avenue on the East.
6) 67th Street on the North to 71st Street on the South, from Cottage Grove Avenue/South Chicago Avenue on the West to the Metra Railroad tracks on the East.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.

(a) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—The Black Metropolis National Heritage Area
Commission shall be the local coordinating entity for the Heritage Area.

(b) **AUTHORITIES OF LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.**—The local coordinating entity may, for purposes of preparing and implementing the management plan, use Federal funds made available under this Act—

(1) to prepare reports, studies, interpretive exhibits, historical markers, and other projects, and other activities recommended in the management plan for the Heritage Area;

(2) to make grants to the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

(3) to enter into cooperative agreements with the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other organizations;

(4) to hire and compensate staff;

(5) to obtain funds or services from any source, including funds and services provided under any other Federal program or law; and

(6) to contract for goods and services.

(c) **DUTIES OF LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.**—To further the purposes of the Heritage Area, the local coordinating entity shall—

(1) prepare a management plan for the Heritage Area in accordance with section 5;

(2) give priority to the implementation of actions, goals, and strategies set forth in the management plan, including assisting units of government, businesses, tourism officials, and educational opportunities for residents and visitors in the Heritage Area;

(3) develop consciousness of and appreciation for the natural, historic, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area;

(4) carry out projects and programs that recognize and protect important resource values in the Heritage Area;

(5) establish and maintain interpretive exhibits and educational opportunities for residents and visitors in the Heritage Area; and

(6) install signs that identify public access points and sites of interest.

(d) **PRIVATE PROPERTY AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.**—Nothing in this Act—

(1) modifies, alters, or amends any law or regulation authorizing a Federal agency to provide technical or financial assistance under any other law.

(2) limits the discretion of a Federal land manager to implement an approved land use plan within the boundaries of the Heritage Area.

(3) modifies, alters, or amends any authorized uses of Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Federal agency.

(4) affects, or authorizes the resumption of, any right of property owner (whether public or private), including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the Heritage Area.

(5) requires any property owner to permit public access (including access by Federal, State, or local agencies) to the property of the property owner or to modify public access or use of property of the property owner under any other Federal, State, or local law.

(6) affects any activity, or affects any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any person injured on the private property.

**SEC. 5. MANAGEMENT PLAN.**

(a) **GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out this Act, the local coordinating entity shall prepare and submit to the Secretary a management plan for the Heritage Area.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The management plan for the Heritage Area shall—

1. include comprehensive policies, strategies, and recommendations for the conservation, funding, management, and development of the Heritage Area;

2. take into consideration existing State and local plans;

3. specify the existing and potential sources of funding to protect, manage, and develop the Heritage Area;

4. include an inventory of the natural, historic, cultural, and recreational resources of the Heritage Area relating to the themes of the Heritage Area that should be preserved, restored, managed, developed, or maintained; and

5. include an analysis of, and recommendations for, ways in which Federal, State, and local programs, may best be coordinated to further the purposes of this Act, including recommendations for the role of the National Park Service in the Heritage Area.

(c) **DISQUALIFICATION FROM FUNDING.**—If a proposed management plan is not submitted to the Secretary by the date that is 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out this Act, the local coordinating entity may not receive additional funding under this Act until the date on which the Secretary receives the proposed management plan.

(d) **APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the local coordinating entity submits the management plan to the Secretary, the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the proposed management plan.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In determining whether to approve or disapprove the management plan, the Secretary shall consider whether—

(A) the local coordinating entity is representative of the diverse interests of the Heritage Area, including governments, natural and historic resource protection organizations, educational institutions, businesses, and recreational organizations;

(B) the local coordinating entity has provided adequate opportunities (including public meetings) for public and governmental involvement in the preparation of the management plan;

(C) the resource protection and interpretation strategies contained in the management plan, if implemented, would adequately protect the natural, historic, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area; and

(D) the management plan is supported by the state, State and local officials, the cooperation of which is needed to ensure the effective implementation of the State and local aspects of the management plan.

(e) **APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS.**

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary approves a proposed management plan, the Secretary shall—

(i) advise the local coordinating entity, in writing, of the reasons for the approval; and

(ii) make recommendations for revision of the proposed management plan.

(B) **APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL.**—The Secretary shall approve or disapprove a revised management plan not later than 180 days after the date on which the revised management plan is submitted.

(C) **APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS.**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall review the management plan for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability of the Heritage Area.

(2) **FUNDING.**—Funds appropriated under this Act may not be expended to implement any changes made by an amendment to the management plan until the Secretary approves such an amendment.

**SEC. 6. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act affects the authority of a Federal agency to provide technical or financial assistance under any other law.

(b) **CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.**—The head of any Federal agency planning to conduct activities that may have an impact on the Heritage Area is encouraged to consult and coordinate the activities with the Secretary and the local coordinating entity to the extent practicable.

(c) **OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—Nothing in this Act—

(1) modifies, alters, or amends any law or regulation authorizing a Federal agency to manage Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Federal agency;

(2) limits the discretion of a Federal land manager to implement an approved land use plan within the boundaries of the Heritage Area; or

(3) modifies, alters, or amends any authorized uses of Federal land under the jurisdiction of a Federal agency.

**SEC. 7. PRIVATE PROPERTY AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.**

(a) **GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years before the date on which authority for Federal funding terminates for the Heritage Area, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct an evaluation of the accomplishments of the Heritage Area; and

(2) prepare a report in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) **EVALUATION.**—An evaluation conducted under subsection (a)(1) shall—

(1) assess the progress of the local coordinating entity with respect to—

(A) accomplishing the purposes of this Act for the Heritage Area; and

(B) achieving the goals and objectives of the approved management plan for the Heritage Area;

(2) analyze the Federal, State, local, and private investments in the Heritage Area to determine the leverage and impact of the investments; and

(3) review the management structure, partnerships, relationships, and funding of the Heritage Area for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability of the Heritage Area.
(c) REPORT.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Based on the evaluation conducted under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall prepare a report that includes recommendations for the future role of the National Park Service, if any, with respect to the Heritage Area.
(2) Required Analysis.—If the report prepared under paragraph (1) recommends that Federal funding for the Heritage Area be reauthorized, the report shall include an analysis of—
(A) ways in which Federal funding for the Heritage Area may be reduced or eliminated; and
(B) the appropriate time period necessary to achieve the recommended reduction or elimination.
(3) Submission to Congress.—On completion of the report, the Secretary shall submit the report to—
(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and
(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.


(a) In General.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act $10,000,000, of which not more than $1,000,000 may be appropriated to carry out this Act $10,000,000, the Secretary of the Senate shall prepare a report that includes—
(1) a description of the Heritage Area;
(2) a description of the activities carried out in the Heritage Area; and
(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of the activities carried out in the Heritage Area.

(b) Required Analysis.—If the report prepared under paragraph (1) recommends that Federal funding for the Heritage Area be reauthorized, the report shall include an analysis of—
(A) ways in which Federal funding for the Heritage Area may be reduced or eliminated; and
(B) the appropriate time period necessary to achieve the recommended reduction or elimination.

(c) Submission to Congress.—On completion of the report, the Secretary shall submit the report to—
(A) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and
(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 10. Termination of Authority.

The authority of the Secretary to provide financial assistance under this Act terminates on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 78—Notifying the President of the United States of the Election of the Secretary of the Senate

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of the Honorable Sonceria Ann Berry as Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 79—Notifying the House of Representatives of the Election of the Secretary of the Senate

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Sonceria Ann Berry as Secretary of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 80—Establishing the Senate Human Rights Commission

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, that

SECTION 1. Senate Human Rights Commission

(a) Commission Establishment.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Senate the Senate Human Rights Commission (in this section referred to as the "Commission").

(2) Duties.—The Commission shall—

(A) serve as a forum for bipartisan discussion of international human rights issues and promotion of internationally recognized human rights as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(B) raise awareness of international human rights violations through regular briefings and hearings; and

(C) collaborate with congressional committees and other congressional entities, the executive branch, human rights entities, and nongovernmental organizations to promote human rights initiatives within the Senate.

(b) Limitations.—The Commission shall not—

(A) have legislative jurisdiction;

(B) have authority to take legislative action on any bill or resolution; or

(C) encroach upon the jurisdiction of any standing, select, or special committee of the Senate.

(c) Membership.—Any Senator may become a member of the Commission by submitting a written statement to that effect to the Commission.

(d) Chairpersons of the Commission.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Two members of the Commission shall be appointed to serve as co-chairpersons of the Commission, as follows:

(i) One co-chairperson shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the majority leader of the Senate.

(ii) One co-chairperson shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the minority leader of the Senate.

(B) Terms.—The term of a member as a co-chairperson of the Commission shall end on the last day of the Congress during which the member is appointed as a co-chairperson, unless the member ceases being a member of the Senate, leaves the Commission, resigns from the position of co-chairperson, or is removed.

(C) Appointment.—Appointments under this paragraph shall be made by the minority leader of the Senate.

(D) Publication.—Appointments under this paragraph shall be printed in the Congressional Record.

(e) Vacancies.—Any vacancy in the position of co-chairperson of the Commission shall be filled by the President pro tempore of the Senate. If the Senate is not in session, the vacancy shall be filled by the member of the Senate who succeeded the co-chairperson who vacated the position. In the case of a vacancy occurring during a recess of the Senate, the Senate shall meet pro tempore.

(f) Compensation and Expenses.—

(A) In General.—The co-chairpersons of the Commission shall be paid at an annual rate of pay.

(B) Expenses.—Payments made under this subsection for receptions, meals, and food-related expenses shall be authorized only for actual expenses incurred by the Commission in the course of conducting its official duties and functions.

(C) Treatment of Payments.—Amounts received as reimbursement for expenses described in clause (i) shall not be reported as income, and the expenses so reimbursed shall not be allowed as a deduction under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(D) Designation of Professional Staff.—

(A) In General.—Each co-chairperson of the Commission may designate 1 professional staff member.

(B) Compensation of Senate Employees.—In the case of the compensation of any professional staff member designated under subparagraph (A) who is an employee of a Member of the Senate or of a committee of the Senate and who has been designated to perform services for the Commission, the professional staff member shall continue to be paid by the Member or committee, as the case may be, but the amount from which the professional staff member shall be reimbursed for the services of the professional staff member (including agency contributions when appropriate) out of funds made available under subsection (c).

(C) Duties.—Each professional staff member designated under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) serve all members of the Commission; and

(ii) carry out such other functions as the co-chairperson designating the professional staff member may specify.

