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-

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.

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
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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 our 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. Commemorating this memorial day is an important marker for all those affected across the country and to help our country heal from this trauma.

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 Krebbs 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. LA MALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LA MALFA. 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:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2021.

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

Dear Madam Speaker:
Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 1, 2021, at 4:39 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 79.

With best wishes, I am, Sincerely,
ROBERT F. REEVES,
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:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2021.

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

Dear Madam Speaker:
Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 1, 2021, at 4:39 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 79.

With best wishes, I am, Sincerely,
ROBERT F. REEVES,
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) one 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.

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debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the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

Sec. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on House Administration or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed.
of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on 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 in order to consider 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 bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (a) 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 (b) 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 1 minute 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 distinguished 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.

Equally 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 barriers to making their voices 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 training 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 organized effort to change the rules because they didn’t like the outcome.

The minority 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 demonstrates 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 gerrymandering, an end to suppressions of voting, and a move toward 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.” 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 without citizenship of 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, that starts with the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. The bill prohibits religious, racial, and discriminatory profiling by every police department in America, supports 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 desecration 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 yet—I say 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. Washington once again considering H.R. 1, a bill that nationalizes the election system and substitutes Washington’s judgment for a key responsibility of our States in the administration of free and fair elections. 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 to bend the majority to the detriment of 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 well-intended 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 ranking member, who knows all too well, 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 their own election.

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 exemption status. If enacted into law, these provisions would reweaponize 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 silencing 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 remedied.

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

Unfortunately, rather than choosing to come 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 face 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 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 and reduce the divided majority. 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 appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 is the most significant democracy reform package in an entire generation, pro-democracy, anticorruption reform package. It is composed of comprehensive policies for eliminating structural and legal 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 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."

This is precisely what we are doing here. As the gentleman has said, we had a huge turnout in the 2020 election, despite efforts by some to suppress turnout. Now, we see legislatures all over the country trying to put barriers in place so the American people will not be able to exercise their franchise. That is simply wrong. We should look to our constitutional obligation to make sure that every American has the capacity to vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), my good friend, also a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member COLE for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1, which should more appropriately be titled, the for the politicians act, is nothing more than a top-down federal power grab that nationalizes our elections and empowers the Democratic party to permanently hold on to their majority.

Article I, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution gives States the primary role in establishing election law and in administering elections.

H.R. 1 upends this constitutional balance by forcing States to permanently expand mail-in voting, legalize ballot harvesting, and disregard voter ID laws. Even more alarming, this bill allows for the first-ever Federal funding of campaigns, creating a 6 to 1 government match to small-dollar donors. This means that for every $200 donated, the Federal Government would contribute $1,200. Additionally, certain voters will be given publicly funded vouchers to donate to candidates of their choice.

H.R. 1 also stifles free speech and empowers President Biden’s IRS to target conservative organizations and deny them their tax-exempt status.

Last, but certainly not least, H.R. 1 increases vulnerability for foreign election interference at a time when we should be increasingly more vigilant about hostile regimes seeking to undermine our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and “no” on H.R. 1.
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 these reforms. And as my colleagues have mentioned, there are people right now in various State legislatures that are doing the exact same pattern of making it hard for Americans to vote. This is embarrassing. This isn’t just a matter of what happened with civil rights, this has been refined as a high art to be gerrymander people into voting patterns that prevent 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.

This somehow 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 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my very good friend, and the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROYDELL WILSON), my good friend, and the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today against H.R. 1230. 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, Speaker Pelosi is surrounded by 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
while destroying their rights and livelihoods. Don’t call a cop for help if this is how you are going to treat them. You should tell them to go home. At least then, they won’t have to stand guard while you dismantle everything they stand for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
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Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), my very good friend and the ranking member of the House Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems like we were just here, debating a COVID relief bill that was not about COVID relief but Democrats’ special interests. Now, we are debating the rule for the so-called For the People Act, but it is not for the people but against the people, against our freedom, and against our right to vote.

H.R. 1, the Democrats’ plan to nationalize elections, stack the deck in their favor, and pad their campaign accounts with corporate money laundered through the IRS, is exactly what this country does not need.

What we do need are States carrying out Federal elections with integrity and transparency, as the Constitution dictates. We need American voters to have confidence in the security and accuracy of their voter ID requirements and maintenance of voter registration lists.

While H.R. 1 actually forbids voter ID laws, Mr. Speaker, you have to have an ID to buy tobacco and alcohol in this country. What is the problem with having to identify who you are to vote?

Two simple provisions to promote integrity and transparency, but my colleagues across the aisle must not be here for integrity, transparency, and improving voter confidence in our elections because they wouldn’t even make my amendment in order.

Mr. Speaker, since we can’t have a debate in committee or here on the floor, I yield the Voter ID Act, and then maybe my friends can explain to the American people why they are opposed to election integrity and transparency and what is wrong with having to verify the identification of voters.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MORELLE. 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 must have the Constitution 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 lawsuits brought by the former President and his advocates, all of which were denied going all the way up to the Supreme Court, our colleagues didn’t 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 going to say 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 discussion that we are 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 continuous pursuit of 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, and 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 $10 million to support the healthy childhood prevention in States where children do not have the option of in-person instruction in school.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the Record, 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 yield to 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 the S. Frelief Project, 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.

The resolution would 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 social 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 state again that America’s children have the very best. Let’s defeat 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. We just simply look at this ceristency. There is a great gap between us. We simply don't see eye to eye. Mr. Speaker, we need to come together. There is no one-size-fits-all regime from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 1, the majority is once again attempting to pass the same flawed police reform bill it passed last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we had a real opportunity here for both Democrats and Republicans to work together to pass real reforms for the American people. Instead of taking "yes" for an answer, the majority is instead seeking to impose a deeply partisan bill that will not fix the problems or help heal the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we deserve better than that. The American people are best served when their Representatives in Congress can come together and work in a bipartisan manner. One side attempting to impose partisan legislation on the country does us all a disservice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to rethink this path, reject both of these bills, and return to the negotiating table and work with Republicans for a brighter future for all Americans.

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 differently. I think it is egregious partisan overreach. On H.R. 1280, there really is an opportunity for bipartisan cooperation. The JUSTICE Act that Mr. STAUBER 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 equally divided House and an evenly divided Senate that still has the filibuster, you can't do things by reconciliation every day. Mr. Speaker, we will never get anywhere. 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 then turn to 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 goodbye 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, as 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 the expression of the will of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, what I find troubling right now is that friends across the aisle have 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 cast their votes, 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 has the right to do so. I urge the "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 1280, the majority is once again attempting to pass the same flawed police reform bill it passed last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on that I disagree. In neither case has the majority allowed Republicans to be involved in the process of legislating.

Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 1, the majority is proposing a deeply troubling takeover of election practices that will benefit only Democrats. The bill will take away the traditional powers of the States to run their own elections as they see fit, imposing a one-size-fits-all regime from Washington.

It dumps huge amounts of corporate money into the campaign finance system, particularly benefiting certain candidates. It imposes severe restrictions on free speech that are anathema to a free and fair election.

On H.R. 1280, the majority is once again attempting to pass the same flawed police reform bill it passed last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we had a real opportunity here for both Democrats and Republicans to work together to pass real reforms for the American people. Instead of taking "yes" for an answer, the majority is instead seeking to impose a deeply partisan bill that will not fix the problems or help heal the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we deserve better than that. The American people are best served when their Representatives in Congress can come together and work in a bipartisan manner. One side attempting to impose partisan legislation on the country does us all a disservice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to rethink this path, reject both of these bills, and return to the negotiating table and work with Republicans for a brighter future for all Americans.

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 differently. I think it is egregious partisan overreach. On H.R. 1280, there really is an opportunity for bipartisan cooperation. The JUSTICE Act that Mr. STAUBER 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 equally divided House and an evenly divided Senate that still has the filibuster, you can't do things by reconciliation every day. Mr. Speaker, we will never get anywhere. 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 then turn to 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 goodbye 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, as 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 the expression of the will of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, what I find troubling right now is that friends across the aisle have 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 cast their votes, 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.
### Messrs. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, GONZALEZ of Arizona, and KINZINGER of Illinois, and others changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
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 2 accordingly).

(2) Strike paragraph (5) in section 204(a).

(3) Redesignate paragraphs (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10) in section 204(a) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9), respectively.

(4) In paragraph (7) of section 204(a), as redesignated by paragraph (3), strike "paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (8)" and insert "paragraphs (5), (6), and (9)".

(5) In paragraph (8) of section 204(a), as so redesignated, strike "paragraph (6)(C)" and insert "paragraph (6)(C)(i)".

(6) Strike paragraph (5) in section 9501(a).

(7) Redesignate paragraphs (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11) in 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 (9)".

(9) In paragraph (8) of section 9501(a), as so redesignated, strike "paragraph (6)(C)(i)" and insert "paragraph (6)(C)(ii)".


The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 179, H. Res. 177 is hereby adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 177
Resolved, That for candidates or Members of the House of Representatives filing required under section 101(c) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1989, or a Member of the House of Represenatives 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 participating candidate 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 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. 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 late Mayor Moses 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. KAP'TUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAP'TUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to support and ask my colleagues 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 Gibbs-Kaptur, Kap'tur-Gibbs bill, to help these hospitals out.

RECOGNIZING JUSTICE GIORDANO

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Miss Justice Giordano from Cambria County, Pennsylvania.

Justice, 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 others will help her excel in this exciting new role.

Congratulations, Justice.

THE TRAGIC DEATH OF GEORGE FLOYD HAS AWAKENED THE NATION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE 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 from California. On behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, we are here to say that the tragic death of George Floyd has awakened the Nation and the world to the gross injustice that too many African Americans face on a daily basis.

Eight minutes and 46 seconds, and the world stood up. New Zealand and London, around the world, they all said, enough is enough.

This legislation will now have qualified immunity reform, pattern and practice investigations, the idea of a national police misconduct registry, the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act banning choke holds, banning no-knock drug warrants.

It will be a new day in the relationship between police and community. Crisis units because police do not want to be social workers. We know there are officers who believe in protect and serve. At the same time, we know the Nation does not want police misconduct.

Let’s work together, pass this legislation, and let it be signed by the President of the United States. I thank the Congressional Black Caucus for its leadership. The world is watching us this week.

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.)

Mr. HILL. 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 Israel-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.

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 call attention to the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which recognizes 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.
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 kicked through the glass, 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 end police brutality and, most importantly, accountability across this country. Those who serve us in law enforcement are not above the law.
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 to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter that is the subject of any investigation of the Committee, or that hearing unless the Chair of the Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Member, determines that there is good cause to announce the date or the Committee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. In the latter event, the Chair or the subcommittee chair, as the case may be, shall have such an announcement published in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form. To the extent practicable, the Chair or the subcommittee chair shall make 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 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 agreed upon by the subcommittee.
(c) All opening statements at hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee will be made part of the permanent written record. Opening statements by members may not be presented orally, unless the Chair of the Committee or any subcommittee determines that one statement from the Chair or a designee will be presented, of which the Ranking Member 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 constituent of a member of the Committee or subcommittee, such member shall be entitled to briefly introduce such witness at the hearing.
(d) To the extent practicable, witnesses who are to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the staff director of the Committee or any subcommittee, in advance of their appearance, a written statement of their proposed testimony, together with a brief summary thereof, and shall be limited to a summary thereof. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly furnish to the staff director of the minority a copy of such testimony submitted to the Committee pursuant to this rule. The Chair of the Committee, or a member designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses.
(e) When any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chair by a majority of those minority party members before the conclusion of such hearing, to call witnesses to be present and hear testimony thereon with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon. The minority party may waive this right by calling at least one hour in the aggregate.
(f) Members presiding or the designees of members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. To the extent practicable, the Chair or the subcommittee chair shall make 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 Congressional Record as soon as practicable after such public announcement is made.
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(g)(3)(A)(v) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall notify the ranking minority party member or any majority party member that a subpoena has been issued, to the extent practicable, at least 48 hours in advance of a subpoena being served under such authority, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, federal holidays, and other days on which the House is not in session. As soon as practicable after issuing any subpoena under such authority, the Chair shall notify in writing all members of the Committee of 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 Ranking Member and majority party, 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 majority staff no less than three business days before any notice or subpoena for a deposition is issued. After such consultation, 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 of Committee counsel as designated by the Chair or Ranking Member.
(f) 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, and 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 shall ask questions first, and a member or Committee counsel designated by the majority staff or minority staff shall ask questions second. (g) During a deposition must be stated concisely and in a non-argumentative and non-suggestive manner. Deponent 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 rule on any such objection after the deposition is conducted. If the Committee rules any such objection and thereby orders a deponent to answer any question 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 and is thereby ordered to answer may request 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. Sanctions for deposition testimony for which an objection has been made is offered for admission in evidence before the Committee, all properly lodged objections then made shall be timely and shall be considered by the Committee prior to admission in evidence before the Committee. (h) Deposition testimony shall be transcribed by 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 transcript or electronic recording to the deponent. Any proposed substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments to the deposition testimony must be noted on the transcript and must be transcribed or recorded. The deponent, the deponent’s counsel (including personal counsel for the party employing the deponent if the scope of the deposition is expected to cover actions taken as part of the deponent’s employment), and the committee clerk for other persons or entities may not attend. (i) After receiving the transcript, majority staff shall make available the transcript for review by the member or Committee 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 committee staff. The member or Committee counsel shall be included in the Committee report on the transcript. Any proposed substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments to the deposition testimony must be noted on the transcript and must be transcribed or recorded. The deponent shall consult regarding the release of deposition transcript or electronic recordings. If other objects 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 Chair for consideration. 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 voting from a measure or recommendation, or in the case of the Committee or a subcommittee authorizing a subpoena. For the enumerated actions, a majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. Two any member 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 subcommittee chair regarding referral to the appropriate subcommittee of such bills, resolutions, or other matters submitted by the deponent. The proposed referral shall be made until three days have elapsed after the deposition transcript or electronic recordings. If either the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be. (b) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until three days have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chair, at which time such referral shall be made unless any member of the Committee or subcommittee shall have given written notice to the Chair of the member or subcommittee that he or she is opposed to the proposed referral. A regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee, or at a special meeting of the Committee called for that purpose, at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the Committee. All bills shall be referred under this rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction, whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. Upon a majority vote of the Committee, a bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee shall be returned to the chair of the subcommittee, and a copy of such resolution or other matter shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter. (c) 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 adopting a substitute or bill or amendment offered thereto, the total number of such votes cast for and against, and the names of the members voting for and against shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter. (d) In accordance with clause 2(b)(4) of Rule IV 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 adopting a substitute or bill or amendment offered thereto, the total number of such votes cast for and against, and the names of the members voting for and against shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter. (e) Written records shall be kept of the proceedings of the Committee and of each roll call vote, and such records and rolls shall be open to the public at reasonable times and shall be made available on the Committee’s website within 48 hours of such record vote. Information made available on the Committee’s website shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order,
RULE 16. REPORTS

(a) Reports of the Committee. All Committee reports on bills or resolutions shall comply with the provisions of clause (1) of Rule XI and clauses 2, 3, and 4 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(1) No such report shall be filed until copies of the proposed report have been available to all members at least 36 hours prior to the filing of such report in the Committee.

No material change shall be made in the report distributed to members unless agreed to by the ranking member; but any member or a majority of the members of the full Committee, as part of the printed report, individual, minority, or dissenting views, without regard to the preceding provisions of this clause, may make such change if the Chair considers it appropriate.

(2) Such 36-hour period shall not conclude earlier than the end of the period provided under clause 2(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives after the Committee approves a measure or matter if such member, at the time of such approval, gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views for inclusion as part of the printed report.

(3) To the extent practicable, any report prepared pursuant to a Committee or subcommittee study or investigation shall be available to members no later than 48 hours prior to consideration of any such report by the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

(b) Disclaimers.

(1) A report on activities of the Committee required under clause 1(d) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall include the following disclaimer in the document transmitting the report to the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

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.

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 include the following disclaimer on the cover of such report:

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

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

(c) The Chair is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requiring the Chair to report any measure which has been approved by the subcommittee to 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 subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the staff director of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the Secretary 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 by the Chair 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 if 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 on the full Committee. In making assignments of minority party members as conferees, the Chair shall consult with the Ranking Member of the Committee.

(c) The Chair is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

RULE 18. MEASURES TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION

(a) A member of the Committee may not seek to suspend the Rules of the House of Representatives on any bill, resolution, or other matter which has been modified after such measure is ordered referred, unless notice of such action has been given to the Chair and Ranking Member of the full Committee.

