



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 2021

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 3, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, You breathed life into us at creation, making humanity a little lower than the angels, crowning us with glory and honor, putting everything under our feet. What a gift.

Keep us ever mindful of the responsibility that comes with that endowment: that You desire that each and all would flourish, that everyone would be able to live into the privilege of becoming the people You designed us to be.

As You did in the beginning, send Your spirit and bring order over the chaotic waters of disputes and debate that surround us.

Shed Your light on the darkness of alienation and division and divide the tempestuous argument from the unique, meaningful, and constructive dialogue.

Remind us that You have created us in Your image, and this is what we should see reflected in the lives of the other. Whether we like them or not, whether we vote as they do or remain adamantly opposed, they, too, are Your beloved children.

And as we labor in this place, we pray that You look over our stewardship of Your gifts and call it good.

In the strength of Your divine name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GIMENEZ led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

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

SHORING UP DEMOCRACY

(Ms. BROWNLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

The limits of our democracy have been tested like never before, especially in the last election, where we saw baseless lawsuits, misinformation, attempts to suppress legal votes, a refusal by a sitting President to transfer power peacefully that resulted in an attempted insurrection aimed solely to block the will of the people.

While our system ultimately worked—thanks to patriotic State and

local officials and volunteers across the country—its limitations were laid bare, for us to fix.

H.R. 1 would shore up our democracy and the people's faith in its power.

I am pleased this bill incorporates two of my bills. The first requires all States to offer same-day registration. The second ends partisan gerrymandering by requiring States to adopt citizen redistricting commissions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" for this transformational bill that fights special interests, takes money out of politics, and puts power back in the hands of the American people.

REMEMBERING ELEANOR "SANDY" TORREY WEST

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to remember and honor Mrs. Eleanor "Sandy" Torrey West, who passed away on January 17 at the age of 108.

Mrs. West was known as a woman who embodied the spirit of Ossabaw Island, which is the third largest of Georgia's barrier islands, just south of Savannah.

She established the Ossabaw Island Project in the 1960s and the Genesis Project in the 1970s as ways to allow students, artists, writers, scientists, ecologists, philosophers, and other intellectuals and creative thinkers to reconnect with the natural world and with each other.

In the late 1970s, Mrs. West spearheaded her family's effort to ensure that Ossabaw Island would remain preserved and protected.

She was the champion of Ossabaw, and her enthusiastic, joyful spirit shined in everything she did.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1019

Throughout Mrs. West's long, prosperous life, she inspired countless individuals.

I am so thankful for her many contributions to Georgia's First District, and I know her legacy will continue for years to come.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family, friends, and all who knew her during this most difficult time.

CONSTRUCTIVELY CHANGING THE CULTURE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, to help constructively change the culture of law enforcement and strengthen the trust between police and the communities they serve.

Last summer, communities across the Nation convulsed with raw emotion after George Floyd was brutally murdered by a police officer.

His death may have been the spark, but the true force motivating these protests was the systemic racism that harms Black Americans every day.

Last June, one month after his death, this House passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, only to see it stall in the Senate.

We will vote again on the bill this week.

George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, these people and countless others should still be alive today.

We can't bring them and the others back, but we can honor their memory and, in so doing, strengthen our communities and our Nation. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

WE NEED MEANINGFUL, BIPARTISAN ELECTION REFORM

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1.

Free, fair, and transparent elections are the cornerstone of our democracy. Americans must be able to trust in the integrity of our election processes.

This bill, however, federalizes elections and takes control of elections from State and local governments.

It will grant the Federal Government unprecedented power over voting processes and pave the way for rampant fraud, abuse, and litigation.

This legislation nullifies voter I.D. laws, allows convicted felons to vote, legalizes ballot harvesting, and expands mail-in voting.

It even allows, for the first time ever, taxpayer funding of Federal campaigns, with a 6-to-1 government, taxpayer-funded match in most cases.

H.R. 1 is a cynical and partisan measure that will erode faith in our democracy and not restore it.

Every citizen should be confident that every legal vote counts. Congress has a duty to deliver election reform that honors the will of the people and the Constitution.

We need meaningful, bipartisan election reform, and I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN DONALD LAMBERT, JR.

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here to honor the life of Captain Donald Lambert, Jr.

Last weekend, the Henrico County Police Department lost one of its own.

Captain Lambert served in the Henrico Police Department for nearly 34 years, and his fellow officers remember him as a true friend, mentor, and leader.

I had the privilege of getting to know Captain Lambert through his work as the head of the Henrico Special Operations Group. Captain Lambert's security expertise helped keep me, as well as my predecessors, Congressmen Brat and Cantor, and our staffs, out of harm's way, and I am forever grateful for his dedication to his work.

Captain Lambert was a pillar of our central Virginia community. He was a dedicated member of the Henrico Police Department, but he will be remembered as a gifted musician, a beloved Sunday school teacher, and a man who demonstrated true compassion for others.