(D) Payment of Expenses.—

(A) In General.—The expenses of the Commission shall be paid from the Contingent Fund of the Senate, out of the amount of Miscellaneous Items, upon vouchers approved jointly by the co-chairpersons (except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees who are paid at an annual rate of pay).

(B) Amounts Available.—For any fiscal year, not more than $200,000 shall be expended for employees and expenses.

SENATE RESOLUTION 81—Honoring Las Damas de Blanco, a Women-Led Nonviolent Movement in Support of Freedom and Human Rights in Cuba, and Calling for the Release of All Political Prisoners in Cuba

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, that

WHEREAS Las Damas de Blanco (also known as the "Ladies in White") is a group composed of wives and relatives of political prisoners, prisoners of conscience, and peaceful dissidents in Cuba;

WHEREAS, in April 2003, during the wave of repression known as the "Black Spring", a group of strong and courageous women formed Las Damas de Blanco in response to the wrongful imprisonment of their family members by the Cuban regime;

WHEREAS members of Las Damas de Blanco continue attempting to attend Sunday mass in the Church of Santa Rita de Casia in Havana, and other churches throughout different provinces in Cuba, and then march peacefully through the streets of Havana holding gladiolus despite the Cuban regime's constant efforts to block their nonviolent exercise of freedom of assembly and speech;

WHEREAS members of Las Damas de Blanco regularly march to advocate for the release of political prisoners and the freedom of the Cuban people;

WHEREAS, despite exercising their fundamental rights to freedom of expression and assembly, members of Las Damas de Blanco are regularly attacked by security forces and mobs organized by the Cuban regime;
Whereas, according to Amnesty International:
(1) Las Damas de Blanco “remain[s] one of the primary targets of repression by Cuban [authorities]”; and
(2) members of Las Damas de Blanco are frequently detained and “often beaten by law enforcement and state security agents dressed as civilians” while in detention;

Whereas, according to the Human Rights Watch 2019 World Report, in Cuba “detention is often used preemptively to prevent people from participating in peaceful marches or meetings to discuss politics, and detainees are often interrogated, and held information for hours or days”;

Whereas the Human Rights Watch 2019 World Report noted that “Cuban Police or state security agents cons…to routinely harass, rough up, and detain members of Las Damas de Blanco before or after they attend Sunday masses”;

Whereas, in 2005, Las Damas de Blanco were selected to receive the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought, but the Cuban regime did not allow members of the group to leave the island to accept the award;

Whereas Laura Inés Pollán Toledo, the founder of Las Damas de Blanco, left a legacy of peaceful protest against human and civil rights abuses in Cuba;

Whereas Laura Inés Pollán Toledo died on October 14, 2011, and while her death garnered widespread international attention, the Cuban regime remained silent;

Whereas, in February 2015, 30 members of Las Damas de Blanco were arrested in an attempt for Cuban officials to bar the women from participating in marches, which sought to advocate for the freedom of political prisoners in Cuba;

Whereas, while Raúl Castro is no longer the head of Cuba, grave human rights abuses continue under the current President of Cuba, Miguel Díaz-Canel;

Whereas Las Damas de Blanco has appealed to the United States Government and other foreign governments in order to bring international attention to the repression of dissidents by the Cuban regime and the plight of political prisoners, who are routinely jailed unjustly and without due process;

Whereas, on May 17, 2018, Las Damas de Blanco received the prestigious 2018 Milton Friedman Prize for Advancing Liberty in recognition of the bravery of the group and its continuing efforts to fight for individual freedom in Cuba;

Whereas Berta de los Ángeles Soler Fernández and Leticia Ramos Herrera, members of Las Damas de Blanco, were prohibited by the Díaz-Canel regime from leaving Cuba to accept the 2018 Milton Friedman Prize forAdvancing Liberty in the United States;

Whereas, on May 6, 2018, Aymara Nieto Muñoz, a member of Las Damas de Blanco, was violently arrested and during her transfer in a patrol car, was beaten by a uniformed cop, causing Nieto to require medical attention;

Whereas following 10 days of confinement in a cell of the Santiago de las Vegas-La Habana, Aymara Nieto Muñoz was transferred to Havana’s women’s prison, known as the Guanabacoa prison, and detained pending a trial for an alleged “crime of attack” with other prisoners arrested for petty crimes;

Whereas this is the second time that Aymara Nieto Muñoz has been imprisoned for political reasons, as she was sentenced to 1 year of prison for an alleged crime of public disorder following a politically charged trial on June 13, 2016;

Whereas, in March 2018, Marta Sánchez González was arrested for peacefully protesting and transferred to a women’s prison a month later;

Whereas, on August 2018, Marta Sánchez González faced a rigged trial and was sentenced to 4 years and 6 months of imprisonment alongside prisoners incarcerated for common crimes;

Whereas, throughout 2019, Las Damas de Blanco continued to suffer acts of repression, and violent attacks intended to imperil their physical and mental state as a result of their peaceful advocacy of the release of all political prisoners;

Whereas the total number of arrests conducted by the Cuban Police against Las Damas de Blanco is 1,120, including those of Berta Soler Fernández, who has been constantly harassed, violently attacked, and detained for lengthy periods of time, and Xiomara de las Mercedes Cruz Miranda, who was imprisoned in 2018;

Whereas, upon entering prison the first time on April 15, 2016, Ms. Cruz Miranda was in good health, but after being sent to prison for the second time in 2018, she acquired a rare skin disease in the women’s prison in Ciego de Ávila and her health began to be affected by several conditions, including tuberculosis, which damaged her respiratory system and her mental and physical health;

Whereas Ms. Cruz Miranda remained hospitalized for more than 6 months in Cuba, and after her health condition failed to stabilize, she was admitted to Jackson South Hospital in the City of Miami on January 2020, thanks to a humanitarian visa granted by the United States Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) honors the courageous members of Las Damas de Blanco for their peacefull efforts to speak up for the voiceless and stand up to the Cuban regime in defense of human rights and fundamental rights, such as freedom of expression and assembly;
(2) recognizes the brave leaders of Las Damas de Blanco who have been arbitrarily detained due to their peaceful activism, including Marta Sánchez González, who is currently serving a sentence under house arrest, and Aymara Nieto Muñoz, who is imprisoned an extended distance from her family, which poses significant obstacles to family visits;
(3) expresses solidarity with the Cuban people and a commitment to the democratic aspirations of those Cubans calling for a free Cuba;
(4) calls on the Cuban regime to allow members of Las Damas de Blanco to attend weekly masses held both domestically and internationally; and
(5) calls for the release of all political prisoners detained and imprisoned by the Cuban regime.

SENATE RESOLUTION 82—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JOHN ROBERT LEWIS AND COMMEMORATING JOHN ROBERT LEWIS FOR HIS TOWERING ACHIEVEMENTS IN THE NON-VIOLENT STRUGGLE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. OSSOFF (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. WARNock, Mr. REED, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 82
Whereas John Robert Lewis (referred to in this preamble as the “SNCC”); and
(2) organized sit-ins at segregated lunch counters, pushing Nashville to become the first major city in the South to begin the desegregation of public facilities;

Whereas Mr. Lewis graduated from the American Baptist Theological Seminary in Nashville, Tennessee, Mr. Lewis—
(1) was a founding member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (referred to in this preamble as the “SCLC”);
(2) instilled in Mr. Lewis an early desire to see the dream of peace and justice achieved;
(3) expressed solidarity with the Cuban people and commitment to the democratic aspirations of those Cubans calling for a free Cuba;
(4) calls on the Cuban regime to allow members of Las Damas de Blanco to attend weekly masses held both domestically and internationally; and
(5) calls for the release of all political prisoners detained and imprisoned by the Cuban regime;

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) honors the courageous members of Las Damas de Blanco for their peacefull efforts to speak up for the voiceless and stand up to the Cuban regime in defense of human rights and fundamental rights, such as freedom of expression and assembly;
(2) recognizes the brave leaders of Las Damas de Blanco who have been arbitrarily detained due to their peaceful activism, including Marta Sánchez González, who is currently serving a sentence under house arrest, and Aymara Nieto Muñoz, who is imprisoned an extended distance from her family, which poses significant obstacles to family visits;
(3) expresses solidarity with the Cuban people and a commitment to the democratic aspirations of those Cubans calling for a free Cuba;
(4) calls on the Cuban regime to allow members of Las Damas de Blanco to attend weekly masses held both domestically and internationally; and
(5) calls for the release of all political prisoners detained and imprisoned by the Cuban regime.

Whereas, following 10 days of confinement in a cell of the Santiago de las Vegas-La Habana, Aymara Nieto Muñoz was transferred to Havana’s women’s prison, known as the Guanabacoa prison, and detained pending a trial for an alleged “crime of attack” with other prisoners arrested for petty crimes;

Whereas, in 1958, Mr. Lewis wrote a letter to Dr. King, who responded with a round trip bus ticket for Mr. Lewis to visit Montgomery, Alabama, where Mr. Lewis and Dr. King met at Reverend Ralph David Abernathy’s First Baptist Church;

Whereas, while a student at the American Baptist Theological Seminary in Nashville, Tennessee, Mr. Lewis—
(1) was a founding member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (referred to in this preamble as the “SCLC”); and
(2) organized sit-ins at segregated lunch counters, pushing Nashville to become the first major city in the South to begin the desegregation of public facilities;

Whereas Mr. Lewis graduated from the American Baptist Theological Seminary in Nashville, Tennessee, Mr. Lewis—
(1) was a founding member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (referred to in this preamble as the “SCLC”); and
(2) organized sit-ins at segregated lunch counters, pushing Nashville to become the first major city in the South to begin the desegregation of public facilities;

Whereas Mr. Lewis graduated from the American Baptist Theological Seminary in Nashville, Tennessee, Mr. Lewis—
(1) was a founding member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (referred to in this preamble as the “SCLC”); and
(2) organized sit-ins at segregated lunch counters, pushing Nashville to become the first major city in the South to begin the desegregation of public facilities;

Whereas Mr. Lewis graduated from the American Baptist Theological Seminary in Nashville, Tennessee, Mr. Lewis—
(1) was a founding member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (referred to in this preamble as the “SCLC”); and
(2) organized sit-ins at segregated lunch counters, pushing Nashville to become the first major city in the South to begin the desegregation of public facilities;

Whereas Mr. Lewis graduated from the American Baptist Theological Seminary in Nashville, Tennessee, Mr. Lewis—
(1) was a founding member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (referred to in this preamble as the “SCLC”); and
(2) organized sit-ins at segregated lunch counters, pushing Nashville to become the first major city in the South to begin the desegregation of public facilities;
WHEREAS, at just 23 years old, Mr. Lewis helped organize the 1964 March on Washington, at which—