(b) The Chair of the Committee shall not request to have scheduled any bill or resolution for consideration under suspension of the Rules of the House of Representatives that expresses appreciation, commendations, congratulates, celebrates, recognizes the accomplishments of, or celebrates the anniversary of, an individual, institution, team, or government program; or acknowledges or recognizes a period of time for such purpose.

RULE 19. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Television, Radio and Still Photography—
RULE 20. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The employees of the Committee shall be appointed by the Chair in consultation with subcommittee chair and other majority party members of the Committee within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee.

(b) The staff appointed by the minority shall have their remuneration determined in such manner as determined by the minority party membership, the Chair shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee.

RULE 21. SUPERVISION AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate authority as he or she determines appropriate. The Chair shall assign the duties of such staff members in accordance with clause 4(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules of the House of Representatives and of the Committee.

RULE 22. AUTHORIZATION FOR TRAVEL

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of Committee members and staff. Travel to be paid from funds set aside for the full Committee or any subcommittee or any other member of the Committee may be authorized for any travel, the Ranking Member shall be given a copy of the written request therefor.
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Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-476. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Commercial Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0708; Product Identifier 2020-1135; Amendment 39-21351; AD 2020-14-21] (RIN: 2120-AA66) 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and referred to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORELLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 179. Resolution 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 preserving democracy and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1280) to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, track的数据, collection, and reform police training and policies; and for other purposes (Rept. 117-9). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. UPTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mrs. BACH)

H.R. 8. A bill to require a background check for every firearm sale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1445. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from changing the names of certain memorials or move any statute related to certain tributes; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mrs. DEMING of Washington, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HOULAHAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE of New Jersey, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MALINEKOV, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MUFEE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEEDLE, Ms. NGOY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PEETERS, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHUMACHER, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. SMITH of West Virginia, Mr. SPEIER, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WASSEMER SCHULZ, and Mrs. WATERMAN COLEMAN):

H.R. 146. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background checks that must be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MCDOWELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CASE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CREST):

H.R. 147. A bill to amend the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act of 2009 to establish an Ocean Acidification Advisory Board, to expand and improve the research on Ocean Acidification and Coastal Acidification, to establish and maintain a data archive system for Ocean Acidification data and Coastal Acidification data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. DUNN, Ms. SHERELL, Mr. RUTHERFORD of South Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STEFANIC, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. BRATTON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. AXE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WALORSKI, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. BRIEN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. VANDEVERE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HICKS of California, Mr. VELA´ZQUEZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VINSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota, Mr. VLETO, Mr. DALY, Mr. CURRAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WOODS of Washington, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PASCULLO, Mr. PETTY, Mr. KEATEN, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KRISHNA MOORTHI, Mr. BACON, Mr. THOM, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. MOUSSA, Mr. BEDWELL, Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. KUSS, Mr. STEFANIC, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. NOBBE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. JAYAPAL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARSON, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Montana, Mr. JONES of Arizona, Mr. BENNING, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. LEE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. VELA´ZQUEZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VELA´ZQUEZ, Mr. MILLER of Texas, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DAVID, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RICE of New York, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. PENCE, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CALVET, Mr. JORDON, Mr. LONG, Ms. MACE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CARL, Mr. NEUGE, Mr. CAVITHLAY, Mr. MILLER-MEERKS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Tennessee, Mr. MISCOURI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. SUZEE, Mr. BALDERSON, Mrs. MILLER of new York, Mr. VEGE of Washington, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KUSTER, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. STANTON, Mr. ROYAL-ALLARD, Mr. BUSH, Mr. LAM-BORN, Mr. HAGERDORN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. POSHY, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. LATT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. KUSTOFF of Georgia, Mr. CAR- THER of Texas, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HUENING, Mr. ROY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KATKO, Mr. EMMETT, Mr. WHELAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. WENSTROOP, Mr. BUD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. RICK, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. PETER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CASE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CREST):
By Mr. PANTER (for himself, Ms. MILLS, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROCCAZO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROYbal of Washington, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON, Mr. ROYBAL-CASTRO of California, Mr. ROYBAL-CALDE
supplies and protection equipment from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and Labor, Ways and Means, Natural Resources, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. Kuster, Mr. CARSON, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SCHAUKWES, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PORTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CASE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KRATINGS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. SHAPAT PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, and Mr. HASTINGS):

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 Mr. NORTON:

H.R. 1468. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the leasing authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself and Mr. GOLODIN):

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 New York as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. BEATTY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. PORTON, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MEeks, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TLAIB, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. KIRKPACTRICK, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHUMACHER, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCCHERN, Ms. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. DELBENZ, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BUSH, Ms. 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 immunity 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 exemption for disaster area member business loans made by insured credit unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. STEEL (for herself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LITTLER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. ISA, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. McCLEINTOCK, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. OBERNOLTE, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 1472. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal 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 purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1473. A bill to require the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 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 Ms. WATERERS (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 1474. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for training and support for families and unpaid 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. BARRAGÁN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DEAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KASKIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHSTER, Mr. DEGETTE, Mr. NORTON, Mr. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TRONE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BASS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. OMAR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WALLACE SCHULTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARSON of Arizona, Mr. MALNOSKI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. SIRES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. AXNE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 1475. A bill to address mental health issues for youth, particularly youth of color, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Mr. GABARDE, Mr. GUEGUEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. STEUBE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BACON, Mr. COULTAN, Mr. GOHSEINI, Mr. STEIL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. CRAWTHORN, and Mr. FEINSTEIN):

H.R. 1476. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to State and local entities to carry out peer-to-peer mental health programs; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H. Res. 176. A resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the engrossment of H.R. 1319; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BOWMAN (for himself, Ms. BUSH, Ms. CLARK of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MENG, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PRESSLEY, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. NORTON, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. OMER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAUkWES, and Mr. BASS):

H. Res. 180. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that it is the duty of the Federal Government to dramatically expand and strengthen the care economy; to the Committees on Transportation and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Agriculture, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H. Res. 181. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit Members of the House from serving on the boards of for-profit entities; to the Committee on Ethics.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule X11 of the Rules of the House of Representa-
tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitu-
tion to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 8. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes." and Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any of Congress’s enumerated powers.

By Mr. CARL:

H.R. 1445. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 1446. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 1447. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 1448.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:
H.R. 1450.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SPALDING:
H.R. 1451.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. BUNCH:
H.R. 1452.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. WATERS:
H.R. 1453.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. TUCKER:
H.R. 1454.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SCOTT:
H.R. 1455.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. BASS:
H.R. 1456.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. THOMPSON:
H.R. 1457.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. BURGESS:
H.R. 1458.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. TAYLOR:
H.R. 1459.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 1460.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SCHUMACHER:
H.R. 1461.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. CLEMENS:
H.R. 1462.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. KUSTER:
H.R. 1463.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. LYNCH:
H.R. 1464.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:
H.R. 1465.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. MENG:
H.R. 1466.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 1467.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. PRESSLEY:
H.R. 1468.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SHERMAN:
H.R. 1469.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. STUPE:
H.R. 1470.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mrs. STEEL:
H.R. 1471.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. MALONEY:
H.R. 1472.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MCLAUGHLIN:
H.R. 1473.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. STEUBE:
H.R. 1474.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. JOHNSON OF TEXAS:
H.R. 1475.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. STEVE:
H.R. 1476.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. LIPPO:
H.R. 1477.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 1478.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MILLER:
H.R. 1479.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SCOTT:
H.R. 1480.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. PALMER:
H.R. 1481.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. GUNNING:
H.R. 1482.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. TIGERWALD:
H.R. 1483.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. ROBSON:
H.R. 1484.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MCELHINNY:
H.R. 1485.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MALONEY:
H.R. 1486.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. LYNCH:
H.R. 1487.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. STEWART:
H.R. 1488.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. HALL:
H.R. 1489.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. PALMER:
H.R. 1490.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 1491.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MILLER:
H.R. 1492.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. PALMER:
H.R. 1493.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. ROBSON:
H.R. 1494.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MCELHINNY:
H.R. 1495.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. TIGERWALD:
H.R. 1496.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. HALL:
H.R. 1497.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 1498.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MILLER:
H.R. 1499.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. PALMER:
H.R. 1500.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MCELHINNY:
H.R. 1501.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. TIGERWALD:
H.R. 1502.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. HALL:
H.R. 1503.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 1504.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MILLER:
H.R. 1505.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. PALMER:
H.R. 1506.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MCELHINNY:
H.R. 1507.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. TIGERWALD:
H.R. 1508.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. HALL:
H.R. 1509.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 1510.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MILLER:
H.R. 1511.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. PALMER:
H.R. 1512.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MCELHINNY:
H.R. 1513.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. TIGERWALD:
H.R. 1514.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. HALL:
H.R. 1515.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 1516.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MILLER:
H.R. 1517.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. PALMER:
H.R. 1518.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MCELHINNY:
H.R. 1519.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. TIGERWALD:
H.R. 1520.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. HALL:
H.R. 1521.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:
H.R. 1522.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MILLER:
H.R. 1523.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. PALMER:
H.R. 1524.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. MCELHINNY:
H.R. 1525.
OFFERED BY MR. NEAL

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. 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 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. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The provisions in H.R. 842 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. 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. 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 tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

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

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 fears, remove their uncertainty with Your wisdom. When they have doubts, strengthen them to rise again. Lord, lead them by Your truth and teach them how to honor You. 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.

Sonceria 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. (Applause.)

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

The resolution (S. Res. 78) was agreed to.

Senatorial courtesy:
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, MOYNIHAN, 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, let me join in a fond farewell 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 credit for their leadership 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 first time 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—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 sent us here with a job to do: to help the country through this moment of extraordinary challenge; to end, through action, the greatest health crisis our country has faced in a century. 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 over even the basic dignities 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, a fight has broken out that President Biden 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 get-out-the-vote drives known as “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 say 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 and fair 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
been historically disenfranchised. That response is toxic to democracy and, indeed, is the very opposite of democracy.

Make no mistake, these despicable, discriminatory, anti-democratic proposals are on the move in State legislatures throughout America. They must be opposed by every American—Democrat, Republican, Independent; liberal, conservative, moderate—who cherishes our democracy.

This is just incredible what they are trying to do incredible. We must do everything we can to stop it.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 461 AND S.J. RES. 9

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I understand there are two measures at the desk due for a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the bills by title en bloc for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 461) to create a point of order against legislation modifying the number of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9) 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

KENTUCKY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, once again, our communities across my home State of Kentucky are enduring the aftermath of severe—very severe—weather. From east to west, heavy rains have drenched the Commonwealth. Sadly, some of the hardest hit areas were still in the midst of trying to recover from last month’s dangerous ice and snow. Emergency crews, first responders, and now the Kentucky National Guard are continuing to work around the clock to prevent this bad situation from becoming entirely tragic.

An entire nursing home in Magoffin County was evacuated as a safety precaution. Feet of water submerged vehicles and caused power outages in Calloway County.

Wolfe County firefighters followed the light of a cell phone and saved a family of five who had been trapped in their car.

Once again, Kentucky’s brave first responders are stepping up at a time of need. We are all grateful for their dedicated efforts and praying for their safety.

All Kentuckians can help the first responders by continuing to follow the recommendations of local emergency personnel. My team and I are closely monitoring the situation, and we will be ready to assist however we can.

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. And but for 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 given a free-spending public relief with 80 percent and 90 percent bipartisan supermajorities last year to the House and Congress 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 winter 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 scholarships 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-digit sum of Federal funding for K-12 schools, 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 continued support for 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 have a bad process, 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 drumming out 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 cronyism 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 reforms.

Perhaps 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 reforms.

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

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

[From the Washington Post, March 1, 2021]

AN AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY IS LOST IN MYANMAR’S COUP

(By Shihabi 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
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Perhaps 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 reforms.

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

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

[From the Washington Post, March 1, 2021]

AN AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY IS LOST IN MYANMAR’S COUP

(By Shihabi 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 a chef with a six-figure salary. But his heart never left Myanmar, and armed with a Ph.D., he returned home as a democratic transition took hold, leading to his appointment as a deputy governor of the central bank—where he served alongside others who fought for democracy three decades earlier.

Just after dawn on Feb. 1, five soldiers appeared at Bo Bo Nge’s home in Myanmar’s capital, Naypyidaw, and demanded he come with them to his workplace, his wife and friends have not heard from him since.

Bo Bo Nge’s fate, along with that of other intellectuals, lawyers and young leaders detaining in the military coup that deposed Aung San Suu Kyi’s civilian government, once again epitomizes dashed hopes for a better future in Myanmar. These reformers and technocrats, whose skills and experience helped salvage the country’s antiquated financial system in recent years, are now silenced and subject to the whims of isolation and terror.

In Myanmar coup, grievance and ambition drove military chiefs power grab. At the same time, Myanmar’s security forces were cracking down on protesters, killing dozens as hundreds of thousands of people, including Bo Bo Nge, have been arrested since the coup.

His predicament is made more urgent by his health issues and the fragile state of Myanmar’s economy, already battered by the coronavirus pandemic. Banks have closed their doors as hundreds of thousands of people, including tellers, resist the coup by refusing to go to work, pushing the economic system to the brink. The few remaining banks that remain open have restricted customer numbers, while the central bank is limiting withdrawals across financial institutions, raising fears of a cash shortage.

“When someone like Bo Bo arrived back in Myanmar, it was like a bottle of water to a person in the desert,” said Ba Win, a former provost of Bard College at Simon’s Rock, who helped Bo Bo Nge move to the United States. Bo Bo Nge, he added, “had the intellectual discipline to look at economic issues in a way that transcended parochial political interests.”

In an interview with Frontier magazine, Win Win Myint, a former minister in Bo Bo Nge’s government, accused protesters and those participating in the civil disobedience movement of “destroying their own country’s economy.”

“Policies differ from one government to another, but they should have a common goal, which is to develop the country and not to hurt the people,” he said. The military government, he added, is “doing their best.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, even foreign nationals have been subjected to unjustified detention. The world is closely watching the case of Sean Turnell, an Australian scholar who has spent years helping Burma’s military leaders unlock its economic potential.

The administration has been right to condemn the junta and to consult with Congress on an appropriate response. But as Burma’s protesters begin to pay the ultimate price for speaking out, the United States must make it clear that military and police officials will face crippling costs of their own. This should include the military-owned holding companies, which have deep roots in Burma’s economy. It is time to lead an international effort to support the people of Burma.

It is also time to strengthen our calls for an international response to China’s shameless human rights abuses, beginning with Hong Kong. Another round of arrests in the last several days has sent a new wave of student activists to prison with no due process. They join veteran pro-democracy performers like my friends Martin Lee and Jimmy Lai, who were already rounded up.

The United States cannot outsource our moral authority in championing democracy around the world. When we stay silent, the voice of the international community is channeled through the Russian Federation, where the most notorious human rights abusers preside over their own trials.

The ironically named U.N. Human Rights Council boasts a membership including such paragons of virtue as the Russian Federation, where the most notorious human rights abusers preside over their own trials.
The Biden administration has advertised a foreign policy focused on human rights and democracy and quite publicly overturned its intention to remain in the U.N. Human Rights Council. Fine, let Burma and Hong Kong and Xinjiang and Belarus be tests of this administration’s approach to the council. But the White House must not put much trust and into this corrupted institution. We should be uniting like-minded democracies around actions that the United Nations panels are either unwilling or unable to take. With respect to Hong Kong, the prior administration took several concrete steps, from closing PRC investment loopholes in Hong Kong to opposing targeted sanctions.

Now is the time for the Biden administration to show its resolve as it confronts serious tests of its own. I support 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. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call 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, from the 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 our country’s future. I asked them to rejoin the Washington, and they did. It is humbling. It is an opportunity to serve my country that I respect, cherish, and will always honor. My staff and I will work hard every day to live up to that trust.

Like the Presiding Officer, my constituents sent me to Washington to represent them and to help make their lives better. I recognize that we all have our differences, but we are all on the same team. We have got an offense and a defense, but at the end of the day, we are still on the same team. One of the things we can do together as a team is to create more opportunity for more people. In my view, that starts with education.

I have been an educator, a coach, and a mentor to young people for 40 years. I recruited 18- to 19-year-olds from all over the country and all walks of life. I saw how THEY lived. I was a father figure to hundreds of young men who had one or no parents. I coached young people from all backgrounds—rich, poor, and everybody in between. I mentored young people of all races, religions, and economic backgrounds.