Captain Lambert's decades of selfless service to the community of Henrico and the Commonwealth of Virginia will never be forgotten.

Our hearts are with his family, friends, and fellow men and women of the Henrico County Police Department as they honor his life.

A TRAVESTY FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1.

Americans love election season. They absolutely love the endless political ads, having their phones blown up by political calls and texts, and having their email inboxes littered with solicitations from want-to-be politicians. My phone keeps ringing off the hook from all of my constituents just pleading for Congress to use their dollars to fund more campaign ads.

This is the fantasy world that government bureaucrats and career politicians who want a Federal takeover of our elections live in. They want to take Americans' money and give it to campaigns at a 6-to-1 ratio, effectively forcing you to finance political campaigns you don't support.

H.R. 1, the so-called For the People Act, weaponizes the FEC into a partisan commission and throws out commonsense voter I.D. laws, just to name a few. As one of the only Members of Congress who has actually had to implement election protocols, I speak on authority when it comes to our elections. This bill is a travesty for all Americans.

REBUILDING OUR CREDIBILITY ON THE WORLD STAGE

(Ms. JACOBS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

Mr. Speaker, I was in this very Chamber on January 6 when our democracy was attacked.

In the days following, I received texts and calls from friends and former colleagues around the world, who were working on improving democracy in places like Burma and Hungary, who were devastated about what they were seeing and how it would impact their ability to make progress around the world.

Passing H.R. 1, rebuilding trust in our democracy, is imperative for our national security.

Since January 6, countries have questioned whether they need to listen to America's calls to defend human rights or abide by the results of free and fair elections.

Our allies and partners have questioned if they should continue following our lead when it seems like other countries' autocratic systems are more capable of addressing crises.

We need to rebuild our credibility on the world stage.

Countries needn't be defined by their darkest days, but rather by how they overcome them.

The world was watching on January 6, and it is watching again today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1.

RECKLESS SWAMP FUELS FRAUD

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in an era of fake news, it is refreshing to find editorialist Jerry Bellune, editor of the Lexington County Chronicle, expose the tragic fraud being perpetrated on taxpayers:

The Washington Swamp set up criminals to steal billions of dollars through fraud.

In attempts to shovel money to the rest of us, Congress has created an opportunity for criminal fraud.

Their real victims are us, the American taxpayers, and our great-grandchildren who will be paying for this folly for generations to come.

The reality is that those who created the CARES Act set us up for up to \$100 billion in fraud. The Labor Department inspector general estimates \$63 billion in tax dollars were stolen.

As the Chronicle Tech Talk columnist Katie Ritchie has warned, scammers wooed victims to convince them to give personal information.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our sympathy to the family of Chamber of Commerce President Bill Mooneyhan.

NEED FOR RENTAL RELIEF

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of New York's renters and the far-too-many families who are struggling as a result of the coronavirus pandemic.

Hardworking New Yorkers who have lost their jobs and closed their businesses, through no fault of their own, now are struggling, too, to pay their rent.

The American Rescue Plan would provide more than \$20 billion in total for emergency rental and utility assistance. This is in addition to the \$25 billion provided in the December package.

The House took bold action last week by passing the American Rescue Plan, and I call on the Senate to pass it immediately and get it to the President's desk.

This is the lifeline our families and businesses so desperately need. Hope and health are on the way.

□ 0915

SACRIFICING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, just weeks into this administration, and after endless promises of unity, the President has issued over 40 radical executive orders, ranging from rejoining a failed climate pact to taking steps to dismantle the Nation's border security.

Governing via executive order, the administration has unilaterally launched a coordinated assault on American energy and a war on agriculture.

By revoking the Keystone XL pipeline project, the administration sent more than 10,000 skilled workers to the unemployment line, disrupted our safest and most efficient form of energy transportation, and increased the cost of transporting grain for farmers and agribusinesses.

The President also issued extremist moratoriums on new oil and gas leasing and drilling on Federal lands, which only serves to increase American reliance on foreign energy, eliminate good-paying jobs, further stifle economic growth, and drive up the cost of fuel and electricity for every American.

This backward agenda is sacrificing the energy independence achievements made by President Trump and Republicans these past 4 years. Sadly, the Biden Democrat Party energy policy is putting America last.

STOP TREATING MENTAL ILLNESS LIKE A CRIME

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, equality and justice are core values of this country, yet for Americans with mental illness, the risk of being killed when approached by law enforcement is 16 times higher. An estimated one in four fatal police encounters ends the life of an individual with mental illness.

We are not fulfilling the promise of equality and justice for Americans with mental illnesses and disabilities. That is why I introduced the Mental Health Justice Act, which would create specialized mental health first responder units. If someone is experiencing a mental health crisis, they are better served by a trained mental health professional, not a police officer.

Mental illness is not a crime, and we have to stop treating it like one. Getting the right help to individuals with mental illnesses prevents them from getting tangled up in a system that isn't built to serve their needs.