(1) Dr. King gave his famous “I Have a Dream” speech
(2) Mr. Lewis vowed, in his address at the Lincoln Memorial, to “splitter the segregated south end pieces and put them back together in the image of God and democracy”;

WHEREAS Mr. Lewis led demonstrations against racially segregated hotels, rest rooms, swimming pools, and public parks for which he was brutally beaten, left unconscious in his own blood, and arrested 49 times; and in one case, spent nights in county jails and 37 days in Parchman Penitentiary;

WHEREAS, in 1963, as Chair of the SNCC, Mr. Lewis moved to Atlanta, Georgia;

WHEREAS, on March 7, 1965, on what would become known as “Bloody Sunday”, Mr. Lewis led 600 peaceful demonstrators demanding their right to vote across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, where Mr. Lewis, who suffered a fractured skull, and other demonstrators were met with violence and police brutality;

WHEREAS, after televised images of the Bloody Sunday violence in Selma shocked the conscience of the United States, President John F. Kennedy asked for equal voting rights legislation before a joint session of Congress, which evolved into his signing of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 1983);

WHEREAS, on December 21, 1968, Mr. Lewis married the love of his life, Lillian Miles, who was his best friend, closest ally, and most recent confidant until her death on December 31, 2012, the 45th anniversary of their meeting;

WHEREAS, in 1970, Mr. Lewis became director of the Voter Education Project, which added nearly 4,000,000 minority voters to the voter rolls and changed the political landscape of the United States forever;

WHEREAS, in 1977, President Jimmy Carter appointed Mr. Lewis to direct more than 250,000 volunteers of ACTION, which was then a Federal volunteer agency;

WHEREAS, in 1981, Mr. Lewis won elected office for the first time as an at-large Councilman on the Atlanta City Council, where he was a leader for social justice and neighborhood preservation, including saving from destruction the historic neighborhoods of the Old Fourth Ward, Inman Park, Candler Park, and Druid Hills;

WHEREAS, in 1982, Mr. Lewis worked with the American Jewish Committee to found the Atlanta Black-Jewish Coalition, part of his deepening friendship and alliance with the Jewish community of Georgia, which later led to the establishment of the Congregational Black-Jewish caucus;

WHEREAS, in 1986, Mr. Lewis became the second African American to represent Georgia in Congress since Reconstruction;

WHEREAS Mr. Lewis fought for the passage of the 1991 Civil Rights Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–166; 105 Stat. 1071), which was signed into law by President George W. Bush;

WHEREAS, in 2001, Mr. Lewis was awarded the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation Profile in Courage Award for “his extraordinary courage, leadership and commitment to civil rights”;

WHEREAS, Mr. Lewis led the effort to build what is now known as the Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center, one of the largest Federal buildings in the United States;

WHEREAS, in 2003, Mr. Lewis secured authorization for construction of the National Museum of African American History and Culture on the National Mall in Washington, DC;

WHEREAS, in 2007, Mr. Lewis introduced the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007 (28 U.S.C. 509 note; Public Law 110–344) to investigate unsolved civil rights crimes, which was signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2008;

WHEREAS, in 2011, President Barack Obama awarded Mr. Lewis the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor in the United States;

WHEREAS Mr. Lewis’s colleagues referred to him as the “conscience of the Congress” for his—

(1) relentless pursuit of justice;
(2) unfailing commitment to building what Dr. King and Mr. Lewis referred to as the “Beloved Community”, a society without poverty, racism, or violence; and
(3) willingness that he called “good trouble, necessary trouble” to confront acts of injustice; and

WHEREAS, on July 17, 2020, Mr. Lewis died, devasting his family, his staff, the City of Atlanta, the State of Georgia, and the people of the United States, who united to honor his monumental legacy of hard work and self-sacrifice in the pursuit of liberty and justice for all, which culminated in Mr. Lewis lying in state at the United States Capitol before his memorial service at Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, before we be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honours the life and legacy of John Robert Lewis, an American hero and civil rights leader who—

(A) faced brutality and suffered grievous injuries while remaining steadfastly committed to the nonviolent struggle for civil rights;

(B) dedicated his life to defending the dignity of all people and building the “Beloved Community”;

(C) spent more than 3 decades as a Member of Congress defending and strengthening civil rights; and

(2) commends John Robert Lewis for his towering achievements in the nonviolent struggle for civil rights;

(3) celebrates 50 years of National FFA Organization in developing the next generation of leaders who will change the world; and

(3) celebrates 50 years of National FFA Organization Alumni and Supporters.

S. RES. 83

Resolved. That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of February 20 through February 27, 2021, as “National FFA Week”;

(2) recognizes the important role of the National FFA Organization in developing the next generation of leaders who will change the world; and

(3) celebrates 50 years of National FFA Organization Alumni and Supporters.

SENATE RESOLUTION 83—AMENDING THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE TO PROHIBIT THE CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION IN THE SENATE UNLESS THE TEXT OF THE LEGISLATION THAT WILL BE CONSIDERED HAS BEEN MADE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE IN ELECTRONIC FORM FOR A MANDATORY MINIMUM REVIEW PERIOD

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved.

SECTION 1. PROHIBITING CONSIDERATION OF TEXT OF LEGISLATION UNLESS COMPLETION OF MANDATORY MINIMUM REVIEW PERIOD

(a) In General.—Rule XII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(c)(a) It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, joint resolution, resolution, or conference report unless the text of the bill, joint resolution, resolution, or conference report which will be considered has been publicly available in electronic form for the mandatory minimum review period.

(b) Each Senator shall self certify that the Senate has read a bill, joint resolution, joint resolution, or conference report before voting on the bill, joint resolution, resolution, or conference report, the greater of—

(i) the period that begins with the first hour beginning after the text of the bill, joint resolution, resolution, or conference report which

S. RES. 83

Resolved. That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of February 20 through February 27, 2021, as “National FFA Week”;

(2) recognizes the important role of the National FFA Organization in developing the next generation of leaders who will change the world; and

(3) celebrates 50 years of National FFA Organization Alumni and Supporters.

S. RES. 83

Resolved. That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of February 20 through February 27, 2021, as “National FFA Week”;

(2) recognizes the important role of the National FFA Organization in developing the next generation of leaders who will change the world; and

(3) celebrates 50 years of National FFA Organization Alumni and Supporters.
SENATE RESOLUTION 85—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT IT IS THE DUTY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO DRAMATICALLY EXPAND AND STRENGTHEN THE CARE ECONOMY

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKKAY, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 85

Whereas the preamble of the Constitution of the United States cites the duty to “promote the general Welfare,” establishing care for the United States as one of the pillars of our system of government;

Whereas, even before the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID–19) pandemic, and the recession it triggered—

(1) the United States was experiencing profound crises of care and well-being; and

(2) critical public services and programs in the United States were underresourced or nonexistent;

Whereas we are interdependent and, at various stages of life, everyone will give or receive care;

Whereas care work makes all other work possible, and the economy of the United States cannot thrive without a healthy and robust foundation of care for all people;

Whereas over 3,700,000 children are born every year in the United States, and about 10,000 people in the United States reach retirement age each day;

Whereas, during the COVID–19 pandemic, it has been necessary for frontline workers to engage in numerous strikes and work stoppages to obtain safe workplaces, personal protective equipment, the right to shelter in place, and other basic protections;

Whereas care and domestic workers who are migrants or immigrants are especially likely to face wage theft, abuse, and other forms of exploitation;

Whereas hospitals in the United States are understaffed, and most of the country does not require minimum nurse-to-patient ratios that save lives;

Whereas care work and social assistance workers suffer from the highest rates of injuries due to workplace violence;

Whereas the closure of rural hospitals is accelerating, and 135 rural hospitals have closed since 2010;

Whereas Black, Latino, and Indigenous people have all been more than twice as likely to die of COVID–19 than White people;

Whereas adults receiving long-term care in institutional settings are over 1 percent of the United States population, but account for more than one-third of COVID–19 deaths in the United States as of the date of introduction of this resolution;

Whereas the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Olmstead v. L.C., 527 U.S. 581 (1999), established the right of people with disabilities to be independent and supported in their homes and communities;

Whereas lack of access to technology and broadband internet access can create work, childcare, and health care challenges for millions of people who live in low-income and rural communities, older adults, and people with disabilities who have negatively impacted the well-being of those people; particularly during the COVID–19 pandemic;

Whereas, on any given night in 2019, well over 550,000 people were unhoused in the United States;

Whereas, in 2019, in the United States, 1 in 7 children, more than 1 in 4 Black children, and more than 1 in 5 Latino and Indigenous children lived in poverty;

Whereas youth suicide rates are rising, and suicide attempts by Black adolescents increased by 73 percent between 1991 and 2017;

Whereas the Federal Head Start program reaches only 36 percent of eligible low-income children, and Early Head Start reaches only 23 percent;

Whereas 14,000,000 students attend schools with a police officer but no counselor, nurse, psychologist, or social worker;

Whereas mental health professionals, such as school psychologists and counselors, are best equipped to maintain school safety without pushing children into the school-to-prison pipeline;

Whereas, in 2019, in the United States, or up to 3,000,000,000 students, has been missing from school during the COVID–19 pandemic, and will need additional support both in and out of school to accelerate learning;

Whereas the youth mental health crisis has been exacerbated by the climate crisis, and has worsened due to the COVID–19 pandemic and economic collapse;

Whereas Black, Brown, Indigenous, and low-income communities have borne the brunt of health impacts arising from fossil fuel use, industrial pollution, and crumbling infrastructure;

Whereas, increasingly, climate disasters are hitting the people living behind communities suffering from widespread trauma and in need of mental health care;
Whereas nurses, care and social assistance workers, and educators—

(1) have been first responders during climate disasters and extreme weather events;

(2) disproportionately impacting children, older adults, and people with disabilities, who risk being separated from their regular care workers and caregivers;

(3) have taken grave personal risks to help the people they serve;

Whereas worsening climate impacts will make care work more necessary and care more difficult to administer, disproportionately impacting children, older adults, and people with disabilities, who risk being separated from their regular care workers and caregivers;

Whereas, despite the prevalence of low wages and difficult conditions, direct care jobs, including home care, residential care, and personal assistance jobs, are among the fastest growing in the United States and represent the largest occupational group in the country;

Whereas communities devastated by deindustrialization and disinvestment are particularly reliant on care and social assistance work for employment;

Whereas many care, social assistance, and education jobs are relatively low-carbon occupations, and can quickly become green jobs as certain physical infrastructures decarbonize by transitioning, health care facilities, and public buildings;