As someone who has had a chance to travel across the country and this globe for my career, I have seen how other people live. One thing I have learned is that education is the key to freedom—the key to freedom—the key to freedom to live the life you want. I have seen firsthand how education can give you a leg up and a way out. It is a way to achieve the American dream. When we empower our young people with a quality education, we give them from the gift of an opportunity, the greatest gift our country can give our citizens. And what I found out as a coach is that, when people are given an opportunity to better themselves, they usually take it.

I think I can safely say I have been in more public schools than any Senator ever. Too often, I have found that we are failing our young people by not providing the quality education they deserve. It is not about money; it is about people; it is about what we value and what we teach. Improving education in this country should be one of the, if not the top, priorities we have. That is why I am proud to be a new member of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. On the HELP Committee, we need to work together as a team to do three things.

First, we need to recognize that parents and teachers know how to best educate our young people in their communities because we are all different. The Federal Government does not need to tell parents in Alabama how to teach their kids. We don’t need a one-size-fits-all education curriculum. What works in San Francisco will not necessarily work in Scottsboro, AL.

Second, we should recognize that education takes many forms. Not every student in America needs to go to a 4-year college or university. To ensure our country remains competitive in the 21st century, we need to promote STEM education to those students who have an interest in math and science, but to remain strong, this country also needs welders, plumbers, nurses, equipment operators, electricians, and craftsmen. These are jobs that have excellent pay and great futures. If the Democrats want to pass a massive infrastructure bill, they need to first ask: Why would we put it? That is why I will be looking for any opportunity to support career technical programs that prepare a skilled workforce. Our goal should be to restore America to a country that makes things again.

No. 3, we have got to start teaching our business people to make deals again. That starts with putting God and prayer back in our schools. Our kids need structure, and they need to learn right from wrong. I have watched everything that has happened in education over the past few decades from a front-row seat on my sideline as a coach. It is embarrassing. As a person who chooses to spend their career in education, I now have the opportunity to say something as a U.S. Senator.

Our young people are our No. 1 hope for this country’s future. If we don’t recognize that, we are going to lose our country as we know it. That is why, the United States is 13th in the world for reading, 18th for science, and we are 36th in the world for math. That is unacceptable.

This country was built on hard work. It was built on competition, whether it is business or individual. Education and athletics teach you how to compete, how to have grit, determination, and to work together as a team. Now, you can learn everything you want from books, but if you don’t learn to persevere and compete, it is hard to survive.

Some people in this country think that you are owed something simply because you live in the United States of America. This country doesn’t owe you a job or a paycheck. This country only owes you one thing, and that is an opportunity, but without this country is that it also gives you the opportunity to fail. That might sound a little funny coming from a football coach who spent his entire career trying to win, but here, if you fail, this country will give you a chance to get back on your feet and try to succeed again and again. You don’t get that opportunity in most countries on God’s green Earth.

That being said, I appreciate the opportunity to serve with Chairwoman MURRAY and Ranking Member BURST, and I look forward to getting down to work and returning education to one of our top priorities.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.
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 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, which was going down.

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 on the other side of 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 Donald Trump's American Rescue Plan. Can we cut money for vaccines and distribution across America, to send a cash payment to families who are struggling to get by, to give unemployment benefits to millions? Can we cut a program whose worth $4 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, which was going down.
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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, he would minimum wage? He 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 he would 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.

Last week, 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 home to watch the pandemic. They stay at home to watch

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 in 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.

Words of the distinguished deputy leader from Vermont.

Today, I am going to put in a quorum call for just a minute, and then I will take it off. I want unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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 the counsel from the Office of Independent 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 presided over 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 several months, with the dual background of these trials. I read transcripts. I read 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 has doubtless 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 one can have 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 Member written from the rules, guided by Senate precedent should a request or 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 equal say in resolving the issues 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 Parliamenterian 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.

While this situation, before the start of the trial I had decided—and I had informed the Parliamenterian 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, now from our Constitution and the practices 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, both counsel 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 preside 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 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 defend 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 that we must be leaders of conscience, that we 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 suspect the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BUDGET EARMARKS

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 funds 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 2009, 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—in 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 individual 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 before. 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 deep 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 today, 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.
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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 today, 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.

We have a chance to not only shine a light on a bad Washington habit that wastes billions of taxpayer dollars, but take a deep 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 today, 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.

We have a chance to not only shine a light on a bad Washington habit that wastes billions of taxpayer dollars, but take a deep 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 today, 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.

We have a chance to not only shine a light on a bad Washington habit that wastes billions of taxpayer dollars, but take a deep 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.
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 $14 billion for 4,600 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. This holds true for reauthorization bills as well. Most, then, as you know for 1 fiscal year at a 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. This quote by Citizens Against Government Waste President Tom Schatz to this publication, 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 being incarcerated. Every disagreement doesn’t have to be a cause for total war.

Real unity requires true bipartisan and working together to discover what binds us together as Americans, even when we disagree politically. Earmarks are not a way to bring 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 passed on time. 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 anyone agreeing 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. A Congressional Research Service review of 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. The Congressional Research Service review will also encourage clearance 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 allocated 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 8,371 earmarks. I opposed that again. Over that again, I went back. In 1997, 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 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, the earmarks allowed the 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 re-institute earmarks, I hope that these 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 the last 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.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I couldn’t be prouder to stand in the Senate Chamber today and speak on behalf of my good friend 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 voice for education is heard loud and clear, 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 come to the United States speaking languages other than 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.

His climb was meteoric and miraculous, but it was based on hard work and a dedication and passion to education for others, because he saw it in his own life and how it enabled him to live the American dream.

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 of our public 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 adventures.

His extraordinary accomplishments have led him to this place of consume-pronounce 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 overworked 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 re-establish the Nation’s trust in 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 in the education system. He 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. He is of Mexican heritage, and 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 the Congress 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.

Texas, 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 honoring 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 into their homes, 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 important 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 they have adapted and 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 red team, there is no blue team in a crisis.

FEMA officials have said that disaster response efforts work best when they are locally executed, State managed, and federally supported, and I agree that it is the appropriate formula. This structure gives local officials the ability to cater response efforts to their specific communities while tapping into the range of resources available from the State and Federal Government.

I want to assure my fellow Texans that I and the entire Texas delegation here in Congress will continue to do everything we can to be responsive to the needs that they have. Part of that, though, is the mobilization of resources. After Governor Abbott, as I said, made the formal request for an emergency disaster declaration, Senator Cruz and I sent a letter to President Biden urging him to grant that request. And, as I said, he did so without delay.

So this formal disaster declaration has allowed our State to receive a range of resources to respond to the crisis, including federal disaster declaration for individual assistance for each of Texas's 254 counties. A major disaster declaration and all types of public and individual assistance for each of the remaining counties.

The FEMA officials have said that disaster resources were 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 and all types of public and individual assistance for each of Texas’s 254 counties. A major disaster declaration opens up even more Federal resources to help communities and individuals recover in the aftermath of an emergency like this. It can include everything from housing assistance for folks who are unable to stay in their home due to water leakage and burst pipes to unemployment assistance to crisis counseling.

So far, President Biden has approved the Governor's declaration for 126 of Texas’s 254 counties, and I know State and local leaders are working with the administration to seek approval for the remaining counties.

Insurance industry leaders believe this could be the costliest weather event in our State’s history, and we have to do everything we can to lessen the burden on Texas families.

Of course, my staff and I are in close contact with State and local leaders managing and executing the response, and we are constantly looking for ways to assist and move the recovery along.

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 is not 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 percentage of Texas's 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 ensure 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, our grids and energy sources across the country must be able to operate without disruption. This should be a bipartisan priority for folks from every corner of the United States.

In Texas, 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 members 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 multiple 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 deliveries and wrote for just simple answers to pending constituent inquiries.

In my hometown of Wilmington, DE, last August, I joined our attorney general, my stepfather, 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 Turner, of Georgetown, DE, said in writing to me, "is very screwed up right now. Deliveries and called my office with complaints. And her husband's VA medication had been sitting in the Wilmington post office for 3 weeks. Medication had been sitting in the Wilmington post office for 3 weeks.

Richard Bilkski of Selbyville, a gentlemen with real and significant heart problems. And now, they have had to tell subscribers that they simply can't 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 Deliveries. The postal manager said in writing to me, "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 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 Bilkski of Selbyville, a gentleman with real and significant heart issues that require him to be on medication, was down to his very last pill on January 25. After calling and calling and calling, it turned out that his medication had been sitting in the Wilmington post office for 3 weeks.

Toby Rubenstein, from Hockessin, wrote me and said:

I have paid my bills by check all my life. [And now] the Postal Service is so unreliable, that I now have monthly problems paying [my] bills on time. [And] I'm not alone in this.

Claudette Richardson of Newark, DE, wrote me a note saying that she had mailed her sister a Christmas card on December 14, and it arrived February 12.

Marcy Leib Rolmann wrote me and said: Our "mail here in Sussex County as everywhere is horrible, despite our great letter carriers."

Geliana Hollis of Wilmington wrote to me last month because of her passport that was sitting idle at a Philadelphia distribution center for 10 days. She was set to travel abroad and had to delay her trip.

Bill Powers, former county councilman I know well from New Castle County, a member of the Farm Bureau, the longest turkey grower who now provides 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 Treb Thompson, of Newark, an egg farmer with Whimsical Farms. Treb wrote:

"Largely 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] baby hatch chicks.

The Post Office has been shipping day-old chicks to farms like mine for over 100 years. All 20 baby hens lived. I love life. 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 and life-saving medication.

Treb Thompson is right. No farmer should ever 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. Delawareans 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 Hajar—all folks who have 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 operation at a time when families are relying on mail service more than ever during this pandemic.

I 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 colleagues from West Virginia, Senator JOE MANCHIN, in introducing the Advancing Unfolded Transition 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 pandemic has provided 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, or 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 a new one. He told me 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 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 learner, Dr. 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 causing anxiety from day one as Secretary of the Department of Education. Dr. Cardona will need to be prepared to meet the challenges facing our students and educators, from addressing learning loss and social, emotional, and mental health challenges, to declining higher education enrollment rates and a sky-rocketing affordability crisis. Additionally, as deep disparities continue to shortchange low-income students, students of color, and students with disabilities, Dr. Cardona will be a key partner in working toward closing these funding and educational opportunity gaps.

I am proud to support Dr. Cardona’s nomination, and I look forward to working together to at last make good on our promises to fully fund title I and IDEA, to expand access to quality early childhood education and community schools, and to ensure higher education is accessible and affordable.

Mr. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise today to voice my strong support for Dr. Cardona’s nomination to serve as Secretary of Education.

Across the country, students, parents, and educators are in crisis. Every day without an experienced leader at the Department of Education is a day that we are losing precious ground. Back in my home State of Washington, I heard from a mother in Yakima whose children shared one iPhone to learn. I heard from a father of a high school freshman in Spokane, worried about the social and psychological toll the pandemic is taking on them. I heard from students at the Lummi Nation, trying to focus on remote classes while in multigenerational households on a shared, spotty broadband.

I know there are so many similar stories across this great Nation and across the country about how this pandemic 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 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 they can safely go back to 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, families of students with low incomes, students with disabilities, LGBTQ students, women, English learners, students experiencing homelessness, and so much more.

At this moment of crisis, Dr. Cardona is exactly the leader we need at the Department of Education to tackle these challenges. During his confirmation
hearing in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, he demonstrated beyond a doubt that he has experience, principles, and the perspective that we need in this critical role. That is why Dr. Cardona was voted out of our committee by an overwhelming 17-to-5 margin with broad bipartisan support.

Dr. Cardona will come to the Department as a proven leader who will work with students, parents, caregivers, educators, school administrators, and State, local, Tribal officials. Just as importantly, he will come to the Department as a former elementary school teacher, an adjunct professor, a principal, assistant superintendent, and former English learner himself who knows we have a responsibility to make sure every single student has access 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 accomplishing 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 challenge the Department is facing is larger than just seeing schools and students 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 available 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 education 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 excellent candidate to get it done, and we have no time to waste. I urge all of our colleagues who have heard from a parent who wants to get their child back in the classroom safely—I am sure everyone has—to join us and vote to confirm Dr. Cardona as Secretary of Education.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent 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 nomination 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 excited 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 crisis 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 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 universities. This is the only thing that allows us to be able to see a bright economic future for our country—expanding access to higher education.

Miguel is made for this moment because he knows how important college is. He was the first member of his family to complete college. He knows how important community is. He came right back to his community of Meriden after completing college and went to work serving his community by taking a job teaching fourth grade in Meriden.

He proved early on that he would go above and beyond the call when it came to the needs of his students. He was a teacher at Israel Putnam Elementary School, room 160. If his kids didn’t have what they needed, Miguel would reach into his pockets to make sure they had it. One year, he spent $450 of his own money—money that he probably had himself, or, second-year teacher—to make sure every kid in his classroom had a notebook, a writer’s handbook, and a box of crayons. One student told the story of a classmate who moved back to Puerto Rico and of Miguel’s 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 Connecticut’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 commissioner of education in Connecticut.

It has been his work over the last year that, I think, caught the attention of educational policy leaders and advocates all across the country because 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 unions to come up with a plan to safely reopen our schools. Connecticut reopened 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 system, was to implement a new teacher evaluation system. You know this can always be a very, very controversial, a new system evaluating teachers’ performances, 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 somebody who knows how to bring people together.

This is an incredibly important moment for America’s educational system. We need to maintain and expand our commitment to equity in our K–12 system to make sure that every single kid, no matter their level of income, no matter the ethnic background, no matter the race, no matter if one is disabled or not—gets a quality education.

This is a moment to invest in accountable, transparent institutions and make sure that we are not wasting taxpayer dollars funding programs and degrees 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 moment. He is whip-smart. He is a consensus builder. He is a passionate advocate for kids and for teachers and for parents. He is the perfect person for this job and for this moment.

Lastly, let me just share with you how I got to know Miguel Cardona, which, maybe, will serve as a final advertisement for his unique qualifications. 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 festival had sort of hit hard times. It was a decade ago, my family, only a couple 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 to 7,000 people come to this festival. You can find Miguel Cardona in his gifted weekend, every hour of each day of the festival, driving around on his golf cart, organizing bus transportation, working on the entertainment acts, and making sure that Meriden is able, on that weekend, to offer to our Puerto Rican heritage and then to offer something really constructive, really fun, and really empowering for the community.
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 postcloture 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.

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 84, nays 33, as follows:

**[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Ex.]**

**YEAS—84**

Baldwin  Grassley  Paul
Bennet  Bennet  Peters
Blumenthal  Blumenthal  Portman
Booker  Bookler  Rubio
Brown  Brown  Sanders
Burr  Burr  Schatz
Cantwell  Cantwell  Schumer
Capito  Kelly  Sinema
Cardin  Klobuchar  Sinema
Carper  Leahy  Smith
Casey  Lujan  Tester
Cassidy  Manchin  Tester
Collins  Markey  Thune
Coons  McConnell  Tillis
Cortez Masto  Merkley  Van Hollen
Duckworth  Marksowski  Warner
Durbin  Murphy  Warnock
Feinstein  Murray  Warren
Fischer  Ossoff  Whitehouse
Gillibrand  Padilla  Wyden
Grassley  Peters  

**NAYS—33**

Barrasso  Hoeven  Sasse
Braun  Hyde-Smith  Scott (FL)
Cotton  Inhofe  Scott (SC)
Cramer  Kennedy  Shelby
Craco  Lankford  Sullivan
Cruz  Lee  Tuberville
Daines  Lummis  Toomey
Ernst  Marshall  Tuberville
Graham  Paul  Wicker
 Hagerty  Risch  Young

NOT VOTING—3

Blackburn  Blunt  Moran

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.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are 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  Grassley  Paul
Bennet  Bennet  Peters
Blumenthal  Blumenthal  Portman
Blunt  Blumenthal  Portman
Booker  Bookler  Rubio
Brown  Brown  Sanders
Burr  Burr  Schatz
Cantwell  Cantwell  Schumer
Capito  Kelly  Sinema
Cardin  Klobuchar  Sinema
Carper  Leahy  Smith
Casey  Lujan  Tester
Cassidy  Manchin  Tester
Collins  Markey  Thune
Coons  McConnell  Tillis
Cortez Masto  Merkley  Van Hollen
Duckworth  Marksowski  Warner
Durbin  Murphy  Warnock
Feinstein  Murray  Warren
Fischer  Ossoff  Whitehouse
Gillibrand  Padilla  Wyden
Grassley  Peters  

**NAYS—15**

Barrasso  Hoeven  Sasse
Braun  Hyde-Smith  Scott (FL)
Cotton  Inhofe  Scott (SC)
Cramer  Kennedy  Shelby
Craco  Lankford  Sullivan
Cruz  Lee  Tuberville
Daines  Lummis  Toomey
Ernst  Marshall  Tuberville
Graham  Paul  Wicker
 Hagerty  Risch  Young

NOT VOTING—1

Blackburn  Blunt  Moran

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

**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 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 protesters 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, 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 autonomous 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?