The Mental Health Justice Act makes our communities healthier and safer, more equal, and more just.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NICK WINUM

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Stanley Police Officer Nick Winum, who was tragically killed in the line of duty this weekend.

Originally a successful tomato farmer on the Eastern Shore, Officer Winum followed his calling to serve others and joined the Virginia State Police. After working for more than a decade as a State trooper, Officer Winum transitioned into the Stanley Police Department in 2016, where he served until his passing.

For the last 15 years of his life, he put the well-being of his neighbors above his own, and our community is forever grateful for the sacrifice he made while keeping our streets safe.

Officer Winum is survived by the love of his life, his wife, Cara; his children, Jedediah, Aubrey, Jackson, and Nicki; his granddaughter, Willa; as well as his parents, siblings, and 24 nieces and nephews.

He is remembered as a man of honor and principle who loved the Lord, his family, and his country.

To honor this patriot, those who knew him will continue to carry on his legacy of kindness, compassion, and service to others. I join his law enforcement colleagues in mourning his passing and extend my deepest condolences to his family.

DARK MONEY INTERESTS SQUEALING LOUDLY

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this week we will be passing H.R. 1, the For the People Act, and the dark money interests are squealing loudly about it right now.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, requires exposure of the identities of the people and companies that are the dark money that contribute hundreds of millions of dollars toward American elections, including Federal elections, in this country—people and companies that don't have to reveal who they are, what they are about, what profits they are trying to maximize, or even if they are from the United States of America. They don't have to reveal any of that.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, is to restore democracy to this country, to restore pure democracy so that we know who is paying for these elections. The dark money interests are squealing about it. They are squealing like stuck pigs. Let's pass H.R. 1.

REMEMBERING PEGGY SADLER

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

Mr. GARCÍA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of my dear friend, Peggy Sadler, who is now with the Lord.

Peggy and her husband, David, met while attending the University of California-Santa Barbara. In the mid-1960s, they moved to the beautiful Simi Valley. David passed away last year as well, so they are now reunited in Heaven.

Peggy was the mother of two children, Robert and Leslie. She was a tireless public servant for over 40 years, supporting local public leaders and volunteering throughout the community. Peggy spent her retirement helping raise her grandchildren and great-grandchildren, serving as a docent at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library and Museum, and serving her community as a volunteer at her local church.

I am grateful for the friendship that Peggy and I shared. The city of Simi Valley is a better place because of Peggy Sadler. May we all pray for her family, and may God bless Ms. Peggy Sadler.

MAKING OUR DEMOCRACY MORE ACCESSIBLE

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

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

As a former voting rights attorney, I have seen firsthand the devastation on the faces of Americans when they are denied their ability to make their voice heard in our elections because they missed an arbitrary deadline or have shown up to their old polling place. It is heartbreaking, and it is not who we are as a nation.

With today's vote on the For the People Act, we, as a Congress, have an opportunity to affirmatively expand access to voting. This bill would do so by allowing for automatic and same-day voter registration and establishing a national early voting period, while also enacting key reforms that will make our elections more secure and that will ensure Americans and only Americans take part in them.

I am proud that two bills that I introduced, the Know Your Polling Place Act and the Shell Company Abuse Act, which would make our democracy more accessible and more secure, are included in today's bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to return political power to everyday Americans and to vote for this legislation.

REQUIRING VOTER ID STRENGTHENS ELECTION INTEGRITY

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

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1 because it violates the U.S. Constitution. It usurps the rights of States to establish and administer their own elections.

As we speak, Georgia lawmakers are working to make smart and targeted reforms to Georgia's election laws, like picture identification for absentee voting. Such reforms are critically important.

H.R. 1 would not only nullify Georgia lawmakers' efforts, but it would also mandate that all States provide no-excuse absentee voting with absolutely zero safeguards.

I read the bill to see what I needed to do to obtain and cast an absentee ballot under H.R. 1. I was shocked to learn I needed nothing: no witness signature, no picture identification. Nothing is required.

Just tell that to TSA the next time you try to get on an airplane, or to your local gun dealer when you try to buy a gun. In fact, if we are going to eliminate a valid government-issued photo ID for constitutional voting rights, then let's eliminate the need for photo ID to exercise your Second Amendment too.

The hypocrisy by the liberal left to eliminate voter ID is stunning. Trust starts by States taking steps to verify that all votes are legal and cast by eligible voters. That is why we must

verify citizenship and require picture identification.

I commend our Georgia lawmakers for strengthening the integrity of our Georgia elections, and I am proud to support those efforts by voting "no" on the Federal takeover of elections.

PUTTING THE FIX IN FUTURE ELECTIONS

(Mrs. MILLER of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, what should be named the for the politicians act. There is nothing in this bill that is for the people.

I could spend hours highlighting the damaging aspects of this bill, but let's start with eliminating voter ID. Americans need an ID to drive, to get married, to get on an airplane, even to buy cold medicine, but to take part in the foundational component of our Republic? Apparently, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think eliminating any proof of who you are is for the people. It is not. It is for the politicians.