Whereas a robust care workforce will also be required to support a just transition to a healthy, zero-carbon economy, as other work for employment;

Whereas the multiple crises now facing the United States require not only unprecedented investments in physical infrastructure, but also similarly sized investments in social infrastructure, including care infrastructure;

Whereas public investment in care work supports care workers’ increased economic activity, creating additional jobs throughout the economy;

Whereas we have a historic opportunity to finally build care infrastructure that is equitable and inclusive, and one in which all people can thrive, prosper, weather future disruptions, and age with dignity in their own homes and communities; and

Whereas in the context of addressing and defeating the COVID–19 pandemic, economic crisis, systemic racism, and climate change, and taking seriously the mandate to “promote the general Welfare,” bold investments in care infrastructure and the rebirth of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(I) it is the duty of the Federal Government to dramatically expand and strengthen the care economy, healing and supporting the country as we emerge from the COVID–19 pandemic and face the challenges of the 21st century and beyond;

(ii) the obligation described in paragraph (I) can only be met with far-reaching public investments, designed to achieve the goals of—

(A) repairing the wrongs of history, including by—

(i) acknowledging and addressing the legacies of exclusion and oppression faced by caregivers and care workers, particularly women of color, Indigenous people,

(ii) acknowledging and addressing the trauma of all those with unmet care needs, such as people of color, including Black, Brown, and Indigenous people, and Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, immigrant, LGBTQA+, older, low-income, rural, and deindustrialized communities, people with disabilities, people who are unemployed, underemployed, unhoused, people who are incarcerated or who were formerly incarcerated,

veterans, survivors of abuse, and children and young people coping with economic and climate disruption; and

(iii) approaching care policy as part of a broader agenda of dismantling systemic racism, sexism, economic inequality, and other forms of oppression, alongside efforts to achieve truth and reconciliation, reparations, democratic institutions, Indigenous sovereignty, a fair and humane immigration system, demilitarization, a Federal jobs guarantee, and economic, environmental, and civil justice for all;

(B) raising pay, benefits, protections, and standards for existing care workers, such that—

(i) care jobs are family sustaining, paying substantially more than $15 an hour and offering generous benefits;

(ii) all care workers have—

(I) the right, and have pathways, to unionize;

(II) the ability to engage in collective action; and

(III) for labor protections, including those specified in the Domestic Workers Bill of Rights Act;

(iii) all care workers who wish to form worker-owned cooperatives have access to resources and technical support with which to do so;

(iv) all care workers have access to ample training opportunities, apprenticeships, and career pathways, including pay for compensation, along with other resources and support, including funding to facilitate those opportunities;

(v) all care workers have the mandated employer protections they need to conduct their work safely in general, and in the event of a pandemic, infectious disease outbreak, or other disaster, including having optimal personal protective equipment, optimal isolation protocols, testing and contact tracing, and paid days off due to exposure or illness;

(vi) all care workers are safe from workplace violence, harassment, and threats to health; and

(vii) all undocumented workers have pathways to citizenship and full and equal access to all public benefits, including health, nutrition, and income support;

(C) creating and expanding new care jobs over the next decade, including as part of existing and new public jobs programs, subject to the same principles in subparagraph (B), in the context of the rebirth of the United States toward universal, public programs ensuring—

(i) high-quality health care, including comprehensive, patient-centered mental health care coverage, substance use treatment, and reproductive care, free at the point of service;

(ii) free, high-quality home and community-based services, without income or asset tests and without waiting lists, which would fix the institutional bias of the current system and allow people with disabilities and older adults to receive needed support and live self-directed lives;

(iii) free, high-quality childcare and early childhood education with a focus on the first 1,000 days of life, and robust, culturally responsive, and diverse care settings to achieve healthy child poverty;

(iv) paid family and medical leave of at least 6 months, with full wage replacement; and

(v) additional support for unpaid caregivers, people with disabilities, older adults, and children, with the goal of eradicating child poverty; and

(D) building and expanding other zero-carbon, non-polluting, climate-safe infrastructure and jobs that are intimately connected to the care infrastructure described in subparagraph (B), to meet the fundamental material, developmental, emotional, and social needs of all people, including—

(i) clean air and water;

(ii) public, permanently affordable, and dignified housing and transit systems, integrated with adequate social services to support residents of all ages and abilities;

(iii) accessible infrastructure, including public accommodations, schools, workplaces, housing, transit, and streets allowing for full mobility for all people;

(iv) public education, with a focus on social and emotional learning, unleashing creativity in the arts and sciences, and educating and nurturing the whole child, and including fully funded programs for high-need students;

(v) healthy, nourishing, and sustainable food systems that provide affordable, accessible, and culturally appropriate foods;

(vi) comprehensive public health and emergency preparedness infrastructure, including equitable, democratic response and recovery efforts during and after climate disasters; and

(vii) opportunities for the removal of barriers to unionization and collective action in all economic sectors, including the service, technology, and gig work sectors;

(viii) a Federal minimum wage of at least $15 an hour, indexed to the cost of living, and the elimination of subminimum wages for people with disabilities, tipped workers, and all other workers;

(ix) expanded leisure time, with no loss in pay or benefits;

(x) generous, paid sick days and vacation time;

(xi) support for worker ownership, worker-owned cooperatives, and safety and democracy in the workplace, so that workers have meaningful influence over their conditions of work and the decisions that affect their lives;

(xii) substantial minimum wages, to lift people out of poverty;

(xiii) strong and effective labor standards for existing care workers, such as the Rights Act;

(xiv) paid family and medical leave; and

(xv) access to nature, public space, diverse forms of public recreation, and technology, including public broadband internet;

(xvi) mechanisms for democratic oversight of data, algorithmic, and technological systems, along with worker and community participation in the development and application of those systems, in service of expanding and improving care and social infrastructures;

(xvii) any COVID–19 relief and economic recovery legislation must prioritize and invest in care infrastructure as a down payment on building an interconnected, holistic care system that—

(A) is the backbone of the economy and essential to all people; and

March 1, 2021
SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7—RECOGNIZING THE HEROISM OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL PERSONNEL AND JOURNALISTS DURING THE INSURRECTIONIST ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL ON JANUARY 6, 2021

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. SHAHNEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. REED, Mr. LUSAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KING, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PARELLO, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. OSSEFF) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 7

Whereas January 6, 2021, the day during which insurrectionists stormed the United States Capitol (referred to in this preamble as the “Capitol”) as Members of Congress convened in a joint session to receive the votes of the Electoral College, will forever be remembered as an assault on democracy;

Whereas many agencies, including the United States Capitol Police, the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, neighboring local law enforcement agencies, and multiple Federal agencies, responded to the Capitol and bravely engaged the attackers;

Whereas, despite the attack on the Capitol, Members of Congress later returned to the task of receiving the votes of the Electoral College for President and Vice President, thereby ensuring that democracy would prevail that day;

Whereas Members of Congress, congressional staff, Capitol personnel, and members of the media—

(1) were at work inside the Capitol as it was attacked; and

(2) shared the experience of fearing for their safety as thousands of rioters surrounded and occupied areas of the Capitol complex, including the Rotunda, Statuary Hall, and the Senate Chamber;

Whereas the staff of the Parliamentarian of the Senate acted quickly and selflessly to preserve the electoral vote certifications from theft or destruction by those attempting to prevent Congress from carrying out the constitutional duty of Congress to receive the votes of the Electoral College;

Whereas members of the Capitol custodial staff and Restaurant Associates staff have bravely shown up to work, and maintained the standard of excellence set by such staff, during a dangerous pandemic, continuing to provide essential services to the congressional community;

Whereas the dedicated staff of the Architect of the Capitol, who care for and maintain the Capitol, immediately began working to repair the parts of the Capitol that were damaged and vandalized during this tragic event;

Whereas the people of the United States have already taken notice of the incredible and diligent work done by Capitol personnel to care for and repair the building in the wake of the January 6 attack, including by sending thank you notes to the Capitol custodial staff;

Whereas journalists continued to report to the world what was happening even as those journalists were threatened, chased, surrounded, subjected to physical violence, forced to shelter in place for hours, and had their equipment stolen and destroyed by rioters;

Whereas several members of the media were physically assaulted during the attack on the Capitol, including a photojournalist who, once the press credentials of the photojournalist were noticed by attackers, was thrown to the floor, causing the photojournalist to fear for her life; and

Whereas, due to the work of journalists who persisted in covering and documenting the events of the day despite the danger those journalists faced, the whole story of January 6 will be known: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate—

(1) commends the service and professionalism of the personnel of the United States Capitol who, under extraordinarily difficult circumstances, ensured Congress was able to continue to operate and fulfill the constitutional obligations of Congress; and

(2) expresses appreciation for, and solidarity with, the women and men of the news media reporting on the work of Congress, even at risk to their own personal safety.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Peter Schenk, a defense fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2021

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, March 2; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Raimondo nomination; that, at 2:15 p.m., the closure time be considered expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; finally, that Senator CRUZ be recognized at 12:15 p.m. for up to 30 minutes, and following his remarks, the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. SMITH. For the information of Senators, there will be two rollover votes at 2:15 p.m. The first vote will be on confirmation of the Raimondo nomination to be Secretary of Commerce, followed by a cloture vote on the Rouse nomination to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

RECESS UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:51 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, March 2, 2021, at 10:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 1, 2021:

MIGUEL A. CARDONA, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION.
INTRODUCTION OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION REAL ESTATE LEASING AUTHORITY REVOCATION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the Securities and Exchange Commission Real Estate Leasing Authority Revocation Act, which would revoke the real estate leasing authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Since the SEC was granted leasing authority in 1990, before I came to Congress, the SEC has consistently stumbled through leasing mistakes at great expense to taxpayers. It is time for Congress to end this fiasco and return the leasing authority to the General Services Administration (GSA), the federal government’s real estate arm, like other federal agencies.

When Congress first granted the SEC from GSA regulations and directives in 1990, it expressed its clear intent that “the authority granted to the Commission to lease its own office space directly will be exercised vigorously by the Commission to achieve actual cost savings and to increase the Commission’s productivity and efficiency.” (H.R. Conf. Rep. 101–924.) Over the past 30 years, none of that has come to fruition.

The SEC did not even establish a Leasing Branch until April 2009, and did not put into place any leasing policies or procedures until August 2010. Before that, in May 2005, the SEC disclosed that it had identified unbudgeted costs of approximately $48 million attributable to misestimates and omissions of costs associated with the construction of its headquarters near Union Station. In 2007, after moving into its headquarters, the SEC shuffled its employees to different office spaces at a cost of over $3 million without any cost-benefit analysis or justifiable rationale.