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a resolution (S. Res. 83) expressing support for the designation of February 28 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to introducing the resolution?

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 117th Congress, under the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended.

I. MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

Meetings of the Committee may be called by the Chair as he or she may deem necessary on at least three calendar days’ notice of the date, time, place, and subject matter of the meeting, or in the alternative with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member, or pursuant to the provision of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended.

Unless a different date and time are set, a meeting shall be held beginning at 10:00 a.m. on Thursdays the Senate is in session, which shall be the regular meeting day for the transaction of business.

At the request of any member, or by action of the Chair, a bill, matter, or nomination on the agenda of the Committee may be held over until the next meeting of the Committee or for one week, whichever occurs later.

II. HEARINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee shall provide a public announcement of the date, time, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee or any Subcommittee at least seven calendar days prior to the commencement of that hearing, unless the Chair is acting as the Ranking Minority Member determines that good cause exists to begin such hearing at an earlier date. Witnesses shall provide a written statement in accordance with the Senator’s curriculum vitae in as many copies as the Chair of the Committee or Subcommittee prescribes.

In the event 14 calendar days’ notice of a hearing has been made, witnesses appearing before the Committee or any Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting business. No bill, matter, or nomination shall be ordered reported from the Committee, however, unless a majority of the Committee is actually present at the time such action is taken and a majority of those present support the action taken.

For the purpose of taking down sworn testimony, a quorum of the Committee and each Subcommittee thereof, now or hereafter appointed, shall consist of one Senator.

The Chair shall entertain a non-debatable motion to bring a matter before the Committee to a vote. If there is objection to bringing the matter to a vote without further debate, a roll call vote of the Committee shall be taken, and debate shall be terminated if the motion to bring the matter to a vote without further debate passes with twelve votes in the affirmative, one of which must be cast by the minority.

Provided at least seven calendar days’ notice of the agenda is given, and the text of the proposed bill or resolution has been made available at least seven calendar days in advance, it shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any amendment in the first degree proposed to any measure under consideration by the Committee unless such amendment has been delivered to the office of the Committee by e-mail to each of the offices by at least 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the scheduled start of the meeting.

It shall be in order, without prior notice, for a Member to offer a motion to strike a single section of any bill, resolution, or amendment under consideration.

The time limit for debate on amendments shall apply to no more than three bills identified by the Chair and included on the Committee’s legislative agenda.

This section of the rule may be waived by agreement of the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member.

In the event 14 calendar days’ notice of a hearing has been made, witnesses appearing before the Committee or any Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting business. No bill, matter, or nomination shall be ordered reported from the Committee, however, unless a majority of the Committee is actually present at the time such action is taken and a majority of those present support the action taken.

For the purpose of taking down sworn testimony, a quorum of the Committee and each Subcommittee thereof, now or hereafter appointed, shall consist of one Senator.

The Chair shall entertain a non-debatable motion to bring a matter before the Committee to a vote. If there is objection to bringing the matter to a vote without further debate, a roll call vote of the Committee shall be taken, and debate shall be terminated if the motion to bring the matter to a vote without further debate passes with twelve votes in the affirmative, one of which must be cast by the minority.

The time limit for debate on amendments shall apply to no more than three bills identified by the Chair and included on the Committee’s legislative agenda.

This section of the rule may be waived by agreement of the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member.
or any other question, a quorum being present, Members who are unable to attend the meeting may submit votes by proxy, in writing or by telephone, or through personal instructions, at the discretion of the Member, must be specific with respect to the matters it addresses.

VII. SUBCOMMITTEES

1. Any Member of the Committee may sit with any Subcommittee during its hearings or any other meeting, but shall not have the authority to vote on any matter before the Subcommittee unless a Member of such Subcommittee.

2. Each Subcommittee shall be provided de novo whenever there is a change in the Subcommittee chair and seniority on the particular Subcommittee shall not necessarily apply.

3. Except for matters retained at the full Committee, matters shall be referred to the appropriate Subcommittee or Subcommittees by the Chair, except as agreed by a majority vote of the Committee or by the agreement of the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member.

4. Provided all members of the Subcommittee consent, a bill or other matter may be polled out of the Subcommittee. In order to be polled out of a Subcommittee, a majority of the voting members of the Subcommittee who vote must vote in favor of reporting the bill or matter to the Committee.

VIII. ATTENDANCE RULES

1. Official attendance at all Committee business meetings shall be kept by the Committee Clerk. Official attendance at all Subcommittee business meetings shall be kept by the Subcommittee Clerk.

2. Official attendance at all hearings shall be kept, provided that Senators are notified by the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member, in the case of Committee hearings, and by the Subcommittee Chair and Ranking Minority Member, in the case of Subcommittee Hearings, 48 hours in advance of the hearing that attendance will be taken; otherwise, no attendance will be taken. Attendance at all hearings is encouraged.

IX. SUBCOMMITTEES

The Chair of the Committee, with the agreement of the Ranking Member or by a vote of the Committee, may subpoena the attendance of a witness at a Committee or Subcommittee hearing, or the production of memoranda, documents, records, or other materials. Any such subpoena shall be issued upon the signature of the Chair or any other Member of the Committee designated by the Chair.

X. DEPOSITIONS

1. Any subpoena issued for a deposition that is to be conducted by staff shall be accompanied by a notice of deposition identifying the Majority staff officers designated by the Chair and the Minority staff officers designated by the Ranking Member to take the deposition, and the Majority and Minority staff officers shall not have the opportunity to participate on equal terms.

2. Unless waived by agreement of the Chair and Ranking Member, any deposition shall have at least one Member present for the duration of the deposition. All Members shall be notified of the date, time, and location of any deposition.

3. Any Member of the Committee may attend and participate in the taking of any deposition.

4. A witness at a deposition shall be examined upon oath administered by an individual authorized by law to administer oaths, or administered by any member of the Committee designated by the Committee.

5. Unless otherwise specified, the deposition shall be in private.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMPETITION POLICY, ANTITRUST, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Jurisdiction:
- Antitrust law and competition policy and antitrust law, including the Sherman, Clayton, and Federal Trade Commission Acts; (2) oversight of the Department of Justice and the Department of Labor; (3) oversight of antitrust enforcement and competition policy at the Federal Trade Commission; (4) oversight of competition throughout the federal government at other federal agencies.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, CITIZENSHIP, AND BORDER SECURITY

Jurisdiction:
- Immigration, citizenship, and refugee laws; (2) Oversight of the immigration functions of the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Ombudsman Citizenship and Immigration Services; (3) oversight of the implementation of the law; (4) Oversight of international migration, internally displaced persons, and refugee laws and policy; and (5) Private immigration relief bills.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, CITIZENSHIP, AND BORDER SECURITY

Jurisdiction:
- Immigration, citizenship, and refugee laws; (2) Oversight of the immigration functions of the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Ombudsman Citizenship and Immigration Services; (3) oversight of the implementation of the law; (4) Oversight of international migration, internally displaced persons, and refugee laws and policy; and (5) Private immigration relief bills.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION, JURISDICTION, AND TERRORISM

Jurisdiction:
- Oversight of the Department of Justice’s (a) Criminal Division, (b) Drug Enforcement Administration, (c) Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys, (d) Office on Violence Against Women, (e) U.S. Marshals Service, (f) Community Oriented Policing Services, (g) Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, as it relates to crime or drug policy; (2) Oversight of the U.S. Sentencing Commission; (3) Youth violence and directly related issues; (4) Federal grants programs under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended; (5) Criminal justice policy; (6) Oversight of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; (7) Oversight of the U.S. Secret Service; (8) Corrections, rehabilitation, reentry, and related policies; and (9) Parole and probation policy; (10) Oversight of anti-terrorism enforcement and policy; (11) Oversight of Department of Homeland Security functions as they relate to anti-terrorism enforcement and policy; (12) Oversight of State Department consular and functional operations as they relate to terrorism enforcement and policy; (13) Oversight of encryption policies and export licensing; and (14) Oversight of espionage laws and their enforcement.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Jurisdiction:
- (1) United States Patent and Trademark Office; (2) United States Copyright Office; (3) Oversight of the functions of the federal government as they relate to intellectual property; (4) Patents; (5) Copyrights; (6) Trademarks; and (7) Trade Secrets.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL LAW

Jurisdiction:
- (1) Federal court jurisdiction, administration and management; (2) Rules of evidence and procedure; (3) Creation of new courts and jurisdiction; (4) Bankruptcy; (5) Access to civil justice, legal reform and liability issues; (6) Local courts in territories and possessions; (7) Administrative practices and procedures including agency rulemaking and adjudication; (8) Judicial review of agency action; (9) Third party enforcement of federal rights; (10) Oversight of the Department of Justice’s anti-terrorism enforcement and policy waste and abuse; (11) private relief bills other than immigration; and (12) Oversight of the Foreign Claims Settlement Act.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND VICTIMS’ RIGHTS

Jurisdiction:
- (1) Human rights laws and policies; (2) Enforcement and application of human rights laws; (3) Judicial proceedings regarding human rights laws; (4) Judicial and executive branch interpretations of human rights laws.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE LAW

Jurisdiction:
- (1) Oversight of laws and policies governing the collection, protection, use and dissemination of personally identifiable information by the private sector and by the government, including online privacy issues; (2) Use of technology to protect privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties; (3) Balance the free flow of information; and encourage innovation; (4) Privacy and civil liberties implications of new or emerging technologies.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVACY, TECHNOLOGY, AND THE LAW

Jurisdiction:
- (1) Oversight of laws and policies governing the collection, protection, use and dissemination of personally identifiable information by the private sector and by the government, including online privacy issues; (2) Use of technology to protect privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties; (3) Balance the free flow of information; and encourage innovation; (4) Privacy and civil liberties implications of new or emerging technologies.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, I ask...
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 proscribing crimes 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 courthouse, 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. Matthew and I, together with Christina and her longtime partner, Jill, and their family our very best in future endeavors.
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 impeachments provide 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 we should expect better 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 “espousing” 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 to be an impeachable offense, the House managers 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 appropriately.

To be clear, I wanted President Trump to win in November. I gave over 30 speeches on his behalf in Iowa the week before the election. He, like any politician, is entitled to seek redress in the courts to resolve election disputes. President Trump did just that, and there’s nothing wrong with it. I supported the exercise of this right in the belief that allowing the challenge process to play out would remove all doubt about the outcome. The reality is, he lost. He brought over 60 lawsuits and lost all but 1 of them. He was not able to challenge enough votes to put the election back to the House of Representatives by significant margins in key States. I wish it would have stopped there.

It didn’t. President Trump continued to argue that the election had been stolen even though the courts didn’t back up his claims. He belittled and harassed elected officials across the country to get his way. He encouraged his own, loyal Vice President, Mike Pence, to take extraordinary and unconstitutional action to help his Presidential college count. My vote in this impeachment does nothing to excuse or justify those actions. There’s no doubt in my mind that President Trump’s language was extreme, aggressive, and irresponsible.

Unfortunately, others share the blame in polluting our political discourse with inflammatory and divisive language. As President Trump’s attorneys showed, whatever we heard from President Trump, we had been hearing from Democrats for years. National Democrats, up to and including President Biden and Vice President Harris, have become regular purveyors of damaging and inciting violence. It’s not surprising that when they talk about taking the “fight” to the streets organizations like antifa actually take to the streets of our cities with shields and bats and fists, destroying lives and livelihoods.

Yes, I think President Trump should have accepted President Biden’s victory when it became clear he won. I think Secretary Clinton should have done the same thing in 2016. But as concerned as we now are about the legitimacy of Trump’s election, saying “[Trump] knows he’s an illegitimate president. I believe he understands that the many varying tactics they used, from voter suppression and voter purging to hacking to the false stories . . . there were just a bunch of different reasons why the election turned out like it did.”

If there’s one lesson I hope we all learned from not only last year but the last few years, it’s that we all need to tone down the rhetoric. Whether it’s the destructive riots we saw last summer or the assault on the Capitol, too many people think that politics really is just a war by another name. Too many people, our democracy isn’t free people coming together to make life better for our communities. It’s a street fight.

The President doesn’t need to agree on everything. In fact, part of what makes our democracy great is that we don’t agree on everything. But we do need to resolve these differences with debate and
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 are 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 the 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 would have been violating 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 is accused. This does not prove that he committed incitement to personal enrichment. A President commits treason when he levies war against the United States or gives comfort or aid to its enemies. As they Comey’s, a President engages in impeachable bribery when he “offers, solicits, or accepts something of personal value to influence his own decision.”

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 committed in a manner that was fundamentally incompatible with the performance of constitutional duties of the office. Further insight is provided by Richard Wooddeson, a legal scholar who began giving lectures on English law in 1777, defined impeachable offenses as those offenses which “produce to the misconduct of public men, or in other words from the abuse of the public trust.”

The convention delegates considered limiting impeachment to treason and bribery. However, they concluded that “high crimes” and “misdemeanors” were an apt way to further capture “great and dangerous offenses” that may be founded on a showing of “maladministration.”

Later commentators expressed similar views. In 1833, Justice Joseph Story quoted favorably from the scholarship of William Rawle, who concluded that the “legitimate causes of impeachment . . . can have reference only to public character, and official duty . . . In general, those offenses, which may be committed equally by a private person, as a public officer, are not the subject of impeachment.”

This line of reasoning is buttressed by the careful and thoughtful work of the House of Representatives during the Watergate proceedings. The Democratic staff 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 incompat-ible 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 “corrup-tion.” By September, the view of presidential Impeachment had been referred to the Committee of Eleven, which was created to resolve the most contentious issues. Committee “B” was enjoined whether the grounds for Impeachment should be “treason or bribery.” It was significantly more restricted than the amor-tistic and disqualification from holding future public office. In fact, for some delegates, George Mason objected and suggested that “mal-administration” be added to “treason and bribery.” It was Madison opposed to the suggestion as being “equivalent to a tenure during the pleasure of the Senate.”

The language was a clear reference to the English legal history of Impeachment. Mason’s proposal explicitly referred to offenses of those “against the State.” The Convention itself further clarified the standard by 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 governmental sys-tem would justify Impeachment and subse-quent removal from office. However, the Committee of Style applied the final stylistic touches to the Constitution and the Committee had no authority to alter the mean-ing 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’ were deleted as unnecessary to the meaning of the passage.22

The weight of both authoritative commentary and the history of the Constitutional Convention combines to foreshadow the inescapable conclusion that impeachments were reserved for serious breaches of the constitutional order that threaten the country in a direct and immediate manner.

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

Article I, Section 3 of the United States Constitution makes clear that ‘[t]he 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 has argued that an Impeachment trial conducted after a President leaves office is unconstitutional. Specifying that an impeachable offense ‘must involve the violation of a law’ is a legal nullity that runs patently contrary to the plain language of the Constitution.23 As Delegate James Wilson wrote, ‘Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.’24

As Delegate James Wilson wrote, ‘impeachments, and offenses and offenders impeachable [do not come] within the sphere of ordinary jurisprudence. They are founded on diverse principles of law and on different maxims, and are directed to different objects: for this reason, the trial and punishment of an offense on an impeachment, is no bar to the trial and punishment of the offense at common law.’25 The independence of the impeachment process from the prosecution of crimes underscores the function of Impeachment as a means to remove a President from office, not only because of criminal behavior, but because the President poses a threat to the constitutional order. Criminal behavior is not relevant to an Impeachment, but it only becomes decisive if that behavior imperils the balance of powers established in the Constitution.

The assertion that an impeachable offense must be predicated on a criminal act goes against the well-established consensus of the legal community. For example, Mr. Trump’s former Attorney General, William Barr, wrote in a 2018 memo to the Department of Justice (DOJ) when he was still in private practice, that the President ‘is answerable to Law.’26 As Delegate James Wilson wrote, ‘The President of the United States since he is no more and no less than the public’s advocate, must be subject to the judgment of Congress . . . Since removal from office by the Senate to accomplish, and thus the curing of the constitutional power of the Senate to conduct an impeachment trial: removal and disqualification.