Then we have taxpayer-funded campaigns. H.R. 1 would implement a 6-to-1 match for small-donor contributions up to \$200 in a congressional or Presidential campaign. The people of Illinois' 15th District shouldn't be forced to fund the campaigns of people they vehemently disagree with.

The November election made it readily apparent that our election system needs fixing. This bill just puts the fix in future elections.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF JOSEPH CORR

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life and memory of New Hartford, New York Police Officer Joseph Corr. Fifteen years ago last month, Officer Corr was shot and killed in the line of duty while in pursuit of a robbery suspect.

Joe Corr, who was born and raised in my hometown of New Hartford, New York, was a dedicated father to Kaitlyn, a loving husband to Tracie, and a hero who served and protected our community with honor.

Today, the Officer Joseph D. Corr Foundation proudly honors Joe's memory and gives back to his fellow members in blue by supporting other families who have experienced similar tragedies. His parents, Dave and Kathleen, continue to provide their love and counsel to those families as well.

Officer Corr's death is a sad reminder of the dangers our brave men and women face each day in the line of duty. These heroes deserve our unwavering respect for the sacrifices that they make each and every day to keep our communities safe.

USING TAX DOLLARS TO FUND CAMPAIGNS IS WRONG

(Ms. MALLIOTAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 shamefully allows candidates for Congress to use tax dollars to fund campaigns with a \$6 match for every \$1 raised. Any normal person would call this a form of embezzlement.

Tax dollars are supposed to be used to maintain our transportation infrastructure, fund our schools, and keep the public safe, not to fund campaigns.

As a representative from New York City, which has public financing of campaigns, and as a former candidate for mayor, I can tell you that it does nothing to take big money out of politics, and it does nothing to level the playing field. Bill de Blasio still received big donations bundled by lobbyists and special interests, and I would have still been outspent 4 to 1 with or without matching funds.

Using taxpayer money to fund political campaigns is not only wrong; it is an abuse of taxpayers and has led to more corruption. Multiple candidates and elected officials in New York City were convicted for exploiting the system and developing schemes to illegally pad their campaigns with taxpayer money.

Additionally, at a time when so many Americans question the integrity of our election system and are looking for safeguards to protect their vote, this bill bans States from having voter ID and implements same-day voter registration, which does not give election boards the proper time to ensure individuals' eligibility and further erodes the public trust.

Instead of this ridiculous bill, we should be adopting the Save Democracy Act and restoring the trust and integrity of our election system.

□ 0930

RADICAL PATH OF DEMOCRATS

(Mrs. GREENE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform Democrats that the radical path you are taking will cause you to lose in 2022.

The American people are shocked at what you are doing and running through this House of Representatives. Passing a bill of \$1.9 trillion that spends less than 9 percent on COVID relief is shameful. Passing the inequality act, which destroys women's rights, religious freedoms; puts men in our little girls' bathrooms, locker rooms, and on sports teams is unforgivable.

Trying to pass what I call the Democrats' hate police bill, H.R. 1280—which puts police on Biden's hit list and allows police to be targets, also gets rid of qualified immunity, opening them up to be sued every time a criminal is offended and gets their feelings hurt—

is reckless and dangerous for our police.

Mr. Speaker, because of H.R. 1, which is a federalization of our elections, I also, today, will make a motion to adjourn so that Democrats can think a little bit harder.

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

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 222, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—182

Aderholt Gaetz Malliotakis
 Allen Garbarino Mann
 Armstrong Garcia (CA) Massie
 Arrington Gibbs Mast
 Babin Gimenez McCarthy
 Baird Gohmert McClain
 Balderson Gonzales, Tony McClintock
 Barr Gonzalez (OH) McHenry
 Bentz Good (VA) Meijer
 Bergman Gooden (TX) Meuser
 Bice (OK) Gosar Miller (WV)
 Biggs Graves (LA) Moolenaar
 Bilirakis Graves (MO) Moore (AL)
 Bishop (NC) Greene (GA) Mullin
 Boebert Griffith Nehls
 Bost Grothman Newhouse
 Brooks Guest Norman
 Buchanan Guthrie Nunes
 Budd Hagedorn Obernolte
 Burchett Harris Owens
 Burgess Harshbarger Palazzo
 Calvert Hartzler Palmer
 Cammack Hern Pence
 Carl Herrell Perry
 Carter (GA) Herrera Beutler Pfluger
 Carter (TX) Hice (GA) Posey
 Chabot Higgins (LA) Reed
 Cline Hill Reschenthaler
 Cloud Hinson Rodgers (WA)
 Clyde Hollingsworth Rogers (AL)
 Cole Hudson Rogers (KY)
 Comer Huizenga Rose
 Crawford Jackson Rosendale
 Crenshaw Jacobs (NY) Rouzer
 Curtis Johnson (LA) Roy
 Davidson Johnson (OH) Salazar
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (SD) Scalise
 DesJarlais Jordan Schweikert
 Diaz-Balart Joyce (PA) Scott, Austin
 Donalds Katko Sessions
 Duncan Keller Smith (MO)
 Dunn Kelly (MS) Smith (NE)
 Emmer Kelly (PA) Snuckler
 Estes Kim (CA) Spartz
 Fallon Kustoff Stauber
 Feenstra LaHood Steel
 Ferguson LaMalfa Stefanik
 Fischbach Lamborn Steil
 Fitzgerald Latta Steube
 Fitzpatrick LaTurner Stewart
 Fleischmann Lesko Stivers
 Fortenberry Long Taylor
 Foxx Loudermilk Tenney
 Franklin, C. Lucas Thompson (PA)
 Scott Luetkemeyer Tiffany
 Fulcher Mace Timmons

Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Drew
 Van Duyne

Adams
 Aguilar
 Allred
 Amodei
 Auchincloss
 Axne
 Bacon
 Banks
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Bourdeaux
 Bowman
 Brown
 Brownley
 Bush
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Carabajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson
 Cartwright
 Case
 Casten
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Cheney
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Courtney
 Craig
 Crow
 Cuellar
 Davids (KS)
 Davis, Danny K.
 Dean
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DeBene
 Delgado
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Escobar
 Eshoo
 Espaillat
 Evans
 Fletcher
 Foster
 Frankel, Lois
 Gallagher
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia (IL)
 García (TX)
 Golden
 Gomez
 Gonzalez,
 Vicente

Barragán
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Cawthorn
 Costa
 Crist
 DeFazio

Wagner
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)

NAYS—222

Gottheimer
 Granger
 Green, Al (TX)
 Grijalva
 Haaland
 Harder (CA)
 Hastings
 Hayes
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Horsford
 Houlihan
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jacobs (CA)
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Jones
 Joyce (OH)
 Kabele
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim (NJ)
 Kind
 Kinzinger
 Kirkpatrick
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Leger Fernandez
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lieu
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Luria
 Malinowski
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Manning
 Matsui
 McBath
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McKinley
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Miller-Meeks
 Moore (UT)
 Moore (WI)
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mrvan
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (NC)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Newman
 Norcross

NOT VOTING—27

Fudge
 Green (TN)
 Johnson (TX)
 Kelly (IL)
 Larsen (WA)
 Lynch
 McCaul
 Mfume
 Miller (IL)
 Mooney

Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams (TX)
 Wilson (SC)
 Zeldin

O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Ross
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Rush
 Rutherford
 Ryan
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Suozzi
 Swalwell
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Trahan
 Underwood
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Walberg
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Weston
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL)
 Womack

Messrs. SCHNEIDER, SHERMAN, GARAMENDI, O'HALLERAN, and MORELLE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. BOEBERT and Mr. LAMALFA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, due to an unforeseen recorded vote, I was unable to leave a previously scheduled engagement. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 56.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 3, 2021, I was not able to make the recorded vote below. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 56.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform you that I was unable to be present for the vote for the motion to adjourn today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 56.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to clarify my position on the Motion to Adjourn considered on the floor this morning.

I support full consideration of the For the People Act and the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. I was unable to vote this morning. Had I been present, I would have voted: nay, on rollcall No. 56.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Buchanan (LaHood)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Neguse (Perlmutter)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Langevin (Lynch)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lieu (Beyer) Lowenthal (Beyer)	Pingree (Kuster) Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Meng (Clark (MA))	Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Gaetz (McHenry)	Moore (WI) (Beyer)	Ruiz (Aguilar) Rush
Grijalva (García (IL))	Moulton (McGovern)	(Underwood) Speier (Scanlon)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Nadler (Jeffries)	Vargas (Correa)
Huffman (McNerney)	Napolitano (Correa)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
		Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further 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, will now resume. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 117-9.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 4208.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to offer an amendment to remove section 4208 from H.R. 1.

Section 4208 is a dangerous provision of this bill that will put people's private information on display and put their personal security at risk.

This section aims to forbid anonymous speech. Throughout American history, anonymous speech about political matters has played a vital role. From the Federalist Papers, to those who supported the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, many in history had very legitimate fears of having their identities uncovered and relied on anonymous speech to show their support for certain policies and initiatives.

Section 4208 removes the protection of anonymous speech forever. By requiring public reporting of the private information of individuals, partnerships, associations, and any group of people who spend \$500 or more on political advertising—which is a very broad definition in this bill—we put individuals at risk.

Furthermore, we drastically limit free speech and destroy the First Amendment. Notably, the courts have already begun to warn against the constitutionality of similar provisions in State law. We cannot allow this to stand. Not only will it cause a security problem for these individuals but, as we have seen, people could lose their jobs, be shamed, or even worse.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding, and I am proud to support her amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the so-called For the People Act a/k/a the for the politicians act. Supporters of this bill claim that it is the fix needed for the problems within our Nation's electoral system, but in reality this bill is a power grab that will blur the lines between official and campaign resources and leave taxpayers footing the bill.