In the summer of 2010, the SEC’s Office of Administrative Services (OAS) conducted a deep cost-benefit analysis to justify the need for the SEC to lease 900,000 square feet of space at Constitution Center and to commit over $500 million over 10 years, overestimating the amount of space needed by over 300 percent. In addition to this gross overestimation of space, OAS failed to provide complete and accurate information and prepared a faulty and backdated Justification and Approval after it had already signed the lease.

As a former chair and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, I was deeply involved in oversight of the SEC’s real estate activities in the District of Columbia after the agency engaged in this improper sole-source procurement of nearly one million square feet of leased space. We held two hearings on this subject in 2011. At the first hearing, titled “The Security and Exchange Commission’s $500 Million Fleeing of America,” SEC Inspector General H. David Kotz testified that employees ignored the SEC chair’s explicit instructions and engaged in possible criminal violations in a sole-source procurement. He also supported stripping the SEC of leasing authority if the SEC did not undertake major changes. Inspector General Kotz’s evaluation and introduced legislation to revoke the SEC’s leasing authority for the first time.

At the second hearing, titled “The Security and Exchange Commission’s $500 Million Fleecing of America: Part Two,” SEC Chairwoman Mary L. Schapiro testified that “the SEC recognizes the benefits of having [GSA] manage the Commission’s future lease acquisitions. Leasing is not part of the Commission’s core mission and we cannot allow it to impede that mission.” She then explained that the SEC would pare down its leasing program “solely to liaise with GSA.” This arrangement, in which GSA manages SEC leasing activities, was memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding between GSA and the SEC on August 1, 2011.

Today, I have concerns that the SEC is going back on the commitment it made to Congress, which is why I am reintroducing this bill. In August 2016, GSA and the SEC entered into an Occupancy Agreement to authorize GSA to conduct the process for a new 15-year lease. In December 2016, GSA, with the approval of the SEC, submitted a prospectus to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for approximately 1,274,000 rentable square feet for the SEC. Congress approved this prospectus in 2018, and by July 2019, GSA had received final bids, resolved all protests and even selected a final bidder. A month later, in August 2019, the SEC canceled the Occupancy Agreement with GSA, citing concerns about the value of the purchase option that was part of the lease, concerns the SEC refused to document to Congress. The SEC effectively vetoed the entire procurement process despite not having the authority or funding mechanism to exercise the purchase option without GSA’s involvement. After a few more months of impasse, the SEC requested that GSA cancel the procurement and commence a new procurement process.

In all this back and forth between two agencies navigating a convoluted authority structure, a multi-million-dollar procurement funded by taxpayers has gone to waste, adding to the hundreds of millions of dollars the SEC has previously squandered in its real estate endeavors. These public blunders also risk undermining the reputation of GSA and the federal government among developers and building owners that participate in these lease procurements and ultimately driving up the costs of all GSA real estate procurements due to the threat of uncertainty. This also means that the SEC will continue to engage in short-term leases at a premium while the procurement process plays out again, instead of quickly transitioning to a more cost-effective long-term lease as planned. Congress created this con-

extension of the Securities and Exchange Commission Real Estate Leasing Authority Revocation Act

HON. MIKE BOST
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I was unavailable to vote in the House on February 17, 2021 and February 26, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted: Roll Call 41: NAY; Roll Call 42: YEA; Roll Call 43: YEA; Roll Call 44: YEA; Roll Call 45: NAY; Roll Call 46: NAY; Roll Call 47: NAY; Roll Call 48: YEA; and Roll Call 49: NAY.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM KINZINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present to cast votes on February 26. Had I been present, I would have voted: NAY on Roll Call No. 45.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HOT SPRINGS RESIDENT MILLIE PATRICK

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of a true servant of the City of Hot Springs and Arkansas’ Fourth Congressional District, Ms. Millie Patrick. She passed away on Friday, February 12, 2021, after years of hard work and sacrifice for her beloved community.

Described by those closest to her as a wonderful friend, Ms. Patrick worked with the Greater Hot Springs Chamber of Commerce

Ms. Millie Patrick. She passed away on Friday, February 12, 2021, after years of hard work and sacrifice for her beloved community.
for over two decades. During this time, she also served as director for Hot Springs Leadership Adult Classes until her retirement in 2020 and as Vice President of Retirement and Relocation.

Born June 28, 1932, in Kansas, Ms. Patrick later made Arkansas home with her husband, Gene Patrick. Together, they had two daughters, three grandchildren, and several nieces and nephews. As a member of Piney Grove United Methodist Church and an avid waterskier until the age of 86, Ms. Patrick was known to be an active woman. Referred to by her friends and colleagues as a "wonderful soul and a true ambassador for Hot Springs," Ms. Patrick shines as a true example of joyful service.

I take this time today to honor the life of service exemplified by Ms. Millie Patrick. I thank her and her family for their dedication to our fellow citizens and our beloved Fourth District.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021
Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I wish Coach Eckenrode and his community on this remarkable achievement. Coach Eckenrode, who was a born-again Christian, had a robust legacy of mentoring new coaches and schools' 1,000-point scorers. Additionally, he coached five of the Delone's girls' basketball team as head coach.

IN RECOGNITION OF GERRY ECKENRODE

HON. JOHN JOYCE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021
Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Delone Catholic High School Squirettes basketball coach Gerry Eckenrode on his 500th victory as head coach.

Coach Eckenrode began his tenure with Delone's girls' basketball team as head coach during the 1999–2000 season. Under his leadership, Delone Catholic has won four state championships, four district championships, and 14 division titles. His teams have excelled, winning at least 18 games per season. Coach Eckenrode has coached five of the school's 1,000-point scorers. Additionally, he has a robust legacy of mentoring new coaches.

Congratulations to Coach Gerry Eckenrode and the entire Delone Catholic girls' basketball community on this remarkable achievement. As he continues to lead the Delone Catholic Squirettes, I wish Coach Eckenrode and his team all the best.

PEACE CORPS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021
Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to reintroduce the "Peace Corps Reauthorization Act" on today, the 60th anniversary of the Peace Corps' founding and the start of National Peace Corps Week. I want to thank my fellow Congressional Peace Corps Caucus co-chair Representative Graves (R–LA), as well as Representatives Meng (D–NY), Takai (D–HI), Phillips (D–MN), Case (D–HI), and Sires (D–NJ), for their support as original cosponsors.

Like successive generations of young Americans, my wife Patti and I answered President John F. Kennedy's call and served in the Peace Corps in Ethiopia from 1966 to 1968. This was an experience that inspired our lifetime of service that continued into California state government, the Clinton Administration, and now the United States Congress.

Since the establishment of the Peace Corps in 1961, more than 230,000 American volunteers have served in some 141 countries around the world. Due to the ongoing global COVID–19 pandemic, the Peace Corps was forced to recall all volunteers serving in 65 countries in March 2020. Now more than ever, Congress must support the Peace Corps’ mission and realize President Kennedy’s vision of generations of young Americans, ready to serve their nation and make the world a better place.

Our “Peace Corps Reauthorization Act” would do just that by providing additional federal resources to support current and returned volunteers. This bipartisan bill would also provide the funding necessary to redeploy Peace Corps volunteers once it is safe to do so after the COVID–19 pandemic subsides, with the goal of finally reaching 10,000 volunteers serving annually around the world.

This bipartisan bill builds upon legislation sponsored by former Congressman Sam Farr (D–CA), who served in the Peace Corps in Ethiopia from 1966 to 1968. Mr. Farr was a Charter Member of The Delta Delta Chapter, Kappa Alpha Psi, Fraternity, Inc. Mr. White completed college and earned a Bachelor of Arts Degree while his studies were temporarily interrupted to serve his time in the U.S. Military where he moved up in the ranks as Sergeant in the U.S. Army serving in the Korean War. He earned an Honorable Discharge in 1960. Jackson State University is where Mr. White met the love of his life, Miriam H. Webb. The two married on December 22, 1951 and welcomed two children into the family during the mid-sixties. After finishing college and fulfilling his service obligation, the two moved to Los Angeles, California in 1955. There, Mr. White worked at Markham Jr. High School as a physical education instructor. Because of his love for sports and athleticism, Mr. White began officiating high school basketball sporting events. He was later recognized by the IAABO (International Association of Approved Basketball Officials) as the first negro ever elected Secretary Treasurer of the organization. The IAABO is the largest organization of its kind in the world where they have jurisdiction over all high schools, semi-pro, and small college basketball officials. Mr. White also taught and coached football at Jordan High School in Los Angeles.

Education was very important to Mr. White and he enrolled in The University of Southern California (USC) where he received a master's degree in business administration. Mr. White then expanded his career in teaching and worked as an educator/administrator in the Los Angeles Unified School District for 30 plus years and held positions as a classroom teacher, assistant counselor, assistant registrar, coach, youth service director, student body advisor, and vice principal mainly at the high school level until he officially retired in 1992.

From 1968 through 1969 Wiley and his beautiful wife Miriam, built their dream home in Baldwin Hills, CA and moved their family into the home where they raised their children. The home was the site for many family parties, gatherings, holiday dinners, reunions, rehearsals, and meetings where he hosted numerous Jackson State University Alumni meetings and served as the Alumni's President for the Los Angeles Chapter.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the late Mr. Wiley Rickman White.
HONORING THE WORK OF WHITKO CAREER ACADEMY

HON. JIM BANKS
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Whitko Career Academy in Whiteley County for their impressive and important work to help young Hoosiers succeed in the 21st century workforce. Part of Whitko Community Schools in Larwill, Whitko Career Academy was founded in September 2019 to help create career opportunities for students in the surrounding community.

Upwards of 500 students walk through the doors of the academy each day. Inside, each student engages in hands-on, skills-based learning. Made possible through partnerships with The 80/20 Foundation Trust and The Whiteley County Community Foundation, the academy gives these students the tools they need to pursue livelihoods in manufacturing, engineering, agriculture, technology, education and more.

Earlier this month, the academy formed a three-way partnership with WishBone Medical Inc. in Warsaw and Red Star Contract Manufacturing to bolster the academy’s engineering curriculum. Students will be manufacturing components for one of Wish Bone’s pediatric medical devices. This year, the academy will also serve as the home of the Whitko Agricultural Program and Future Farmers of America—organizations together dedicated to training the next generation of leaders in agriculture.

In the year and a half since its founding, Whitko Career Academy has established itself as a model for career and technical education. Hoosiers are thankful for, and proud of, this institution for the immediate impact it has brought to northeast Indiana. This record is testament to the life-changing education hundreds of young Hoosiers have received, and will continue to receive, at the Whitko Career Academy for years to come.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REMINGTON KRISTINE VINEY

HON. ADAM KINZINGER
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Remington Kristine Viney, who passed away on Tuesday, February 16, 2021, at the age of 26. Through passion for aviation and flying, Remington truly lived her dreams of adventure.