IV. STANDARD OF PROOF

In an Impeachment trial, each Senator has the obligation to establish the burden of proof or she deems proper.27 The Founding Fathers, in their deliberations on impeachment, were critical for Senators confronting the gravest of constitutional choices.28 Differentiating 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.’29 In this regard, Hamilton further distinguished Impeachment proceedings from a criminal trial by stressing that an impeached official who is convicted could be tried again for the same criminal prosecution after Impeachment.30

However, what exact constitutional standard should be used remains unarticulated. Prätorian considerations will play a role in determining the standard of proof, but not the standard for removal from office.31

When uncertain about the standard of proof to apply, it is worth reviewing the writings of eminent scholars. In doing so, we find a closer approximation to what the standard should be in many Impeachment trials as compared to those used in general legal practice: ‘[o]verwhelming preponderance of the evidence’ . . . ‘Yet, I believe that the President of the United States warrants an even higher bar. As such, a definition slightly modified, but modeled on that proposed by the Founders, is reasonable: [t]he evidence must be `overwhelmingly 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 invoke their thirded Article I, Section 4 is currently applies to the 45th President of the United States since he is no longer a member of the Senate. The President’s Counsel hinge their argument on the wording of Article II, Section 4, which reads, ‘The President, Vice President and all Civil Officers of the United States, shall in Case of Address, by the House of Representatives, be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.’ The President’s Counsel argue that once Mr. Trump is no longer the president.

‘[T]he clause shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for . . .’ is impossible for the Senate to accomplish, and thus the current proceeding before the Senate is void ab initio as a legal nullity that runs patently contrary to the plain language of the Constitution.32 Since removal from office by the Senate of the President is a condition precedent which must occur before, and jointly with, ‘disqualification’ to hold future office, the fact that the President is unable to remove from office the 45th President whose term has expired, means that Article 1 is therefore irrelevant to any matter before the Senate.33

Such logic ignores the historical context in which the Impeachment power was drafted, willfully misinterprets the language of the Constitution, rejects precedent set by previous Senates, and promotes the dangerous concept of a ‘January Exception.’34 The Framers had misgivings about Impeachment as a means to remove a President from office, not only because of criminal offenses, there is a strong inference that the President poses a threat to the constitutional order, but because the president poses a threat to the well-established consensus of the English political custom, which framed much of the Founder’s understanding of government.35 Indeed, Alexander Hamilton explicitly stated in Federalist No. 65 that the Impeachment power was borrowed from English political history as a way to circumscribe the impeachability of former officials. First, ‘[n] 1725, former Lord Chancellor Macclesfield was impeached and convicted for corruption. . . . Second, at the time of the Philadelphia Convention, Parliament was preparing to conduct an Impeachment trial against Warren Hastings, the former Governor General of Bengal. These proceedings commenced after Hastings had retired from office, and most of the Hastings proceeding, with George Mason raising it as an example during debate on the Impeachment clauses.36 If the Framers had misgivings about Impeachment as a means to remove a President from office, they would have had a reason to frame the wording of the Impeachment power in the U.S. Constitution.

The practice of impeaching former officers was also common in the early state governments. For example, Mr. Trump is the first President of the newly independent states adopted constitutions that included impeachment provisions. Five state constitutions of the early state explicitly forbade it.40 Moreover, some state constitutions only allowed the Impeachment of former officials, meaning that future disqualification from office was central to the very purpose of impeachment.41 For example, Thomas Jefferson underwrote an Impeachment inquiry in 1781 after his tenure as governor ended. What purpose could such a late inquiry have except to attempt to disqualify a former official from holding office again in the future? This influence of the early state constitutions on the drafting of the U.S. Constitution is widely accepted. This influence no doubt extended to the Framers’ understanding of the Impeachment power as including former officials.42

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 quasification regarding its timing. The House impeached Mr. Trump, and it is now in the constitutional power of the Senate to conduct a pending impeachment.43

D. Conclusion

Authoritative commentary on, together with the structure of, the Constitution makes it clear that the term, ‘other high Crimes and Misdemeanors,’ encompasses conduct that involves the imposition of the impermissible exercise of the powers of his office to upset the constitutional order. Moreover, since the essence of Impeachment is removal from office, the punishment for offenses, there is a strong inference that the improper conduct must represent a continuing threat to the American people and the Constitution.
The Senate cannot exceed these 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 neutralize the risk that disqualifying officials from future office upon their resignation. Hence, an official accused of crimes against the political order could simply resign to avoid potential removal and take office in the future. The Framers understood that the power of a demagogic president could extend far beyond the tenure of office. The disqualification component of the Impeachment power is the constitutional method for addressing this dangerous potentiality, for it establishes a legal ostracism from the esteem and confidence, and honors and emoluments of his country."45

In accordance with English political history, the early state constitutions, and the clear language of the U.S. Constitution, the Senate has repeatedly asserted its right to conduct an Impeachment trial of former government officials. The first Impeachment trial concerned Senator William Blount of Tennessee on the charge of conspiracy. After the Senate brought charges against Blount in July of 1797, the House brought five articles of Impeachment against the former senator in January of 1798 with the intention of disqualifying him from office in the future.46 Most scholars agree that the Senate dismissed the case on the grounds that the Impeachment power does not extend to Members of Congress.47 The Senate did not, however, dismiss the case on the basis that Blount was a former official.48 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. Though 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 chose not to hold hearings on the Article of Impeachment. Manager Lieu analogized the present facts to a case where crimes are committed in plain view, and prosecutors do not have to spend a prolonged time investigating before pressing charges.57 In this case, the events in question—the "Save America" rally, the Electoral Certification, and the ensuing insurrection—were widely broadcast on television and in news publications. Those who took part in the attack also documented their participation on Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube.58 In the aftermath of the insurrection, participants were arrested for their unlawful and violent actions, and their charging documents were available to the public.59

In addition, President’s Counsel, throughout this case, has conflated the requirements of an Impeachment proceeding with that of a criminal case, where the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment applies. These comments mimic constitutional scholar Michael Gerhardt stated in regards to Mr. Trump first Impeachment, “First, the [Due Process] clause does not apply in a removal proceeding by the due process clause are being denied—the sanctions are removal and disqualification but not the deprivation of life, liberty or property. The clause protects, Second, even if due process applies, it has been satisfied here: The minimal requirements of due process are an impartial decision-making process and that due process is not a ‘technical concept.’”60

"Insurrection" is defined as the act of rising in open resistance against established authority or government, or as any open and active opposition of a sufficient number of persons to the perpetuation of 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.”61

Turning to the definition of “insurrection” itself, the Corpus Juris Secundum defines it as “the act of rising in open resistance against established authority or government, or as any open and active opposition of a sufficient number of persons to the perpetuation of 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.”62

Based on the above analysis, I find that there is overwhelming and convincing evidence that Mr. Trump was afforded due process in this Impeachment proceeding.

\[\text{March 1, 2021}\]
(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 Solutions

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 vote 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 the people don’t turn out and it’s the only way we’re going to lose this election. So we have to be very careful.” In September, from the White House lawn, “I’m not sure that it [the election] can be [honest]. I don’t know that it can be with this whole situation, unsolicited ballots being sent to everybody.”

Before the election took place, Mr. Trump also refused to say whether he would accept the electoral college result in November. When asked directly whether he would accept the results of the election, Trump said “Look, you—I have to see. No, I’m not going to just say yes.” In September, Mr. Trump forcefully pushed these lies, no matter how divorced from reality they became. In the weeks after the election, it became plain that the president would not accept the results of the election. No matter the facts, Mr. Trump repeated the same baseless narrative and continued his full-throttled assault on the integrity of the election. Mr. Trump 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 at a rally Trump! Trump and the American flag.”

After Mr. Biden was declared the winner, Mr. Trump focused his ire in the following weeks on discrediting the results in Georgia. Mr. Trump’s relentless claims of voter fraud in Georgia were followed by a wave of death threats against state election officials, including Gabriel Sterling, a state election official in Georgia, pleaded with Mr. Trump to denounce the threats of violence, clearly articulating the risks of failing to do so. Sterling said, “Mr. President, it looks like you likely lost the state of Georgia. We’re investigating. There’s always a possibility. I get it, and you have the rights to go through the courts. What you don’t have the ability to do—and you need to step up and say this—is stop inspiring people to commit potential acts of violence. Someone’s going to get killed. Like, somebody’s going to get killed. And it’s not right.”

d. Mr. Trump Supported Extremist Groups

Mr. Trump made statements supporting, or failing to condemn, members of extremist groups, many of whom came together to storm the Capitol on January 6th. Famously, during the first presidential debate on September 29th, when asked to condemn white supremacist groups, like the Proud Boys, Trump refused. Instead, he announced, “Proud Boys—stand back and stand by.”

Mr. Trump often used his Twitter account to promote and endorse Q’Anon, a conspiracy movement, including by retweeting or promoting its content. Q’Anon’s slogan, and Proud Boys leader Joe Biggs likewise posted that he was “standing by.”

Mr. Trump also made statements and used social media to promote the false claim that he had won the election, and that he had the ability to change the outcome of the election, including by filing lawsuits, or by having the state election officials hold a new election.

Leading up to January 6th, Mr. Trump supported—either tacitly or outright—the use of violence by his supporters and these groups. For example, in the spring of 2020, Mr. Trump embraced the backlash against COVID-19 policies to aid his re-election. When asked over when six men plotted to kidnap Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer because they were angry about the state’s coronavirus policies. When the FBI foiled the plot, Mr. Trump added fuel to the fire, and attacked Governor Whitmer over Twitter. He tweeted, “Governor Whitmer of Michigan has done a terrible job—and in effect disbanded the Michigan Police, Math & Jobs that burn down Demo-
hall on October 15th. Mr. Trump praised Q’Anon 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. And I lack what I mean, I do agree with that. And I agree with it very strongly.”

e. 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 gather. In December he tweeted, “Big protest in D.C. on January 6th... Be there, will be wild!”

On December 27, he tweeted, “Save America Rally tomorrow on the Ellipse at 11AM Eastern. Arrive early—doors open at 7AM. BIG CROWDS!”

Mr. Trump not only knew, but actively co-ordinated 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 come to D.C. to “stop the steal” the way he did the day before. The Washingon Post described the day as 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 invitation and replied “I will be there Historic Day!”

Manager Plaskett stated that the Trump campaign even “became directly involved in planning details 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.” Notably, Vice President Pence’s sister-in-law is on the advisory board of Women for America First, which has ties to Women for America First—thus blurring the lines between the Trump administration and the organizers of the January 6th rally.

Manager Plaskett also emphasized that Mr. Trump’s top advisors and the Trump campaign were actively monitoring posts from mainstream websites such as Twitter and Facebook, as well as pro-Trump message boards on Reddit and 4chan. The campaign was involved in preparing for the rally in Washington, D.C. to take their election back, by violent means if necessary, on these message boards. His supporters posted hundreds of messages outlining their plans for January 6th. They discussed how to physically breach the Capitol, 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 Forel 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 only following 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 promingly 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 election 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 and take our capital 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 message on the Ellipse on January 6th stating, “[We fight. We fight like hell.]” His supporters got the message.

By 12:30pm, 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 their side arms.116

b. The Insurrection Begins

The crowd pushed past the barricade, knocking down police officers in the process, in an attempt to get closer to the building. Within minutes, pro-Trump supporters began hurling other entrances of the Capitol. Inside the Capitol, Vice President Pence presided over the session of the Senate. Contrary to the wishes of Mr. Trump, Vice President Pence began the process of certifying the election results. Outside the Capitol, the president’s supporters sang along as rioters wearing Trump paraphernalia shoved and punched Capitol Police officers, gouged their eyes, assaulted them with pepper spray and projectiles, and denounced them as “cowards” and “traitors.” Law enforcement officers were attacked with baseball bats, crates, hockey sticks, flash gear, and fire extinguishers. Some rioters came armed with handguns, pepper spray, knives, and brass knuckles. Congressional staff and reporters tried to stay away from windows and doors.

c. Rioters Storm the Capitol

Between 2pm and 2:30pm, rioters broke through multiple entrances and began pushing through the Rotunda, Crypt, Statuary Hall, and other locations. Videos captured by rioters show the crowd, many in Trump paraphernalia, chanting “The</s>
The Rioters Target Vice President Mike Pence and Speaker Pelosi

As members of Congress moved to secure locations or sheltered in place, rioters walked through the U.S. Capitol vandalizing the building, and breaking into congressional offices, including the office of Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi. One rioter was later seen in Nancy Pelosi’s office door and that “Crazy Nancy probably would have been torn into little pieces but she was nowhere to be seen.” CRAZY NANCY IS STEALING THE COUNTRY. The relevant legal framework for incitement was established by the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1969 case of Brandenburg v. Ohio. In that case, a Ku Klux Klan leader, Clement Millard Brandenburg, was convicted after making a speech at a Klan rally that apparently broke an Ohio law against “advocat[ing] crime, sabotage, violence, or unlawful methods of achieving industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Klan leader, Albert Hess, was convicted after making a street speech encouraging unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Klan leader, Albert Hess, was convicted after making a street speech encouraging unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Klan leader, Albert Hess, was convicted after making a street speech encouraging unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Klan leader, Albert Hess, was convicted after making a street speech encouraging unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Klan leader, Albert Hess, was convicted after making a street speech encouraging unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Klan leader, Albert Hess, was convicted after making a street speech encouraging unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Klan leader, Albert Hess, was convicted after making a street speech encouraging unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Klan leader, Albert Hess, was convicted after making a street speech encouraging unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Klan leader, Albert Hess, was convicted after making a street speech encouraging unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Klan leader, Albert Hess, was convicted after making a street speech encouraging unlawful methods of terrorism as a means of accomplishing industrial or political reform.” The Supreme Court overturned Brandenburg’s conviction and struck down the statute on First Amendment grounds. In doing so, the Court articulated a new test for when advocating 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 incite or produce such action.” Subsequent cases further clarified the “imminence” standard set out in Brandenburg. In the Supreme Court case of Hess v. Indiana, the Court held that a Ku Klux Kl...
There is overwhelmingly clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Trump’s overall course of conduct meets the spirit of the Brandenburg test. As laid out in the Cia- horn case, the jury was to take into account the context and timing of Mr. Trump’s January 6th rally speech. After months of fueling the narrative that the election had been stolen from him, Mr. Trump asked his supporters to assemble on the day that Congress would be certifying the election results. Once Mr. Trump had gathered his supporters, he directed them to break into the Capitol, where he had spoken. He told them to ‘stop the steal’—he directed the crowd to “walk down Pennsylvania Avenue,” “fight like hell,” and “stop the steal.” Unlike the speech in Cia- horn, the presence ofblk.ingYS Also significant is the evidence that Mr. Trump was aware that violence would occur. In Section VII, Mr. Trump was at the head of the mob and was in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives when he directed the crowd to “walk down Pennsylvania Avenue,” “fight like hell,” and “stop the steal.”

In Mr. Trump’s January 6th rally speech, 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 been told that they would 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 republican form of government. In exchange, the president is given tremendous power and prestige—more than any other person in the country. That is why, in an instant, a president’s words can carry, 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 effect, they are 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 law and to obey their oath of expression must yield to that higher duty.

In this case, Mr. Trump did not have a First Amendment right to fuel a mass disobedience of the laws, and the flames of political division, and then direct a mob to disrupt a congressional proceeding.

V. 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 all persons voted for as Vice-President; and the number of votes for each, which lists 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, the 2020 election took place according to the requirements of the Constitution. Voters in each respective state and territory chose their electors to serve in the Electoral College, with Mr. Biden winning a majority of 306 electoral votes. On December 14, 2020, the appointed electors convened state-by-state to cast their ballots for the Presi- dent and Vice President of the United States, and certified the result. On Janu- ary 6th to 7th of 2020, Congress counted the certification of the Electors. Most state laws require the appoint- ers to be registered to vote, and their elections at least six days before the electors meet to vote. After his loss on Election Day, Mr. Trump sought to exploit the ambigu- ities of the Electoral College Act that gives states discretion in choosing electors. Most state laws require the appointee of the electors who vote according to the outcome of the popular vote in each state. 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. He also hosted members of the Wayne County Board of Canvassers, including its Republican chairwoman, who noted after the vote that Joe Biden won their county.

Within 24 hours of the call, the Republican chairwoman announced that she wanted to “recount” the election. She said she was “alarmed” by 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 irregularities in Pennsylvania, and I want to know what’s going on what with your law What can we do to fix this?”

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. The Trump campaign convened alternate Electoral College meetings in Wisconsin, Arizona, Pennsylvania, Georgia, New Mexico, and Nevada. However, election law experts dismissed the validity of these false electors, which had “neither been certified by state executives nor purportedly appointed by state legislators.”

Mr. Trump made clear that all his 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 send a joint letter to the secretary of state saying that Joe Biden had won the state.