It is shameful that this body is even considering this legislation that forces hardworking Americans amid an unprecedented crisis to give politicians money. H.R. 1 would funnel millions of taxpayer dollars into the campaign accounts of politicians through voucher and funding match programs. This bill will allow 16-year-olds to vote, give \$25 vouchers to individuals to donate to the candidate of their choice, redefines

free speech, triggers universal mail-in ballots, creates an election czar, strips voter ID requirements, and so much more.

This bill jeopardizes the future of Americans' freedom of speech with new requirements for public disclosure of support of political campaigns and candidates.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot claim to be protecting the rights and freedoms enshrined in our Constitution when this, the For the People Act—more aptly named the for the politicians act—is under consideration.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's amendment, and I will be supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the underlying bill, the "destroy election integrity and centralize all power in Washington, D.C., act" that Democrats are, once again, pushing because they never have and never will believe in the rights of our States and the limited power of Federal Government.

Some of my colleagues who took every opportunity to emphasize that democracy was on the ballot in this past election have returned to Congress eager to change election laws in their favor.

H.R. 1 is wholly about control—control of free speech and control of how elections are conducted. And when they exercise this control, their purpose is to crush opposing views, because opposing views will not be tolerated when there are Democrat majorities at stake.

America's strength lies in its free speech and decentralized elections, and we must continue to make our election system more resilient to natural challenges and foreign actors. H.R. 1 fails to do this on all fronts.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected by the people of the 24th District of Texas to stand up for freedom, the rule of law, and limited government. I urge my colleagues to vote against this vile new form of tyranny in H.R. 1.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with this amendment. It would strike section 4208 of H.R. 1 which requires online platforms to retain records of certain online political advertisements. According to Forbes magazine, political advertisers spent \$1.6 billion online in the 2020 election—almost 10 times what they spent in 2012.

At a time when Americans are increasingly bombarded with political ads online, striking this provision is not useful and would harm the efforts

of this bill to provide increased transparency in political advertising. Fundamentally, Americans deserve to know who is paying for online political ads to ensure that they are informed voters.

Digital advertising can also have a far greater reach than broadcast advertising. Online political ads are relatively inexpensive to produce and can be disseminated instantly to vast audiences across great distances without regard to geographic boundaries. It is time for our disclosure and disclaimer laws and regulations to be updated to reflect how campaigns are run in the 21st century and how to keep pace with changing technology.

The online platform records requirements in this section are key to the Honest Ads Act, which is a part of H.R. 1, designed to improve transparency in political advertising. By requiring online platforms to retain copies of political ads, everyday Americans at home will be able to see who is paying for what. These requirements are narrowly drawn and only apply to online platforms with over 50 million monthly unique visitors and to advertisers who run over \$500 a year in political advertisements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the measure and protect this important reform.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the insurrection on January 6 had a specific purpose: to overturn our election and to violently disenfranchise millions of voters.

The immediate threat to the Capitol has been quelled, but our democracy's future is still unclear. Across the country there are ongoing efforts to suppress and limit votes. Dark money fuels campaigns without transparency and accountability, and partisan gerrymandering tilts the playing field.

A vote for H.R. 1 is a vote for equality, for transparency, and for returning power to the people.

Mr. Speaker, 56 years ago on March 7, John Lewis almost lost his life on the Edmund Pettus Bridge for the right to vote. He said: "Your vote is precious, almost sacred. It is the most powerful, nonviolent tool we have to create a more perfect union."

Let's strive for that more perfect union. Let's confirm our democracy and vote "yes" on H.R. 1.

□ 1045

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would just note that the late Justice Scalia, who was not exactly one of our liberal beacons on the Court, said this: "Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposes to knock out the

heart of the Honest Ads Act, so the public won't know who is purchasing ads online. That is the exact opposite of what we need to be doing. We need far greater transparency about who is polluting the airwaves and who is polluting the internet with propaganda and fake news. We should know who is paying for all of that.

This used to be a very solid bipartisan commitment between Democrats and Republicans. Everybody agreed there should at least be disclosure of campaign spending.

Now, they not only want to put out propaganda online, but they don't even want anybody to know who is paying for it. That is the opposite direction that we should be moving in America.

We should be defending everybody's right to vote, everybody's right to participate against all of the schemes to undermine voting rights, and we should make sure that everybody knows who is putting money into the political system.

I urge a "no" vote on that amendment.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, in Florida, we have strong redistricting standards that were passed by a large majority of Florida voters and placed in our State constitution.

I also recognize that strong standards and criteria are provided for in H.R. 1.