Remington was passionate about any adventure that life had to offer and obtained her pilot license in high school. While in college, she was the captain of the Wisconsin Flying Team. Additionally, she was a founding member of the Women in Aviation, Madison chapter. Remington enlisted in the Wisconsin Air National Guard in 2013 where she proudly served through several deployments and obtained the rank of staff sergeant. She pursued her commercial pilot license in addition to becoming a flight instructor. Further, Remington was working on a degree in Airframe and Powerplant Mechanics.

During her service in the Air National Guard, Remington met the love of her life, fellow service member, Kyle Henry. They shared so much together, including her passion for real estate, flying, and raising her future stepson, Kellan. Above all else, her family was the anchor of her life, and she was so excited for her future with her fiancé, Kyle.

Madam Speaker, I want to express my condolences, but encourage family, friends, and community to celebrate the life of Remington Kristine Viney, for her service to our country and love for life. My thoughts and prayers remain with her family and friends during this difficult time.

IN TRIBUTE TO DR. JOAN M. PRINCE

HON. GWEN MOORE
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Joan M. Prince, the Vice Chancellor of Global Inclusion and Engagement at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM). After more than two decades of working with distinction and serving her alma mater, she is retiring on March 1, 2021.

Dr. Prince’s education career with UWM began as a promising freshman when she was 16 years old. She was the first African American recipient of a bachelor’s in medical technology and a master’s in clinical laboratory science. She joined St. Joseph’s Hospital as a hematologist and, in 1988, she became the supervisor in hematology for the Medical Science Labs. Around the same time, she began working for the University of Wisconsin-Madison’s Medical school where she implemented the Health Professional Partnership Initiative’s collaborative project as lead strategist.

Equipped with a strong educational background and a breadth of experience, she began her 20-year career with UWM when she was appointed Vice Chancellor in 2000. She went on to earn a Ph.D. from UWM in Urban Education, with a focus on STEM education. At UWM she is also the Chief Administrator for the Divisions of Global Inclusion and Engagement, and Partnerships and Innovation, with responsibilities as the University’s Chief Inclusion Officer. She led campus-wide projects, including the STEM Inspire Pipeline, the Inclusive Internationalization Projects, Global Partnerships in STEM, Center for Interdisciplinary Research, and Equity and Diversity Services. Dr. Prince has led many important campus-wide initiatives that include the establishment of the first anti-bias training curriculum, as well as the formation of a program dedicated to advancing historically underrepresented student and first-generation students in the STEM field.

Outside of work, Dr. Prince’s commitment to community service extended to working to meet the needs of students in underserved communities, including minorities, women, children, entrepreneurs and small businesses. She served in a variety of leadership positions, civic organizations and was board member and governance chair of the Council on Foundations, the International Foundation Membership Association and the Urban Libraries Council. She is also a corporate board director of Managed Health Services, a subsidiary of the Centene Corporation, a director emeritus of C. G. Schmidt Construction Company and a corporate director of Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation.

Dr. Prince has received recognition and numerous awards for her commitment to community service from civic and professional organizations such as The Business Journal’s Woman of Influence award, The Community Leadership award (The Marshall Scholarship Fund) and the Friends of the Hispanic Community award. She was named one of the ten most powerful women in Milwaukee in the February 2006 issue of Milwaukee Magazine and is featured as an honoree in the national 2008 Black Women in Sisterhood Distinction Black Women calendar. She is also spotlighted as a nominee in the national African American oral history archival project, The History Makers.

On September 12, 2012, Dr. Prince was nominated by President Barack Obama to the key administrative post of alternate representative to the 67th General Assembly of the United Nations with the honorary rank of ambassador. This diplomatic position also maintained an appointment position as Senior Advisor to the State Department and Public Delegate.

Dr. Prince leaves behind a legacy of a long list of accomplishments. She is someone that cares deeply about her former students, the individuals she mentored, her colleagues and the larger community for more than 25 years that I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with her, she has been a tremendous force in the City of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin and the United States. Madam Speaker, I am so proud to honor Dr. Joan M. Prince and to call her a friend. I wish her much success as she transitions into this new phase of her life.

CONGRATULATING BRYER HALL

HON. GREG PENCE
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bryer Hall of East Central High School for becoming the 17-pound Indiana State Wrestling Champion.

Wrapping up his astonishing 38–0 season record, Bryer won all four of his state competition matches by pinfall, becoming only one of...
nine in Indiana wrestling history to have done so.

Having placed runner-up in the state final last year, Bryer is a true example that hard work and dedication pay off.

I congratulate Bryer, he has made the Sixth District proud.

IN MEMORY OF JAMES “JIM” E. ALTY, SR.

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor James “Jim” E. Alty, Sr., a Vietnam hero and active member of the seacoast community, who passed in late January at the age of 86. Through both his military service and his subsequent community engagement, he is remembered as a shining example of American fortitude, ingenuity, and empathy.

While Jim worked at General Electric for 15 years, he also served his country for 20 years in the U.S. Air Force, which included tours in Vietnam as part of the crash and rescue team, before retiring in 1973. In Vietnam, Jim’s bases were frequently targeted by rocket and mortar attacks, which included the October 2, 1968 attack that left four airmen dead. Jim never forgot those he served with and honored them with a list of their names in his wallet.

In his retirement, he engaged heavily in community service. His involvement included membership on the Dover HUB Family Resource Board, an organization that provides family education services, as well as volunteered with local police and correctional departments on reentry projects.

Jim also advocated for veterans’ health services as he was also familiar with the realities and struggles many face when returning from war and readjusting to life outside of combat. One of his proudest accomplishments was aiding in the opening of the new Somersworth VA Clinic in 2019. Jim also created the Dover veterans support group, Bets for Vets, and frequently transported fellow veterans from Manchester to Boston to ensure they received necessary counseling and medical treatment.

On behalf of all of my constituents in New Hampshire’s First Congressional District, I share my condolences to Jim’s sister and brothers, three children, five grandchildren, and many nieces and nephews. As we recognize Mr. Alty, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in honoring his rich life and legacy. May his memory be a blessing.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HAMBURG MAYOR DANE WEINDORF

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Mayor of Hamburg, Dane Alan Weindorf. He passed away at the age of 75 on Saturday, February 20, 2021, leaving behind a community of friends and a legacy of hard work, sacrifice, and service.

After opening his first local grocery store in 1972, Mayor Weindorf grew his business to seven grocery stores in what came to be known as Joe and Dane Enterprises, or JADE’s chain of stores. Weindorf retired with 30 years of service, which led to his desire to continue doing great things for his community. He was elected Mayor shortly after his retirement, and he worked on a variety of projects that led Hamburg to further success, such as renovations to city parks, the baseball park, and a new fire station.

Born on September 20, 1946, in Minnesota, Mayor Weindorf was one of six siblings. He and wife, Annette, of 38 years have two sons, two daughters, eight grandchildren, and seven children. With his passion for his large and diverse family and membership at First Baptist Church of Hamburg, Mayor Weindorf was known not just for his service, but also for his emphasis on personal relationships, friendship, and fellowship with his community.

I take this time today to honor the life of service exemplified by Mayor Weindorf. I thank him and his family for their dedication to our fellow citizens and our beloved Fourth District.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE VICTIMS OF THE BAKU AND SUMGAT POGRIMS AND THE 2020 AZERBAIJANI ATTACKS ON ARTSAKH

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 33rd Anniversary of the Sumgat pogrom and the 31st Anniversary of the Baku pogrom.

On February 27, 1988, hundreds of Armenian civilians living in the city of Sumgat in Azerbaijan were indiscriminately killed, raped, maimed, and even burned alive because of their ethnicity. Armenian rhetoric from Azerbaijani citizens and officials instigated this tragedy.

Similarly, on January 12, 1990, a seven-day pogrom broke out against the Armenian population in Baku during which Armenians were beaten, murdered, and expelled from the city. Over 90 Armenian civilians were killed, over 700 were injured, and countless others were permanently displaced by the ethnic violence that ensued.

For over three decades, Azerbaijan has taken steps to cover up these crimes against humanity and dismiss the atrocities at Sumgat and Baku. Even more disturbing, the Azerbaijan government lauded the perpetrators of this event and similar violent attacks.

Tragically, the Azerbaijani government’s approach toward Armenians has changed little since the Sumgat and Baku pogroms. We saw similar rhetoric right before Azerbaijan’s attacks on Artsakh last fall. Azeri forces, Turkish drones, and Turkish-backed mercenaries conducted an indiscriminate bombing campaign against large population centers that killed thousands of Armenians and displaced tens of thousands more civilians. It also included appalling war crimes against Armenians at the hands of Azerbaijani forces and foreign mercenaries that included beheadings, torture, and other abhorrent acts of violence.

I continue to stand with the Armenian people in condemning the horrific pogroms and in mourning the loss of those who were senselessly killed in the recent Artsakh attacks. It is critical for the United States to recognize and denounce violence based on race, ethnicity, or religion. These lessons are especially important as we prepare to commemorate the 106th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide in April.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on the Democratic Armenian Issues Caucus to honor the victims of the Baku and Sumgat pogroms and the recent victims of Azerbaijani aggressions in Artsakh. I will continue to condemn all acts of violence against people who are targeted simply because of who they are. I hope my colleagues will join me in rejecting violent rhetoric and intimidation. In doing so, we renew our commitment to achieving a lasting peace in the Caucasus.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALEXANDER X. MOONEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. MOONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 66th Anniversary of the Sumgat pogrom and the 31st Anniversary of the Baku pogrom.

On February 27, 1988, hundreds of Armenian civilians living in the city of Sumgat in Azerbaijan were indiscriminately killed, raped, maimed, and even burned alive because of their ethnicity. Armenian rhetoric from Azerbaijani citizens and officials instigated this tragedy.

Similarly, on January 12, 1990, a seven-day pogrom broke out against the Armenian population in Baku during which Armenians were beaten, murdered, and expelled from the city. Over 90 Armenian civilians were killed, over 700 were injured, and countless others were permanently displaced by the ethnic violence that ensued.

For over three decades, Azerbaijan has taken steps to cover up these crimes against humanity and dismiss the atrocities at Sumgat and Baku. Even more disturbing, the Azerbaijan government lauded the perpetrators of this event and similar violent attacks.