When Kemp told the former president he would not be complying with either demand, Mr. Trump told a crowd of supporters that Kemp’s refusal was “very bad for him.” The former president’s threats were more within the compass of probable cause to thwart. The Framers knew that an executive who amassed too much power might repudiate the Republic. The Framers built constitutional protections to body the exact kind of behavior that the Framers were worried about. Mr. Trump has conducted himself to match that description.

The question is not whether these Members had the legal right to object to electors, but whether there were facts to support the objections. At that point, the results of the election and lack of substantive voting irregularities was affirmed by dozens of judges, the U.S. Supreme Court, governors, and election officials. In addition, Department of Homeland Security officials put out a statement that said, “The November 3rd election was the most secure in American history.” Attorney General Barr put out a similar statement that said that there had not been any election fraud on a scale that could have affected a different outcome in the election. In the face of all this evidence, the subsequent objections could be seen as little more than a ploy to lend specious legitimacy to Mr. Trump’s allegations of voter fraud and avoid provoking Mr. Trump’s ire.

Mr. Trump’s overall course of conduct embodied the exact kind of behavior that the Framers built constitutional protections to thwart. Mr. Trump was the kind of executive who amassed too much power might replicating the abuses of a monarchy. At the Constitutional Convention, James Madison explained the risks of an executive executive—saying “loss of capacity or corruption was more within the compass of probable events, and either of them might be fatal to the Republic.”

Mr. Trump has conducted himself to match that description. His threats were more within the compass of probable cause to thwart. The Framers knew that an executive who amassed too much power might repudiate the Republic. The Framers built constitutional protections to body the exact kind of behavior that the Framers were worried about. Mr. Trump has conducted himself to match that description.
whatever to get himself reelected.' [Dave] considered this as an essential security for the good behaviour of the Executive.'"223 Wilson concurred with Dave '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 influence of law. This was evident when the Framers prompted the design system of checks and balances and Congress’s Impeachment power. Another intentional hallmark of the Constitution is the precaution of power, which is especially important when an incumbent loses re-election.225 This assures that an executive acquires and maintains power in such lawful ways that 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's acceptance of 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 process through non-violent means.227 When these attempts failed, he directed a mob to help him wrest power by launching an attack on the legislative branch.

IX. 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 Framers, for instance, from the Constitution, the Federalist Paper Number 47, "The accumulation of power by launching an attack on the legislative branch, Congress would send a message that is unwilling to use its own oversight powers functionally and effectively, and is unwilling to uphold a meaningful separation of powers. Disqualification is the necessary method for protecting the republic from such democratic decay within the executive and legislative branches.

This chapter in history reminds us that democracy is fragile and we must diligently safeguard its principles. To this end, I have a responsibility to defend the rule of law, and our democratic institutions. I am compelled to vote to convict President Donald J. Trump of committing "high Crimes and Misdemeanors" and support his disqualification from ever again holding an office of public trust.
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Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the Senate was asked to decide whether this body has the constitutional jurisdiction to hold an impeachment trial of Donald Trump now that he is no longer President of the United States. While the Constitution does not explicitly add-
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.
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falsehoods, the former President claimed—without evidence—that there were "900,000 Fraudulent Votes" in Pennsylvania,5 that Dominion Voting Systems switched 221,000 votes from the former President to Joe Biden in Pennsylvania,6 and that "Fraud and Illegality" were a "big part" of his election lawsuits in Pennsylvania.7 The Pennsylvania election was administered safely and securely by thousands of Republican and Democratic election officials and selfless volunteers across the Commonwealth, as the Secretary of State,Brad Raffensperger, and the Secretary of the Commonwealth,Delke Shackelford, attested in their brief to this Court. Managers highlighted in their trial brief, "[o]ur legal system affords many ways in which to contest the outcome of an election."8 The former President did not merely contest the election in Pennsylvania, but also in Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, and Wisconsin.9 In total, the former President and his allies filed 62 lawsuits in state and federal courts regarding the 2020 election and they lost every case, except for one minor lawsuit in Pennsylvania.10

Furthermore, despite the President's public claims of widespread illegalities, his legal team rarely attempted to allege fraud in his lawsuits. For example, in his brief before this Court, Attorney General William P. Barr, the former President's attorney and appointed special counsel, cited the mob to "stop the steal" by declaring that "the next time we see people taking down their state capitol building, try to have a little more violence."11 The former President's legal team did not turn their attention to pressuring federal, state and local elections officials to overturn the election. In Georgia, he personally called the Secretary of State, Brad Raffensperger, and threatened to deny him his Electoral College votes, telling him "you need to do guys like that when they were in a place like this?" he asked the crowd. "They'd be carried out on a stretcher, for."12

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 33 other injuries in Charlottesville, Virginia, the former President offered perhaps the most disturbing commentary when he suggested that there was "blame on both sides" and that there were "very fine people on both sides."13 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 hospitalized a journalist in May 2017.14 Mr. Gianforte had already pled guilty to the assault.15

In 2020, the former President further glorified violence by indicating that the "looting starts, the shooting starts" in relation to the civil rights protests occurring after George Floyd's murder at the hands of a police department in Minneapolis.16 Later, we saw the former President direct federal agents to forcibly move hundreds of peaceful protestors outside of the White House so he could pose for a photo in front of St. John's Church in Washington, D.C.17

In April 2020, in what turned out to be a dress rehearsal for the January 6 insurrection, we saw the former President tweet "LIBERATE MICHIGAN!" after the Governor of Michigan implemented several mitigation measures to address the COVID-19 public health crisis.18 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.19 Rather than condemn those who had seized the state capitol waving Confederate flags, the former President encouraged the Governor of Michigan to negotiate with them: "The Governor of Michigan should ask them to please go home!"20

In 2019, the former President's Attorney General, William P. Barr, released a memo stating that former President Trump wanted to "accrue political capital by aggressively pursuing and attacking the Capitol and the Department of Justice. It seems clear that the former President’s actions—longer than eight false statements about Pennsylvania's elections alone.”21 The former President’s conduct was not an aberration. In 2020, the former President—then a candidate—made countless false statements about Pennsylvania’s elections.22

The case for incitement is about far more than just the former President’s speech on January 6. This was about a pattern of conduct. 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.”23

I, as well as public officials in both parties, talk about fighting for public policy goals. The former President gave fight for civil rights. We fight for equity and justice. However, when the former President tells his supporters to fight, it means something different. The former President has repeatedly 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.”24 It was the former President’s pattern and practice of condoning and encouraging violent action. For example, during remarks in October 2017, the former President warned: "If you don’t fight like hell, you’re not going to have a country anymore.”25

The former President’s pattern of conduct is indisputable. A reasonable person cannot dispute that the former President knew exactly what he was doing by perpetuating the "Big Lie," summoning his supporters to fight, and encouraging violent action. 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 33 other injuries in Charlottesville, Virginia, the former President offered perhaps the most disturbing commentary when he suggested that there was "blame on both sides" and that there were "very fine people on both sides.”
injuries to nearly 140 members of law enforcement and untold collateral damage resulting from the carnage of that day.\textsuperscript{7} He endangered the lives of countless Congressmen, Senators, officers, and employees 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 our national security by tarnishing the United States’ reputation abroad and emboldening violent extremists at home.\textsuperscript{8}

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 event.\textsuperscript{9} After the Capitol had been secured in the early evening of January 6 and Congress was making plans to resume its joint session, the former President turned to Twitter 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.”\textsuperscript{10}

“These are the things and events that happen when a sacred landslide election victory is so badly & unfairly treated for so long. Go to Twitter & watch, if only for a few minutes, the destruction that @realdonaldtrump has caused to our great Nation.”

Jan. 6, 2021, Mr. Trump repeatedly used these words about himself, his Vice President, and their staff.\textsuperscript{11} See also HRC Letter on Impeachment of Former Officials (Feb. 9, 2021, 3:10 PM), https://twitter.com/HRCCongress/status/1332405141549927233. See also Trump Twitter Archive V2, https://www.thetrumparchive.com/ (last visited March 1, 2021) (archiving all of the former President’s tweets).\textsuperscript{12}
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74. 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 tyranny of an unaccountable King, 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 empowering the Congress was necessary to protect against the threat of 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 some public trust” and “injuries done immediately to society itself.” Impeachment is a remedy for this public harm.
75. 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 immediately to society itself.” Impeachment is a remedy for this public harm.
76. During the trial, we saw evidence that the President of the United States left open the possibility of a second TERM, even after the votes were cast. As Manager RASKIN noted, “we must never forget Officer Harry Dunn, who ran to take on a growing group of 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.
77. 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.
78. While much of the trial rightfully focused on what President Trump did on January 6 and leading up to the riots, numerous questions about 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 BLUNT, Vice President Pence, and alongside two young women who carried the mahogany boxes 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.

Mr. 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 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 as that of 76 was effected indeed by the sword . . . but by the rational and peaceful 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 instigated 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 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 election that exposed his effort to 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 prepared to riot 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 stormed 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 we were left to take a stand alongside a brave Capitol police officer who lost his life 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 “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 about 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: what 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 for the 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 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 work to pass the articles of impeachment that violates 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 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 majority power 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—manufacturing 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, and in interviews after interview 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 campaign to undermine 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 brought his own Secretary of State and Brad Raffensperger in a recorded phone call to “find” another 11,780 “Trump 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 “steal the seat.” 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, spurred, 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-political election officials of 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, Mitt 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 blunt rejection of history and dodged his duty to hold President Trump accountable on the feeble ground that the Senate lacked jurisdiction. Through this sophist 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 demonstrate the responsibility to serve as a check on the President for anything he has done to undermine American democracy.

The Constitution grants the legislative branch authority to hold accountable and to provide redress for 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 democracy 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 face their own difficulties 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 our democracy demands. 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
role, I learned the power and the significance of accountability. When wrongdoers enjoy impunity for their actions, they and others like them are emboldened.

The first and former President Trump was impeached by the House, he had pressured a foreign government to corrupt the American election process, extorting a vulnerable, fledging democracy to help him cheat in a Presidential election.

This 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 oblige 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 wrong he was, he would never stop telling people that the election was corrupt and that he was the winner of this Presidential election.

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 still processing it and trying to put into perspective the violent insurrection that 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 happened wasn’t clear at the time. Both 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 a violent, overwhelming mob? 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 be commended 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 violent mob was to the Senate, Representatives, and staff came to harm. The video of chanting, gleeful, rioters denouncing 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 when he tried to hold it shut with his foot. The terror must have felt hoping that the door was 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 leadership. 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 mob of our supporters showed the very 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.

In some respects, it is difficult to know how best to move forward from that awful day. We came back. We did know how best to move forward from that shocking election result and the assault on the Capitol. But the January 6 assault on the People’s Capitol may have been changed indelibly for many of us.

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 and the sacrifice 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 of late, in books, articles, 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 a clear and deliberate 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 failed 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 overpowered by the mob, Donald Trump did nothing. Democracy is at its most fragile at the moment of transition, and that fragility is exactly what the former President sought to exploit.

During President Trump’s second impeachment trial, his defense tried to paint for Americans a picture of a President who called for peaceful protest and who bears no responsibility for the January 6 assault on the People’s House. But the President’s actions took place before our House conducted, before, during, and immediately after the assault on the Capitol is well known to the American public. He is uniquely responsible for the events of January 6.

Americans spoke clearly and forcefully in November when they elected a new President. Donald Trump’s attempt to cling to power through lies and violence is just what the Framers of our Constitution feared. But part of the brilliance of our Constitution’s separation of powers is that, while the President, Congress, have the power and obligation to defend against such gross misconduct through impeachment.

I voted to convict and disqualify former President Donald Trump because he violated his oath of office and because our future leaders must know that such abuses of power will not be tolerated in a free and democratic society. I will continue to call out these abuses and I will do everything in my power to keep those in power accountable.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, the essence of any American President’s job is set forth in the oath he or she swears: an oath that the Founders considered so fundamental that they put it in the Constitution. And that job is to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

A President who violates that oath has committed an impeachable offense. That is a truth. There can be no reasonable dispute that a President who fails at this basic responsibility is unfit to remain in office and cannot and should not be permitted to hold that office again.

If we do not convict Mr. Trump now, then did Donald Trump fail to uphold his oath, he took steps intended to violate it. It wasn’t mere negligence. It wasn’t even recklessness. Donald Trump engaged in an active, willful, intentional attack on our Constitution and its democracy.

Donald Trump incited to violence and riot a mob that attacked the U.S. Capitol and our government. That is a high crime and misdemeanor. We all saw and heard the evidence during the trial. The statements. The affidavits. The tweets. The arguments. The affidavits.

Months before the election, Donald Trump laid the groundwork for this insurrection, arguing he would only lose the election if there were fraud. After he lost, he repeated over and over again the “Big Lie” that the election was stolen. He agitated his supporters who falsely and wrongly believed that the election was rigged.

Trump beckoned the 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 and its democracy. Of preserving his power at any cost.

In January 6, 2021, President Trump swears—an oath that the Founders considered the cornerstone of any American President’s job and the cornerstone of any American President’s accountability. The statements. The affidavits. The tweets. The trials. The affidavits.
has maintained that he acted perfectly appropriately.

The Senate of the United States sat as an Impeachment Court, with Democrats and Republicans serving as jurors. But the vast majority of those Republicans were intensely loyal 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 think what is most concerning is how we knew that from the beginning.

Some witnesses wanted to kill Vice President Pence and House Speaker Pelosi. They told us so. We know that the west side of the Capitol was breached around 3 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. We know that 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, but to ask the President what he would do next. Donald Trump incited and relished in an effort to violently overthrow our government. He invited. He incited. He delighted.

Some witnesses wanted to certify or produce such action. 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 his support of it. But even before we debated potential witnesses, Republicans had made up their minds. They were unmoving in their fealty to Trump. Republicans were willfully blind to the truth and the facts of the case.

The 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 his support of it. But even before we debated potential witnesses, Republicans had made up their minds. They were unmoving in their fealty to Trump. Republicans were willfully blind to the truth and the facts of the case.

The House managers proved their case with facts and evidence. Donald Trump incited and relished in an effort to violently overthrow our government. He invited. He incited. He delighted.

Anyone who is opposed to abolishing the filibuster need only look at the vote to acquit and see how Republicans willfully blinded themselves to truth and facts in fealty to Trump and their party. Their votes to acquit once again show our hurdles to progress: Republican political calculations and their dereliction to truth and justice.

The final tally on the vote to acquit does nothing to reassure me that Republicans are willing to work together to support our Constitution. Donald Trump had the opportunity to recognize that faith in the Constitution is a faith that we all share. Instead, they ignored the Constitution for a Big Lie. How can we expect them to work in good faith with Democrats to respond to the big challenges our country faces when they refuse to accept undeniable facts?

The only reasonable conclusion based on the evidence presented at the trial was that Donald Trump committed an impeachable offense, should have been immediately barred from office, and disbarred from holding future office. Republicans refused to accept or acknowledge that.

I fear that with their votes to acquit, they have sown the seeds of another violent attack on our Constitution and our democracy.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, the impeachment trial of former President Donald Trump marked the third time in 1 year that the Senate has had to confront significant constitutional and institutional questions with consequences that will undoubtedly reverberate into the future. As always, I am guided by the Constitution, historical precedent, and “a deep responsibility to future times,” as stated by Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story, our Nation’s first great constitutional scholar, two centuries ago. This is what has informed me during last year’s impeachment, the electoral college certification in January, and now another impeachment proceeding.

This has been a disheartening episode for a divided America. Make no mistake: I condemn the horrific violence that engulfed the Capitol on January 6. All those who undertook violence on that day should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. I also condemn former President Trump’s poor judgment in calling a rally on that day, and his actions and inactions when it turned into a riot. His blatant disregard for his own Vice President, who was under the same constitutional duty at the Capitol, infuriates me. I will never forget the brave men and women of law enforcement—some of whom lost their lives and were seriously injured—who carried out their patriotic duty to protect members of Congress that day.

However horrible the violence was—and how angry I have been about it—I believe that it is imperative for the future of our democracy, to examine closely the totality of the precedents, impeachment proceedings, and evidence, and to be as dispassionate and impartial as possible in this case. That is 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 can face impeachment and conviction.

Therefore, the fundamental issue in this impeachment trial is not removal from office but whether the Senate has or should accept jurisdiction to try, convict, or disqualify a private citizen, 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 case law precedent, the House’s right to try former officials, who are now private citizens, amounts to a massive expansion of Congress’ impeachment jurisdiction.
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.

Thus, I oppose 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. As a result, judicial deference, 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 public 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 protects the right to electoral interference only to electoral officials in impeachment proceedings. A conviction based on this breathtaking precedent has the potential to significantly 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 condemnation 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 suppose that the President became incensed at police 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 favor of the former President’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 end 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.