Would the chairperson agree to working together with the State-adopted redistricting criteria to ensure H.R. 1 does not dilute the Florida requirements?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to work with the gentlewoman as this bill advances towards enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I would urge a "no" vote on the Lesko amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 117-9.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 88, after line 8, insert the following:
SEC. 1055. LOWERING MANDATORY MINIMUM VOTING AGE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) LOWERING VOTING AGE TO 16 YEARS OF AGE.—A State may not refuse to permit an

individual to register to vote or vote in an election for Federal office held in the State on the grounds of the individual's age if the individual will be at least 16 years of age on the date of the election.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2022 or any succeeding year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

H.R. 1 is bold, transformative legislation, which fights voter suppression, promotes access to the ballot, cracks down on money in politics, and provides transparency to the American people.

Passing this bill has never been more urgent. We must act to protect and preserve our democracy.

My amendment gets to the heart of H.R. 1 and recognizes the contributions that young people continue to make to our democracy.

By lowering the Federal voting age from 18 to 16 years of age, my amendment would enfranchise young Americans to help shape and form the policies that will set the course for our future.

From police violence, to immigration reform, to climate change, to the future of work and the minimum wage, our young people are organizing, mobilizing, and calling us to action. They are at the forefront of social movements and have more than earned inclusion in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, 16- and 17-year-old constituents of mine are supporting their families. They are working, not for enrichment or to build a resume, but because they have no choice. They are attending school full-time and taking care of loved ones in the midst of the COVID crisis.

Young people are contributing both to the labor force and their local economies by paying taxes, and yet they are deprived of the opportunity to exercise their right to vote.

Some have questioned the maturity of our youth. I don't.

Sixteen- and 17-year-olds today possess wisdom and maturity defined by today's challenges, hardships, and opportunities.

They deserve and demand a government that is accountable to them, a government that values their voices, and understands the depth and breadth of their lived experience.

They are not a monolith. But they are nation-builders, living through a global pandemic, confronting racial injustice, and rebuilding our democracy.

Now is the time for us to meet the moment and enfranchise 16- and 17-year-olds.

I would like to thank my colleagues and dear friends, Representatives MENG

and SCHAKOWSKY, for their leadership on this issue and for cosponsoring my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my friend, AYANNA PRESSLEY, the wonderful congresswoman from Massachusetts. I have had the pleasure of knowing AYANNA PRESSLEY well before she was even 16, and she was ready to vote as soon as that.

I want to say that all over the country, and especially in my district, I feel we see young people, young activists, who are working tirelessly to make their voices heard, from battling climate change, battling gun violence, to advocating for racial justice and economic equality.

This is their century, and our national leadership should be accountable to them, to these young people in their generation who will be most impacted by the existential threats that are looming before us today.

This is a serious proposal. Sixteen-year-olds are doing the work of adults, and they should be treated with the respect that they deserve and the participation that they should be able to have.

So I heartily support this amendment and urge my colleagues to consider it carefully and vote for it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), my good friend.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces serious challenges, including an ongoing pandemic, vaccine distribution hurdles, continued lockdowns from out-of-touch Governors, prolonged closures of our schools, and one-in-four small businesses face the risk of permanent closure.

At a time when the American people are concerned with election integrity, a top priority of our Democrat leadership is to federalize election laws, removing the authority of State legislatures expressed in Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution.

H.R. 1, the bill before us today, would allow for taxpayer-funded campaigns through a government match on political contributions at a 6-to-1 ratio. So a \$200 contribution would be matched by the taxpayer to the tune of \$1,200.

H.R. 1 would also hinder the rights of States to determine their registration voting practices, including mandating automatic voter registration.

The suggestion being made by my Democrat friends and colleagues that opposition to this legislation is somehow a form of voter suppression is ridiculous. I and my colleagues would never consider engaging in a course of

action that suppresses a citizen's legitimate right to vote.

This is a partisan power grab that threatens election integrity. "One citizen, one vote" is my solemn resolve. I oppose this amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me rise to support the Pressley-Meng-Schakowsky amendment. I thank Congresswoman PRESSLEY for bringing this forward and to say that she is about the future and really about making sure that civic participation is really enhanced and moved forward by allowing for this amendment to come into this bill, H.R. 1, because this is what it is about. It is about our democracy, and she has been consistent in terms of inclusion and making sure our democracy works.

Elections are about the future, and no one has more at stake in that future than our youth. By age 16, we trust our young people with a host of important decisions and responsibilities. It is the moment when lifelong habits are built and when ideas about the world become to be fixed. Evidence has shown that when people start voting younger, they are more likely to exercise their right to vote as they grow older.

Too many of the arguments against lowering the voting age to 16 crumble when you really examine them clearly. Often the objection is simply that 16-year-olds are too young to exercise good judgment. This is really a patronizing thought. In fact, it is downright scary to think that we would have our government policies decide what constitutes as wisdom for our young people.

It is past time for us to elevate voting as one of the central responsibilities of our democracy. I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), my good friend.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment en bloc No. 4 and the underlying bill.

I have a long list of concerns with this bill, and at the top of this list is nationwide ballot harvesting.

Democrats in California have already legalized ballot harvesting in our State. Despite our concerns with the practice, Republicans were determined to play by the rules and utilized legal ballot collection methods in the last election.