Tragically, the Azerbaijani government’s approach toward Armenians has changed little since the Sumgat and Baku pogroms. We saw similar rhetoric right before Azerbaijan’s attacks on Artsakh last fall. Azeri forces, Turkish drones, and Turkish-backed mercenaries conducted an indiscriminate bombing campaign against large population centers that killed thousands of Armenians and displaced tens of thousands more civilians. It also included appalling war crimes against Armenians at the hands of Azerbaijani forces and foreign mercenaries that included beheadings, torture, and other abhorrent acts of violence.

I continue to stand with the Armenian people in condemning the horrific pogroms and in mourning the loss of those who were senselessly killed in the recent Artsakh attacks. It is critical for the United States to recognize and denounce violence based on race, ethnicity, or religion. These lessons are especially important as we prepare to commemorate the 106th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide in April.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on the Democratic Armenian Issues Caucus to honor the victims of the Baku and Sumgat pogroms and the recent victims of Azerbaijani aggressions in Artsakh. I will continue to condemn all acts of violence against people who are targeted simply because of who they are. I hope my colleagues will join me in rejecting violent rhetoric and intimidation. In doing so, we renew our commitment to achieving a lasting peace in the Caucasus.

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. VICTORIA SPARTZ
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 26, 2021

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1319. This $1.9 trillion spending package is being considered without meaningful debate and without Republican input. While more than 200 Republican amendments were proposed, Democrats only accepted two.

I personally authored five commonsense amendments to improve government transparency and accountability, assist juvenile justice and foster care systems, and address concerns with standardized testing. All of them were unanimously rejected by Democrats.

We must take action to address the consequences of the coronavirus pandemic, but this bill does not address the concerns of everyday Americans. It addresses the desires of the Majority. It also does not address small business struggles. Instead, it adds more regulations on businesses already suffering from the pandemic.

Less than nine percent of the $1.9 trillion authorized in this bill goes to defeating COVID-19. Under this package, taxpayers will have to finance the wish list of the Majority. It also does not address small business concerns with standardized testing. All of them were unanimously rejected by Democrats.

In doing so, we renew our commitment to achieving a lasting peace in the Caucasus.
serve our constituents. The American people need Congressional action to curb COVID-19. While there are portions of this bill I could support, I cannot support it in its current form.

MENSTRUAL EQUITY IN THE PEACE CORPS ACT

HON. GRACE MENG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, for 60 years, Peace Corps has been an enduring symbol of peace and friendship between the U.S. and our global community. Peace Corps Volunteers (PCVs) sacrifice over two years of their time, working side by side with local leadership to combat some of the most pressing challenges of our generation.

Unfortunately, I have heard from too many PCVs who have struggled to access and afford menstrual products. PCVs, and Returned Peace Corps Volunteers (RPCVs) have shared with me how menstrual products are not readily available, or these items are far more expensive than they would be in the U.S. So many of these volunteers are also placed in very remote locations—forcing them to travel extremely far distances to access menstrual products.

Additionally, while the Peace Corps Medical Officers in some countries provides these products for PCVs, volunteers in other countries are forced to purchase these products out of the same limited stipend everyone else receives. Other volunteers pay hundreds of dollars out-of-pocket to ship these items from the U.S. to their country of service, or they wait to receive these items in their care packages from loved ones back home.

This is simply wrong. Menstrual products are not luxury items; they are medical necessities. Menstrual equity is a basic health right and human right.

That is why, today, on the 60th Anniversary of Peace Corps, I am reintroducing the Menstrual Equity in the Peace Corps Act to ensure that all PCVs have free and equitable access to menstrual products.

For the 65 percent of PCVs who are women, and the more than 90 percent of PCVs who are under the age of 50, this is simply a matter of equity. The Menstrual Equity in the Peace Corps Act would direct the Peace Corps Director to establish a comprehensive policy that makes available free menstrual products to PCVs who require them, or increase stipends to allow for those expenses.

Today, on the 60th Anniversary of the founding of Peace Corps, I recognize the bravery of all my constituents who have served in Peace Corps, and I am proud to reintroduce this critical bill that upholds the health and safety of all who answer the call to serve in Peace Corps. I thank my colleagues who have joined me in this critical legislation, and I urge its swift passage to ensure menstrual equity for all Peace Corps Volunteers.

TRIBUTE TO THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EDWARDS V. SOUTH CAROLINA MARCH

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an important anniversary that brings the actions of my youth full circle to my service in this esteemed body.

Sixty years ago, a student-led march took place in South Carolina’s capital city protesting state laws designed to maintain de jure segregation of Blacks and whites in my home state. The arrests that day, March 2, 1961, resulted in the U.S. Supreme Court’s landmark breach of the peace ruling. The case, Edwards v. South Carolina, is still taught in law schools today. I was among the student protestors arrested that day for seeking equal justice and civil rights, and I am proud of the role this event played in protecting the right to protest peacefully in this country.

On that momentous day, approximately 200 high school and college students from all over South Carolina gathered at Zion Baptist Church in Columbia and marched to the State House to protest racial discrimination. As a 20-year-old student protest leader at South Carolina State College (now University), I left Orangeburg with several of my classmates to join in the march. We divided into groups, and I agreed to lead a contingency of students from my high school Mather Academy toward State House. When we arrived at the State House, the law enforcement officers ordered us to turn around. It had been my intention to do just that, but the students I was leading wanted to press on. We marched on singing hymns and patriotic songs. 191 protestors were arrested for breaching the peace and spent the next three days in jail before being released on bail.

There were four separate bench trials that March and 189 students were convicted in Magistrate’s Court despite the exemplary representation of NAACP attorney Matthew J. Perry and his colleagues, Lincoln Jenkins II and Donald Sampson. All but two of the protestors appealed their convictions, which were upheld by the South Carolina Supreme Court.

On December 13, 1962, the Edwards v. South Carolina case, named for Benedict College protestor James Edwards, was argued before the U.S. Supreme Court by Matthew Perry. On February 25, 1963, the high court ruled eight to one in favor of the student defendants, reversing convictions. Justice Potter Stewart wrote in the majority opinion that a state cannot “make criminal the peaceful expression of unpopular views.” Since that ruling, Edwards v. South Carolina has been cited as the precedent in more than 70 breach of the peace cases.

Madame Speaker, ask you and my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the contributions of the student protestors in Edwards v. South Carolina as we remember their protest 60 years ago.

As one of the young people involved in this historic event, I can attest that we were committed to the fight for civil rights, and had no idea that our actions would contribute to preserving the right to peacefully protest for future generations.

Today similar tactics are being employed in movements like Black Lives Matter. I applaud their efforts and thank the City of Columbia, Historic Columbia and the University of South Carolina for the monument they have erected to memorialize this momentous event.

TRIBUTE TO DEACON DAVIES JOHNSON

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. DAVIS. Madam Speaker, to be of service to humanity is one of the greatest attributes one can have. Such was the life and character traits of Davies Johnson. Born and raised in rural Arkansas on the border of Louisiana, in the little town of Wilmot, Arkansas, Davies married his childhood sweetheart Mabel Parker in 1953 and migrated to Chicago, Illinois where they made their home and their lives. Davies was employed by the Burlington Railroad where he began as a Porter and became a Crane Operator and retired as a Supervisor after thirty-three years. Mr. Johnson was always kind and considerate. He was Christian-orientated and joined the Lord’s Way Missionary Baptist Church in 1973. At Lord’s Way, Mr. Johnson served on the Trustee Board, Sunday School Superintendent, Chairman of the Deacon Board and as anything else the church needed him to do. Deacon Johnson was a stalwart in his family and the community where he lived. He was a man of high standards and was well regarded by all who knew him. The world became a better place because Davies Johnson lived, and my life was enriched by knowing him. May he rest in peace.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF JOHN SCHIECHE

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of John Schieche, Superintendent of the East Valley School District, who is retiring after 43 years of shaping the next generation of Central Washington students.

As a farmer, it is my duty to highlight the fact that John was first exposed to teaching during his days managing a 1,500-acre wheat farm. It was not uncommon for John to hire high school students as labor during the summer months and teach them how to operate heavy machinery. This experience made for an easy transition into teaching as an auto mechanics and shop teacher.

Over the years, John excelled in all areas of education, most recently, he was awarded the 2018 Crystal Apple Award for his dedication to advancing school communications.

John started his journey to becoming superintendent in the early 1990’s after being hired by the Yakima School District to serve as Director of the Yakima Valley Technical Skills Center.

During his time in that leadership role, John was also pursuing his credentials to become a
superintendent from my alma mater, Washington State University. Go Cougs.

John was hired to serve as East Valley’s superintendent in 2002, and during his tenure, three of the district’s schools have been recognized by the state as distinguished schools for their teaching and learning methods. I wish as he makes his transition into retirement and returns to farm life. I thank John for everything he has done for our districts’ students, and from one lifelong farmer to another, try not to work too hard.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1280, THE GEORGE FLOYD JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT OF 2021

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 2021

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to affirm my support for H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021.

Last summer, in the wake of George Floyd’s horrific murder, people in communities sweeping the nation and the world took to the streets to express anger born of despair. His death was not an isolated incident—but another in a long, tragic pattern of injustices committed against the Black community at the hands of law enforcement. And each incident, however severe, serves as a sobering reminder of the systemic racism still woven into the fabric of our institutions.

For many, the death of George Floyd is merely an eye-opening introduction to the harsh, unequal application of justice unfairly meted on the Black community. But for us, this is nothing new. Many decades ago, I remember having the conversation with my parents about how to act during a police encounter. Fast forward to a newer generation, I was forced to have that same conversation with my son—but it does not stop there. As my son raised his three sons, he too had to repeat this morbid discussion with my grandsons. For far too long, for too many generations, we have tolerated and suffered the consequences of racism in our way of life. But at this moment, in the wake of so much pain and grief, Congress has a moral responsibility to meet the calls for bold and transformative change.

As such to support federal policies to address this ongoing issue, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. This proposed legislation would: ban the use of no-knock warrants and deadly chokeholds; limit the transfer of military-grade equipment to police departments; and, most importantly, put into place several reforms to make it easier to hold police officers accountable for misconduct. If enacted, the Justice in Policing Act will be a critical first—but necessary first—step on the path toward racial reconciliation.

It is important to note that this legislation alone cannot right the wrongs of the past, nor will it guarantee the total prevention of injustices in the future. Rather, we must empower our communities to reimagine public safety in an equitable manner. This means reinvesting—not defunding—police department resources to prioritize community-based safety efforts. Further, I am pleased that the Justice in Policing Act supports this proposal by providing public safety innovation grants for localities to reassess current practices.