Ms. 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 insurrection against our Republic. As the evidence presented by the House impeachment managers has made clear, Donald Trump used the power 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 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 the result of the election. In early January, he said simply, “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 overcame 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. While 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 almost anything to convince Vice President Pence to violate his duty to the Constitution, and so the Vice President had a target on his back.

In other words, those who came to Washington at former President Trump’s request and attacked the seat of our democracy were trying to do exactly what they believed Donald Trump asked them to: prevent the certification of Joe Biden as President-elect. This is why they frankly admitted, both during the Capitol riot and later to law enforcement, that they were at the Capitol because “[o]ur president wants us here.”

In response to all these facts, Donald Trump argues that the Constitution 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 lawyerly fig leaves. Mr. Trump relies on them so heavily because his own behavior is indefensible.

The vast majority of legal scholars agree that the First Amendment does...
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, it was voted for 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 just before impeachment. 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 our 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 year and of the 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 service for 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 Founders 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 forebear 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 the rule of law. I would remind 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. I turn to this speech to end my remarks in need of hope. Precisely when slavery seemed to have won a decisive victory, Frederick Douglass, himself a former slave, said in that speech that his “hopes were never brighter than now.” He believed that the “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 on this complicated 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 expected 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 read, “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” and 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 position of the Senate “has historically presided over Senate impeachment trials of 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 remove from Office.” This reiterates that removal from office must occur before that person is disqualified from holding an office again. If the Founders had intended the disqualification to extend to a subsequent 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 does not allow the Senate to acquit and then disqualify the authority to disqualify him from an office 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 match 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 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 Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight adopted subcommittee rules of procedure.

Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, today I ask unanimous consent to have published 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 routine business.
   B. Taking testimony. One Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony.
   C. Rule 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 the presentation of persons and the production of memoranda, documents, records, or any other materials at a hearing, provided that the Chair may subpoena attendance or production of the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair, or that the Chair designates a quorum of the subcommittee rules of procedure. The chair 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 is present. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum for the transaction of business.

3. Subcommittee subpoenas. The Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair may issue a subpoena immediately.

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 of the Subcommittee.

5. Quorums.
   A. Taking sworn or unsworn testimony. One Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business other than testimony.

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.
   A. Transaction of routine business. One-third of the membership of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business.
   B. Taking testimony. One Member of the Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking sworn or unsworn testimony.
   C. Rule in establishment of quorum. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

3. Subcommittees. The Chair of the Subcommittee, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, is authorized to create subcommittees.

4. Subcommittees. Subcommittees may be created by the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair, with the approval of the Ranking Minority Member.

5. Quorums.
   A. Taking sworn or unsworn testimony. One Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair 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 is present. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum for the transaction of business.

6. Subcommittee subpoenas. The Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair may issue a subpoena immediately.

7. 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 of the Subcommittee.

8. Quorums.
   A. Taking sworn or unsworn testimony. One Member of the Subcommittee designated by the Chair or a staff officer designated by the Chair shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business other than testimony.

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’ 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 of the Committee. In all cases notification to all Subcommittee Members of the intent to hold hearings must be given at least 7 days in advance of the hearing by the Chair. The Minority Member should be kept fully apprised of preliminary inquiries, investigations, and hearings. Preliminary inquiries may be initiated by the Subcommittee Majority staff. If approval of the Chair and notice of such approval to the Ranking Minority Member, Minority that, in the event of a vacancy, the Majority Member of the Subcommittee, or by counsel of the Subcommittee, or may order and direct the witness to answer the question, but the Subcommittee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement unless the witness refuses to testify after being ordered and directed to answer by the Chair or designated Member.

4. If at least three Members of the Subcommittee, or by counsel of the Subcommittee, or may order and direct the witness to answer the question, but the Subcommittee shall not initiate procedures leading to criminal or civil enforcement unless the witness refuses to testify after being ordered and directed to answer by the Chair or designated Member.

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, provided that at least one member of the minority is present.

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, 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, a Senator at Arms of the Senate, or any law enforcement official to eject said person from the hearing room.

8. Counsel retained by any witness and accompanying such witness shall be permitted to be present during the testimony of such witness and public evidence hearing 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, or by personal counsel not representing 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, interfering, or disrupting 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 to whom secure 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 served on the witness. The Chair and the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee shall be kept fully apprised of the authorization for the taking of depositions. Such notice shall specify a time and place of examination, and the name of the Subcommittee 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 accompanied by a Subcommittee subpoena.

9.2 Counsel. Witnesses may be accompanied by counsel of the witness’s own choosing. Such counsel shall be kept fully apprised of the hearing. The Chair and the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee shall be kept fully apprised of the authorization for the taking of depositions. Such notice shall specify a time and place of examination, and the name of the Subcommittee 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 accompanied by a Subcommittee subpoena.

9.3 Procedure. Witnesses shall be examined by the Chair, or by counsel for the Chair or officer designee of the Chair, or by counsel of the Subcommittee, or by counsel of the Subcommittee.
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 pursuant to alternative (a) referred to herein, said request shall be considered timely if it is not received by the Chair, Staff Director, or Chief Counsel in writing on or before thirty (30) days subsequent to the day on which said person’s name was mentioned or otherwise specifically identified during a public hearing held before the Subcommittee, unless the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member waive this requirement.

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 after no less than 10 days’ notice and opportunity for comment by the Members of the Subcommittee unless the need for such notice and opportunity to comment has been waived in writing by a majority of the Minority Members of 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 assistance as the Ranking Minority Counsel deems advisable. The total compensation allocated to such Minority staff shall be not 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 possession 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, local and/or Federal authorities. Such letter or report may recite the basis for the determination of reasonable cause. This rule is not authority 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 Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs as the Chair and Ranking Minority Member “of the Committee.”

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, is charged with the planning, organization, and execution of 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 Lohmeyer, 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 siege 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 the 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 in 1931 by 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 1931, Congress began to require that one copy of each book be made in raised characters and deposited in the Library of Congress for national 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 set in place what 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 6,600 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 predates the 20th century. As the NLS mission states, it was only available to people who are blind; 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 set in place what 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 6,600 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 predates the 20th century. As the NLS mission states, it was only available to people who are blind; 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 set in place what 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 6,600 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 predates the 20th century. As the NLS mission states, it was only available to people who are blind; 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 set in place what 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 6,600 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 predates the 20th century. As the NLS mission states, it was only available to people who are blind; 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 set in place what 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 6,600 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 predates the 20th century. As the NLS mission states, it was only available to people who are blind; 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 set in place what 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.
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.


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. 1556, the Sunshine Protection Act of 2019 which would permit the President to extend daylight saving time; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-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 “Final Rule: Limits on Exempted Calls Under the 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.

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. WARNE, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KAIN, Mr. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKS, Mr. ROSEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLUCHA, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. SCHATZ):

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. COLIN):

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. MARKET (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 492. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes to remove the defense of qualified immunity in the case of any action under section 1988, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SANDERS, 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 Mr. 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.

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. MURPHY, Mr. MARKK, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 497. A bill to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist in the stewarding 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 restructure water rights in designating a national monument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HASSAN, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. STARKOW, Ms. SMITH, Mr. Tester, Mr. Murray, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. KLOUCHA, and Mr. KAIN):

S. 499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility for the refundable credit created by the United States Code, under a qualified health plan, to improve cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; 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 (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. EINSTEIN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 501. A bill to provide authority to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 502. A bill to amend chapter 33 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. STARKOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 504. A bill to establish clean 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. MARKK, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Ms. WARNER, 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. COOMES, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOUCHA, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. KAIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. PADILLA, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. LUGAR, 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 Ms. 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 Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, 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. KLOUCHA, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. KAIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. PADILLA, Ms. MURRAY, Mr. LUGAN, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. OSWALD):

S. 507. A bill to increase deployment of electric vehicles charged 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. STARKOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. ROSEN, Mr. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, 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 Mr. BROWN):

S. 509. A bill to establish a program to assist States in establishing or enhancing community integration network infrastructure for people with disabilities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

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. SCHUMER:
S. Res. 85. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that it is the duty of the Federal Government to dramatically expand and strengthen the economy; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mrs. HARRASSO, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLENSON, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KAIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKSKY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. ROBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLEN, and Mr. WYDEN):
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 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; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. OSSOFF (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. REED, Mr. CARDEÑO, Mr. FOUNTAIN, and Mr. LANKFORD):
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. BROWN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONROY, Mr. COTESTA MASTO, Ms. COTTON, Mr. CHAMBER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HAGGERTY, Mr. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HORVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUSAN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MOYAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. ROUND, Mr. RUHOL, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STEVENSON, Mr. TUBEBERGE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUVERVILLE, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):
S. Res. 83. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 20 through February 27, 2021, as ‘National FFA Week’, to improve access to economic injury disaster loans and emergency advances under the CARES Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. BLOOMBERG, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HIRONO, Mrs. SHABEE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENEND, and Mr. ROBIN):
S. Res. 101. A bill to require the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to collect and report certain data concerning COVID–19; to ease the care economy; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):
S. Res. 102. 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. WARNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HINCHI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTIZ MASTO, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. SHAEBEE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENEND, and Ms. ROEN):
S. Res. 104. A bill to obtain and direct the placement in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds of a monument to honor Associate Justice Thurgood Marshall, the Supreme Court of the United States Ruth Bader Ginsburg; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BOOKER):
S. Res. 105. 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 health professionals to respond in lieu of law enforcement officers in emergencies involving persons with a mental illness or an intellectual or developmental disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):
S. Res. 106. A bill to plan for and coordinate efforts to integrate advanced air mobility air-craft into the national airspace system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HASKIN:
S. Res. 107. 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.

By Mr. SCHUMER:
S. Res. 108. A resolution resolving that the 117th Congress has concurred in Senate Resolution 8 and is in session.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. SHABEE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. HINCHI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLEN, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAIN, Mr. CARDEN, Mr. LAUAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. KING, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. WARE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PANTELLA, Mr. CORTIZ MASTO, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. ROEN, and Mr. OSSEFF):
S. Res. 109. 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. SHAEBEE, 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. 255

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. 255, 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. WICKER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to provide reentry to the employees of Air America.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAIN) 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. 413

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 names 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. 460

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 Emmett Till and Mamie Till-Mobley.

S. 465

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. 465, 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 names 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 the authority for Federal contractors to reimburse employees unable to perform work due to the COVID–19 pandemic from March 31, 2021, to September 30, 2021.

S. 465

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. Padilla) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to establish and support public awareness campaigns to address COVID-19-related health disparities and promote vaccination.

S. 475

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. 479

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 (Ms. 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. 437

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, repressing, gross human rights violations, and other destabilizing activities.

S. 495

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.

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:

(1) HERITAGE AREA.—The term “Heritage Area” means the Bronzeville-Black Metropolis National Heritage Area established by section 3(a).

(2) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—The term “local coordinating entity” means the local coordinating entity for the Heritage Area designated by section 3(a).

(3) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term “management plan” means the plan developed by the local coordinating entity under section 5(a).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) 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) 18th 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 South.

(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.

The bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

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

This Act may be cited as the “Bronzeville-Black Metropolis National Heritage Area Act”.

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Prioritizing Help to Businesses Act”.

SEC. 2. PRIORITIZING THE ALLOCATION OF H-2B VISAS FOR STATES WITH LOW UNEMPLOYMENT RATES.

Section 214(g)(10) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)(10)) is amended to read as follows:

(10)(A) Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), the numerical limitation under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to H–2B visas issued to aliens for positions that are certified pursuant to subsection (b) of section 214(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)) to subpart A of part 655 of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations, to perform service or labor in a State that had a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 3.5 percent or lower in at least 3 of the most recent monthly reports issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics during the previous fiscal year.

(B) The number of aliens exempted from the numerical limitation pursuant to subparagraph (A) in any State during any fiscal year may not exceed the lesser of—

(i) 125 percent of the number of visas issued to aliens working in such State during the most recently completed fiscal year; or

(ii) 2,500.
Commission shall be the local coordinating entity for the Heritage Area.

(b) AUTHORITY OF LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—The local coordinating entity may, for purposes of planning and implementing the management plan, use Federal funds made available under this Act—

(1) to prepare reports, studies, interpretive exhibits, informational literature, and promotional materials, to carry out projects, and to develop and implement the management plan; and

(2) to make grants to the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other persons; to enter into cooperative agreements with the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other organizations; to hire and compensate staff; to obtain funds or services from any source, including funds and services provided under any other Federal program or law; and to contract for goods and services.

(c) DUTIES OF LOCAL COORDINATING ENT-ITY.—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; and

(2) give priority to the implementation of actions, goals, and strategies set forth in the management plan, including assisting units of government and other persons in—

(A) carrying out programs and projects that recognize and protect important re-

source values in the Heritage Area;

(B) encouraging economic viability in the Heritage Area in accordance with the goals of the management plan;

(C) establishing and maintaining interpr- etive exhibits and educational opportunities for residents and visitors in the Heritage Area;

(D) developing heritage-based recreational and educational opportunities for residents and visitors in the Heritage Area; and

(E) establishing awareness of and appre-ciation for the natural, historic, and cul-

tural resources of the Heritage Area;

(F) restoring historic buildings that are—

(i) located in the Heritage Area; and

(ii) related to the themes of the Heritage Area; and

(G) installing throughout the Heritage Area, park, consistent, and appropriate signs identifying public access points and sites of interest;

(h) consider the interests of diverse units of government, businesses, tourism officials, private property owners, and nonprofit groups within the Heritage Area in develop ing and implementing the management plan;

(i) conduct public meetings at least semiannually regarding the development and implement ing of the management plan; and

(j) for any fiscal year for which Federal funds are received under this Act—

(A) submit to the Secretary an annual re port that describes—

(i) the accomplishments of the local co-

ordinating entity; (ii) the expenses and income of the local coordinating entity; and

(iii) the entities to which the local coordi-nating entity made any grants;

(B) make available for audit all records re lating to the expenditure of the Federal funds and any matching funds; and

(C) require, with respect to all agreements authorizing the expenditure of Federal funds by other persons, that the receiving organizations make available for audit all records relating to the expenditure of the Federal funds.

SEC. 5. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out this Act, the local coordi-nating 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, strate-gies, and recommendations for the conserva-

tion, 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, his-

toric, cultural, and recreational resources of the Heritage Area re-

lating to the themes of the Heritage Area that should be preserved, restored, managed, developed, or maintained; and

(5) include an analysis of, and rec-

ommendations for, ways in which Federal, State, and local programs, may best be co-

ordinated 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 coordi-nating 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 MAN-

AGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the local coordi-nating 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 rep-

resentative of the diverse interests of the Heritage Area, including governments, nat-

ural and historic resource protection organi-

zations, educational institutions, businesses, and recreational organizations;

(B) the local coordinating entity has pro-

vided adequate opportunities (including pub-

lic meetings) for public and governmental in-

volvement in the preparation of the manage-

ment plan;

(C) the resource protection and interpreta-

tion strategies contained in the management plan, if implemented, would adequately pro-

tect the natural, historic, and cultural re-

sources of the Heritage Area; and

(D) the management plan is supported by the appropriate 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 dis-

approves a proposed management plan, the Secretary shall—

(i) advise the local coordinating entity, in writing, of the reasons for the disapproval; and

(ii) make recommendations for revision of the proposed management plan.

(B) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL.—The Sec-

retary shall approve or disapprove a revised management plan not later than 180 days after the date on which the revised manage-

ment plan is submitted.

(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 the amendment.

SEC. 6. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act af-

fects 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 con-

duct activities that may have an impact on the Heritage Area is encouraged to consult 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 author-

ized use of Federal land under the jurisdic-

tion of a Federal agency.

SEC. 7. PRIVATE PROPERTY AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.

Nothing in this Act—

(1) abridges the right of any 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;

(2) 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 ac-

cess or use of property of the property owner under any other Federal, State, or local law;

(3) alters any duly adopted land use regula-

tion, approved land use plan, or other regu-

latory authority of any Federal, State, or local agency, or conveys any land use or other regulatory authority to the local co-

ordinating entity;

(4) authorizes or implies the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights;

(5) diminishes the authority of the State to manage fish and wildlife or to manage Federal land under the jurisdiction of a Federal agency.

(b) EVALUATION.—An evaluation conducted under subsection (a)(1) shall—

(1) assess the progress of the local coordi-

nating 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 in-

vestments; and

(3) review the management structure, part-

nership relationships, and funding of the management plan 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) the ways in which Federal funding for the Heritage Area may be reduced or eliminated; and
(B) the appropriate time period necessary to access 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.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(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 authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year.
(b) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—The Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out using funds made available under this Act shall be not more than 50 percent.

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.
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 noted that “Cuban Police or state security agents continue 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 by 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 Friedeman 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 Angeles Soler Fernandez 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 Friedeman Prize for Advancing 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 Hospital de la Mujer, where she was 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 July 19, 2017;

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 18, 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 experienced arrests, 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 and Ramos, 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 endangered her respiratory system and her mental and physical health; and

Whereas Ms. Cruz Miranda was 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 peaceful efforts to speak up for the voicesless and stand up to the Cuban regime in defense of human rights and fundamental freedoms 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 both domestically and internationally; and
(5) calls for the release of all political prisoners detained and imprisoned by the Cuban regime.

SENNATE 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 “Mr. Lewis”) was born on February 21, 1940, near Troy, Alabama, the third of 10 children born to his mother Willie Mae (née Carter) and his father Eddie Lewis, a sharecropper;

Whereas, at 5 years old, Mr. Lewis was given responsibility for the family chicken coop, including his favorite, L’il Pullet, which he tended with great care and to which he would preach nearly every evening, which—

Whereas, in 1963, he helped his family to give Mr. Lewis the childhood nickname of “Preacher”; and
(2) instilled in Mr. Lewis an early desire to enter the clergy;

Whereas, from a young age, Mr. Lewis insisted on attending school daily, defying his parents’ instructions to work the family farm, established within Mr. Lewis a lifelong commitment to education and enlightenment;

Whereas when Mr. Lewis was 15 years old his family, moved to the core”, as described in his memoir “Walking With the Wind”, by the Mississippi murder of Emmett Till, deepening his passionate opposition to segregation and Jim Crow laws;

Whereas, as a high school student, Mr. Lewis intensely followed the progress of the Montgomery Bus Boycott (referred to in this preamble as the “Boycott”) in 1955 and 1956, awakening him to the power of nonviolent resistance to segregation;

Whereas Mr. Lewis wrote in his memoir that the Boycott “of course opened the door to many others, but it opened the door to more than any other event before or since”;

Whereas, while following the progress of the Boycott, Mr. Lewis was inspired by radio broadcasts featuring the Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. (referred to in this preamble as “Dr. King”)—
(1) whom Mr. Lewis’ parents referred to as “that young preacher”;
(2) whose example deepened Mr. Lewis’ ambition to become a minister;

Whereas, inspired by Dr. King, Mr. Lewis, on February 16, 1956, 5 days before his 16th birthday, preached his first public sermon, entitled “A Praying Mother”, at Macedonia Baptist Church in Troy, Alabama, which came from the First Book of Samuel and discussed the example of Hannah, mother of Samuel, which sermon made such an impact that it was published in the Montgomery Advertiser newspaper;

Whereas, on February 18, 1956, 2 days after Mr. Lewis gave his first public sermon, a rally was planned; Mr. Lewis, the Brewer of Columbus, Georgia, a voting rights activist working with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (referred to in this preamble as the “NAACP”), was shot and killed by a white man who was never indicted for the murder;

Whereas Mr. Lewis joined the NAACP in the summer of 1956; and

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 “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 in 1961, and was subsequently ordained as a Baptist minister;

Whereas, in 1961, Mr. Lewis became one of the 13 original Freedom Riders, who challenged segregated interstate travel throughout the South;
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 "splinter the segregated South and put them back together in the image of God and democracy";
Whereas, Mr. Lewis led demonstrations against racially segregated hotels, restrooms, swimming pools, and public parks for which he was brutally beaten, left unconscious in his own blood, and arrested 40 times. He 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 Lyndon B. Johnson called 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. 10301 et seq.) on August 6, 1965;
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 caregiver 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 powerful advocate for ethics and voter rolls and changed the political landscape of 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;
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) honors 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"; and
(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 accomplishments in the nonviolent struggle for civil rights.

SENATE RESOLUTION 83—EXPRESSION SUPPORT DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 20 THROUGH FEBRUARY 27, 2021, NATIONAL FFA WEEK, RECOGNIZING IMPORTANT ROLE NATIONAL FFA ORGANIZATION DEVELOPING IMPORTANT ROLE NATIONAL FFA ORGANIZATION STUDENTS THROUGH AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, PROVIDING POSITIVE INFLUENCE STUDENTS THROUGH AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, PROVIDING POSITIVE INFLUENCE 

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. Ernst, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Kennedy) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:
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 84—AMEND THE STANDING RULES SENATE PROHIBIT CONSIDERATION LEGISLATION TEXT LEGISLATION TEXT PUBLICLY AVAILABLE ELECTRONIC FORM A MANDATORY MINIMUM REVIEW PERIOD 

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. Ernst, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Kennedy) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:
Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) the text of the bill, joint resolution, conference report unless the text of the bill, joint resolution, conference report which will be considered has been publicly available in electronic form for 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—EXPRESSION SUPPORT DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 20 THROUGH FEBRUARY 27, 2021, NATIONAL FFA WEEK, RECOGNIZING IMPORTANT ROLE NATIONAL FFA ORGANIZATION DEVELOPING IMPORTANT ROLE NATIONAL FFA ORGANIZATION STUDENTS THROUGH AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, PROVIDING POSITIVE INFLUENCE STUDENTS THROUGH AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, PROVIDING POSITIVE INFLUENCE 

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. Ernst, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Kennedy) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:
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. MARKS, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension:

S. Res. 85

Whereas the preamble of the Constitution of the United States cites the duty to “promote the general Welfare,” establishing care for those in need 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 nearly 20,000,000 adults in the United States have long-term care needs arising from old age or a disability;

Whereas more than 1 out of 5 adults in the United States had been an unpaid caregiver for an adult family member or friend, or for a child with disabilities, in the preceding 12 months;

(2) has an institutional bias, requiring State programs to cover care in congregate facilities, while home and community-based services are optional and limited;

(2) covers long-term care needs, but with strict income and asset eligibility requirements; and

(1) covers long-term care needs, but with strict income and asset eligibility requirements; and

(2) covers long-term care needs, but with strict income and asset eligibility requirements; and

(2) covers long-term care needs, but with strict income and asset eligibility requirements; and

(2) covers long-term care needs, but with strict income and asset eligibility requirements; and

Whereas, during the COVID–19 pandemic, it has become 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; and

Whereas domestic workers, mostly from the global South, were the most common victims of labor trafficking reported in the United States between 2007 and 2018;

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 health care 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 more than 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 is more than 50 percent more likely among Black, Latino, and Indigenous communities;

Whereas, in 2019, 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 33 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 out 9 percent;

Whereas, during the COVID–19 pandemic, it has become 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; and

Whereas domestic workers, mostly from the global South, were the most common victims of labor trafficking reported in the United States between 2007 and 2018;

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 health care 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 more than 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 is more than 50 percent more likely among Black, Latino, and Indigenous communities;

Whereas, in 2019, 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 33 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 out 9 percent;

Whereas, during the COVID–19 pandemic, it has become 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; and

Whereas domestic workers, mostly from the global South, were the most common victims of labor trafficking reported in the United States between 2007 and 2018;

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 health care 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 more than 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 is more than 50 percent more likely among Black, Latino, and Indigenous communities;

Whereas, in 2019, 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 33 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 out 9 percent;

Whereas, during the COVID–19 pandemic, it has become 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; and

Whereas domestic workers, mostly from the global South, were the most common victims of labor trafficking reported in the United States between 2007 and 2018;

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 health care 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 nurses, care and social assistance workers, and educators—

(i) have been first responders during climate disasters and extreme weather events;

(ii) have been disproportionately impacted by COVID–19 as well as other forms of environmental harm; and

(iii) 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 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, including by transit, health care facilities, and public buildings;

Whereas a robust care workforce will also be required to support a just transition to a healthy, green, and equitable economy, and better workers shift to new industries, move across the country, and develop new care needs;

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; and

(ii) acknowledging and addressing the legacies of exclusion and oppression faced by caregivers and care workers, particularly women and caregivers;

(iii) building and expanding zero-carbon, non-polluting, climate-safe infrastructure, including physical infrastructure and social infrastructure, to guarantee care to all people throughout the life cycle, moving the United States toward universal, public programs ensuring—

(A) high-quality health care, including comprehensive, accessible mental health care coverage, substance use treatment, and reproductive care, free at the point of service;

(B) 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;

(C) 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 development;

(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 access to work places, 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) clear opportunities for, and 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-organized 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) adequate public services and programs to support all people in navigating economic and social challenges, including navigating the rapidly warming planet; and to help all people unleash their full potential as human beings;

(xiii) public libraries, community centers, and other spaces that foster creativity, connection, mental health, and human development;

(xiv) support for practicing and aspiring artists, as well as institutions, venues, and platforms that empower and fairly compensate artists, bringing their work to wider audiences, and integrating the arts into comprehensive mental health, education, and resilience efforts;

(xv) access to nature, public space, diverse forms of public recreation, and technology, including public broadband and flexible work models; and

(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;

Whereas 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

(B) is already working to keep care workers safe from workplace violence, harassment, and threats to their work safely in general, and in the event of a pandemic, infectious disease outbreak, and other risks.

That it is the sense of the Senate—

(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 ample training opportunities, apprenticeships, and career pathways, including personal 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, and other risks, 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 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 a rapid recovery, to help the Green New Deal, and any similar efforts to meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century;

(D) building and expanding zero-carbon, non-polluting, climate-safe infrastructure, including physical infrastructure and social infrastructure, to guarantee care to all people throughout the life cycle, moving the United States toward universal, public programs ensuring—

(E) 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—

(f) clean air and water;

(g) public, permanently affordable, and dignified housing and transit systems, integrated with adequate social services to support residents of all ages and abilities;

(h) accessible infrastructure, including public access to work places, housing, transit, and streets allowing for full mobility for all people;

(i) 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;

(j) healthy, nourishing, and sustainable food systems that provide affordable, accessible, and culturally appropriate foods;

(k) comprehensive public health and emergency preparedness infrastructure, including equitable, democratic response and recovery efforts during and after climate disasters; and

(l) clear opportunities for, and the removal of barriers to, unionization and collective action in all economic sectors, including the service, technology, and gig work sectors;

(m) 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;

(n) expanded leisure time, with no loss in pay or benefits;

(o) generous, paid sick days and vacation time;

(p) support for worker ownership, worker-organized 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;

(q) adequate public services and programs to support all people in navigating economic and social challenges, including navigating the rapidly warming planet; and to help all people unleash their full potential as human beings;

(r) public libraries, community centers, and other spaces that foster creativity, connection, mental health, and human development;

(s) support for practicing and aspiring artists, as well as institutions, venues, and platforms that empower and fairly compensate artists, bringing their work to wider audiences, and integrating the arts into comprehensive mental health, education, and resilience efforts;

(t) access to nature, public space, diverse forms of public recreation, and technology, including public broadband and flexible work models; and

(u) 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.

Whereas it is essential that 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

(B) is already working to keep care workers safe from workplace violence, harassment, and threats to their work safely in general, and in the event of a pandemic, infectious disease outbreak, and other risks.
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(B) celebrates the interdependence of all people;
(4) unpaid caregivers deserve support, care workers deserve quality, high-paying, union jobs, people with disabilities and older adults deserve independence and self-determination, and every person, at every stage of life, deserves to live, work, play, and care with dignity; and
(5) our ultimate aim is to build an economy and society based on care for people, communities, and the planet we all share.

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. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. Kaine, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. REED, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHATZ, 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. PADILLA, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. OSSEFF) submitted the following concurrent resolution:

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 Schunk, 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 cloture 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 6:31 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

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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 analysis and found 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 Fleecing 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 reforms. 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, 2010.

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-
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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 water-skier 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, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 45.

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 today to honor Mr. Wiley Rickman White. Mr. White was an exceptional athlete at his High School and as a result of his abilities, he earned a football scholarship to attend Jackson State University in Mississippi where he displayed his talent on the field as a member of the JSU Tigers football team for four years as an undergraduate. Later, Mr. White was honored by his Alma Mater by being inducted in the Sports Hall of Fame wherein he was the 35th athlete to be inducted into the Hall of Fame in the University’s 103-year existence. As an honoree Mr. White was presented a plaque and a medal.

Mr. White was also a very good student where he maintained a 3.5 grade average and 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 couple 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, semipro, 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.
were many, but her most memorable asset was the depth and breadth of her relationships with family and friends.

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 accreditation and certification to receive 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 the 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 project areas such as the STEM Inspire Pipeline, the Inclusive Internationalization Projects, Global Partnerships in STEM, Center for Interational Health, Carnegie Engagement Classification team, Center for Community Solutions, 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 students 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 Cooperatives.

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 (Thurmond 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 2012 Black Women in Sisterhood Distinguished 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 greater 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 170-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 two 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 in Vietnam, 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 grandchildren. With his passion for his large 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.

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 Sumgait pogrom and the 31st Anniversary of the Baku pogrom.

On February 27, 1988, hundreds of Armenian civilians living in the city of Sumgait in Azerbaijan were indiscriminately killed, raped, maimed, and even burned alive because of their ethnicity. Hostile, anti-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 Sumgait and Baku. Even more disturbing, the Azeri government lauded the perpetrators of this event and similar violent attacks.

Tragically, the Azerbaijani government’s approach toward Armenians has changed little since the Sumgait 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 violent actions 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 Congressional Armenian Issues Caucus to honor the victims of the Baku and Sumgait 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, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 48.

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 expansion of the Majority passed under the guise of relief.

Democrats’ partisanship stands in the way of meaningful discussions about how to best
serve our constituents. The American people need Congressional action to crush 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 to include menstrual products in care packages for PCVs of all ages from loved ones back home.

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 the State House. When we approached the State House, 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 student 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. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. 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 summer workers 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 district’s 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 grandchildren. 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 critical first—but necessary first—step on the path towards 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 reinvigorating—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 on 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 Polly Ellen Trottenberg, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

Committee on Environment and Public Works
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.

Committee on Finance
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.

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.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs
To resume hearings with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations.

MARCH 18

10 a.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary, and Renu P. McKeon, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Secretary for Management and Resources, both of the Department of State.
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:

Special Report entitled “Activities of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs” (S. Rept. No. 117–1) Page S954

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.

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: Page S953

Measures Placed on the Calendar: Page S953

Executive Communications: Page 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) Page S921

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 or-
dered 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.

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 provides for 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 Lofgren, 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.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine global security challenges and strategy, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: 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., WEBEX.

Committee on the Budget: 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 Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: 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.

Select Committee on Intelligence: 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

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Health and Safety Protections for Meatpacking, Poultry, and Agricultural Workers”, 10 a.m., Webex.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on Open World, 10 a.m., Webex.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing entitled “U.S. Military Service Academies Overview”, 10:30 a.m., Webex.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Congressional Budget Office, 2 p.m., Webex.


Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The 2021 GAO High-Risk List: Blueprint for a Safer, Stronger, More Effective America”, 10:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled “COVID–19’s Effects on U.S. Aviation and the Flight Path to Recovery”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.
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., WEBEX.

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., WEBEX.

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.

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

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Congressional Record:**

| Pages of proceedings | 906 |
| Public bills enacted into law | 4 |
| Private bills enacted into law |       |
| Bills in conference |       |

Measures passed, total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures reported, total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bills</th>
<th>Joint resolutions</th>
<th>Concurrent resolutions</th>
<th>Simple resolutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quorum calls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yea-and-nay votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recorded votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bills vetoed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vetoes overridden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>Civilian nominees, totaling 90, disposed of as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed ..................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfirmed ...............................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn ...................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Civilian nominees, totaling 1, disposed of as follows:**

| Confirmed .................................................. | 1 |

**Air Force nominees, totaling 1,664, disposed of as follows:**

| Confirmed .................................................. | 48 |
| Unconfirmed ............................................... | 1,616 |

**Army nominees, totaling 2,454, disposed of as follows:**

| Confirmed .................................................. | 118 |
| Unconfirmed ............................................... | 2,336 |

**Navy nominees, totaling 124, disposed of as follows:**

| Confirmed .................................................. | 1 |
| Unconfirmed ............................................... | 123 |

**Marine Corps nominees, totaling 437, disposed of as follows:**

| Confirmed .................................................. | 69 |
| Unconfirmed ............................................... | 368 |

**Space Force nominees, totaling 984, disposed of as follows:**

| Confirmed .................................................. | 1 |
| Unconfirmed ............................................... | 983 |

**Summary**

| Total nominees carried over from the First Session | 0 |
| Total nominees received this Session | 5,754 |
| Total confirmed | 249 |
| 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 Advisers.

(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

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 Advisers.

(Senate will recess following the remarks of Senator Cruz until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)
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