To those who called, wrote, and visited my offices to relay your support for this bill, know that my vote today lends action to your voices. You have inspired me with your dedicated and tireless advocacy for justice, and it is because of you that I am optimistic for the success of our individual and collective cause.

Black lives matter, Madam Speaker, and it is past time that the laws of our nation reflect that. It is why I am urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. It goes sans saying that I strongly encourage its immediate consideration and passage in the Senate.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 2, 2021 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 3
10 a.m. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary, and Ben P. McKee, of the State of Columbia, to be Deputy Secretary for Management and Resources, both of the Department of State. SD-106

MARCH 4
9:30 a.m. Committee on Armed Services To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Colin Hackett Kahl, of California, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. SD-366

10 a.m. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources Business meeting to consider subcommittee assignments for the 117th Congress, and the nomination of Debra Anne Haaland, of New Mexico, to be Secretary of the Interior; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nomination of David Turk, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy. SD-392

10:15 a.m. Committee on Veterans' Affairs To continue hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations. WEX

MARCH 9
9 a.m. Committee on the Judiciary To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General, and Vanita Gupta, of Virginia, to be Associate Attorney General, both of the Department of Justice. SH-216

MARCH 18
10 a.m. Committee on Veterans' Affairs To resume hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations. WEX
Monday, March 1, 2021
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HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate confirmed the nomination of Miguel A. Cardona, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Education.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S907–S963

Measures Introduced: Twenty-eight bills and nine resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 490–517, S. Res. 78–85, and S. Con. Res. 7. Pages S954–55

Measures Reported:


Measures Passed:

Notifying the President of the Election of the Secretary of the Senate: Senate agreed to S. Res. 78, notifying the President of the United States of the election of the Secretary of the Senate. Page S907

Notifying the House of the Election of the Secretary of the Senate: Senate agreed to S. Res. 79, notifying the House of Representatives of the election of the Secretary of the Senate. Page S907

Honoring the Life and Legacy of John Robert Lewis: Senate agreed to S. Res. 82, honoring the life and legacy of John Robert Lewis and commending John Robert Lewis for his towering achievements in the nonviolent struggle for civil rights. Page S921

National FFA Organization: Senate agreed to S. Res. 83, expressing support for the designation of February 20 through February 27, 2021, as “National FFA Week”, recognizing the important role of the National FFA Organization in developing the next generation of leaders who will change the world, and celebrating 50 years of National FFA Organization Alumni and Supporters. Page S922

Raimondo Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Gina Marie Raimando, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of Commerce. Page S921

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 84 yeas to 15 nays (Vote No. EX. 69), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Tuesday, March 2, 2021; and that at 2:15 p.m., the cloture time be considered expired and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination. Page S963

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 64 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. EX. 68), Miguel A. Cardona, of Connecticut, to be Secretary of Education. Pages S912–21, S963

Messages from the House:

Pages S953

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Pages S953

Executive Communications:

Pages S953

Petitions and Memorials:

Pages S953–54

Executive Reports of Committees:

Page S954

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S955–56

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S956–63

Additional Statements:

Page S953

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S963

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—69)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 3 p.m. and recessed at 6:51 p.m., until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, March 2, 2021. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S963.)
Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 117th Congress, and ordered favorably reported the nomination of Merrick Brian Garland, of Maryland, to be Attorney General.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 33 public bills, H.R. 8, 1445–1476; and 5 resolutions, H. Res. 176–178, 180–181, were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:
H. Res. 179, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans’ access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1280) to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–9).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Beyer to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Recess: The House recessed at 12:01 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m.

Recess: The House recessed at 2:07 p.m. and reconvened at 7:19 p.m.

For the People Act of 2021 and George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 179, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans’ access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1280) to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies, by a yea-and-nay vote of 218 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 51, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 201 nays, Roll No. 50. Pursuant to section 6(a) of H. Res. 179, H. Res. 176 was adopted. Pursuant to section 6(b) of H. Res. 179, H. Res. 177 was adopted.

Senate Referral: S. 422 was held at the desk.

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on page H864.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H870–71 and H871–72.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 p.m. and adjourned at 10:09 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021; GEORGE FLOYD JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT OF 2021

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 1, the “For the People Act of 2021”; and H.R. 1280, the “George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 7–4, a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1, the “For the People Act of 2021”, and H.R. 1280, the “George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021”. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1, the “For the People 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 House Administration or their designees. 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 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 House Administration or her 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 House Administration 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 resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule waives points of order against consideration of H.R. 1280, the “George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021”, under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides that House Resolution 176 and House Resolution 177 are hereby adopted. Testimony was heard from Chairman Lowry, and Representatives Rodney Davis of Illinois, Jackson Lee, Biggs, Stauber, Lesko, Bourdeaux, Armstrong, Jones, Comer, Sarbanes, Grothman, Smucker, Spartz, Westerman, and Burgess.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.
CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of March 2 through March 5, 2021

Senate Chamber

On Tuesday, Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Gina Marie Raimondo, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of Commerce, post-cloture, with a vote on confirmation thereon at 2:15 p.m. Following which, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Cecilia Elena Rouse, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: March 2, to hold hearings to examine global security challenges and strategy, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

March 4, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Colin Hackett Kahl, of California, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: March 2, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Gary Gensler, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and Rohit Chopra, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, 10 a.m., WEXBEX.

March 4, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine how the financial system hurts workers and widens the racial wealth gap, 10:15 a.m., WEXBEX.

Committee on the Budget: March 2, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, 11 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: March 3, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Polly Ellen Trottenberg, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: March 4, business meeting to consider subcommittee assignments for the 117th Congress, and the nomination of Debra Anne Haaland, of New Mexico, to be Secretary of the Interior; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nomination of David Turk, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: March 3, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Brenda Mallory, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Council on Environmental Quality, and Janet Garvin McCabe, of Indiana, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., SD–562.

Committee on Finance: March 3, business meeting to consider the nominations of Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, Katherine C. Tai, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, and Adewale O. Adeyemo, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Foreign Relations: March 3, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary, and Brian P. McKeon, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Secretary for Management and Resources, both of the Department of State, 10 a.m., SD–106/VTC.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: March 2, to hold hearings to examine the Government Accountability Office’s 2021 High Risk List, focusing on addressing waste, fraud, and abuse, 2:30 p.m., SD–342/WEBEX.

March 3, Full Committee, with the Committee on Rules and Administration, to hold a joint hearing to examine the January 6, 2021 attack on the Capitol, 10 a.m., SD–G50/WEBEX.

March 4, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director, and Jason Scott Miller, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director for Management, both of the Office of Management and Budget, 10:15 a.m., SD–342/WEBEX.

Committee on Rules and Administration: March 3, with the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, to hold a joint hearing to examine the January 6, 2021 attack on the Capitol, 10 a.m., SD–G50/WEBEX.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: March 3, to hold hearings with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

March 4, Full Committee, to continue hearings with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

Select Committee on Intelligence: March 2, closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters; to be immediately followed by a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

House Committees

Committee on Appropriations, March 3, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the U.S. Capitol Police, 10 a.m., Webex.

March 3, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch budget hearing on the Library of Congress, 12 p.m., Webex.

March 4, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “FDA’s Foreign Drug Inspections Program”, 10 a.m., Webex.

March 4, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, 10 a.m., Webex.

March 5, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Status of Department of Veterans Affairs Infrastructure”, 10:30 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 3, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, Migration and International Economic Policy, hearing entitled “A

Committee on Natural Resources, March 4, Full Committee, hearing on legislation on Insular Area Climate Change Act, 12 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Ways and Means, March 4, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing entitled “Reauthorizing Trade Adjustment Assistance: Opportunities for Equitable Access and Modernization”, 10 a.m., Webex.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: March 3, Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to hold hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

March 4, Full Committee, to continue hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, 10 a.m., WEBEX.
Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

### DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY
January 3 through February 28, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days in session</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in session</td>
<td>147 hrs, 06'</td>
<td>110 hrs, 1'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Record:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages of proceedings</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions of Remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public bills enacted into law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private bills enacted into law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills in conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures passed, total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate bills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House bills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate joint resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House joint resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple resolutions</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures reported, total</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate bills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House bills</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate joint resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House joint resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate concurrent resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House concurrent resolutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple resolutions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures pending on calendar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures introduced, total</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>2,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint resolutions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent resolutions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple resolutions</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorums calls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yea-and-nay votes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded votes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills vetoed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetoes overridden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. No written reports have been filed in the Senate, 8 reports have been filed in the House.

### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS
January 3 through February 28, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Civilian nominees, totaling 90, disposed of as follows:</th>
<th>Other Civilian nominees, totaling 1, disposed of as follows:</th>
<th>Air Force nominees, totaling 1,664, disposed of as follows:</th>
<th>Army nominees, totaling 2,454, disposed of as follows:</th>
<th>Navy nominees, totaling 124, disposed of as follows:</th>
<th>Marine Corps nominees, totaling 437, disposed of as follows:</th>
<th>Space Force nominees, totaling 984, disposed of as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmed ....................................................................</td>
<td>Unconfirmed .....................................................................</td>
<td>Confirmed .....................................................................</td>
<td>Unconfirmed ..................................................................</td>
<td>Confirmed ....................................................................</td>
<td>Unconfirmed ..................................................................</td>
<td>Confirmed ....................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconfirmed ..................................................................</td>
<td>Confirmed .....................................................................</td>
<td>Unconfirmed ..................................................................</td>
<td>Confirmed ....................................................................</td>
<td>Unconfirmed ..................................................................</td>
<td>Confirmed ....................................................................</td>
<td>Unconfirmed ..................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawn ...................................................................</td>
<td>Confirmed .....................................................................</td>
<td>Unconfirmed ..................................................................</td>
<td>Confirmed ....................................................................</td>
<td>Unconfirmed ..................................................................</td>
<td>Confirmed ....................................................................</td>
<td>Unconfirmed ..................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

- Total nominees carried over from the First Session: 0
- Total nominees received this Session: 5,754
- Total confirmed: 2,549
- Total unconfirmed: 5,472
- Total withdrawn: 33
- Total returned to the White House: 0
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10:30 a.m., Tuesday, March 2

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Gina Marie Raimando, of Rhode Island, to be Secretary of Commerce, post-cloture, with a vote on confirmation thereon at 2:15 p.m. Following which, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Cecilia Elena Rouse, of New Jersey, to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

(Senate will recess following the remarks of Senator Cruz until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Tuesday, March 2

House Chamber
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Banks, Jim, Ind., E185
Booz, Mike, Ill., E183
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E187
Cole, Tom, Okla., E184
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Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E188
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