One amendment in this package, offered by my California colleague, puts this hypocrisy on full display. Under current law, with my colleague's amendment, a foreign operative—maybe a Russian operative, maybe a Chinese spy—could still handle ballots for untold numbers of people. My colleague's amendment is a blatant attempt to criticize ballot harvesting only when the other guys do it.

In other words, California Democrats think it is fine when their paid operatives collect ballots from strangers and throw them in a bag. But they object when churches try to collect them for members of their congregation and put them in a box.

Don't be fooled. Democrats don't want to facilitate ballot collection for all Americans. They just want to make it easier for their operatives to harvest ballots and will cry foul whenever Republicans try to play by the same rules.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I stand in this Chamber today thanks to the young people of Westchester and Rockland Counties.

When I first ran for Congress, I was joined by a small group of young, committed volunteers. Many of them were not eligible to vote. Many of them were 16 and 17 years old. And my goodness, did they know more about policy and national politics than people who are four and five times their senior.

In this country, when you are 16 and 17 years old, we charge you as an adult in the courtroom. You are able to drive to the job we expect you to work in order to help support your family. So I think that the least we can do is give 16- and 17-year-olds a say in who governs them.

□ 1100

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), another great friend.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution vests primary responsibility in State legislatures to set the times, places, and manner of congressional elections, allowing States and localities to determine how best to conduct elections that suit the needs of voters in their communities.

But the bill before us today, and this amendment also, reverses the long-standing history of State control over the electoral process, makes unconstitutional changes to our election laws through a top-down Federal power grab, and places unprecedented limitations on political speech.

Rather than strengthening the election process by working with Republicans to find bipartisan solutions, H.R. 1 was written without any input from Republican Members. Some of the most egregious provisions include mandating that States allow ballot harvesting, mandating same-day registration in all 50 States, abolishing the signature requirements for mail-in ballots, mandating absentee ballots be accepted up to 10 days after election day, mandating that States send ballots in the mail proactively, and, finally, forcing taxpayers to pay politicians to campaign for office.

This bill is nothing more than an attempt by Democrats to cement their fragile and fleeting majorities at taxpayer expense.

The bill would limit the free speech of my voters, use my voters' tax dollars to fund candidates, and violate the Constitution by superseding the Commonwealth's ability to determine their own laws on voter eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this misguided and radical legislation.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, we must do right by the young organizers and activists who have fought for our democracy. They have a stake in our democracy, and they deserve to have a stake at the ballot box.

Civil rights heroes like the late John Lewis taught us through example that no one is too young to fight for access to the ballot. In fact, he supported this very amendment last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), a mediocre friend, not a great friend.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, after a divisive election season, allegations of election fraud, objections to the electoral college, and impeachment, a friend of mine on the other side of the aisle recently asked what it would take to unify our country. My answer is that it is certainly not this legislation which, from my standpoint, is the most divisive, unconstitutional, and destructive piece of legislation in my time in Congress.

They call it the For the People Act, but it should be called the for the politicians act because it would force taxpayers to fund political campaigns, including the campaigns of politicians with whom those taxpayers disagree.

Maybe a better name would be the election power grab act because it would normalize the chaos, uncertainty, and irregularities surrounding mail-in voting in the 2020 election by centralizing the administration of elections in Washington, D.C., commandeering States to permanently expand mail-in voting without safeguards, legalize ballot harvesting, disregard voter ID laws, permit same-day voter registration without citizenship verification, among other egregious measures.

Mr. Speaker, election laws should make it easy to vote and hard to cheat. This bill would not only make it easy to cheat, but it would also effectively make it legal to cheat.

At a time when half of Americans have lost confidence in the integrity of our elections, this bill will only drive distrust and division higher.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of ending division in our country, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this power grab of our elections.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON), another mediocre friend.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I have only been here 2 months, and in that

time, I have seen some bad legislation. To date, this is one of the worst that I have seen.

The age of consent has always coincided with the franchise. For nearly 200 years, it was 21. Then, in the 1970s, they changed it to 18. Our society has agreed since then, for 50 years, that 18 is when a child becomes an adult. I find it interesting that our friends across the aisle don't want to have 16- and 17-year-olds tried as adults when they commit violent adult crimes, yet they want those 16- and 17-year-olds to have the franchise. Some even, believe it or not, want 16- and 17-year-olds who are convicted of murder to be able to vote while they are in prison after they have been convicted.

Mr. Speaker, this is a horrible amendment, and I respectfully request that all of our Members join us in voting "no."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 179, I rise to offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56, printed in part B of House Report 117-9, offered by Ms. LOFGREN of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER OF VIRGINIA

Add at the end of subtitle B of title VII the following:

SEC. 7105. DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR MATERIALS POSTED ON ONLINE PLATFORMS BY AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS ON BEHALF OF CLIENTS.

(a) METHOD AND FORM OF DISCLAIMER; PRESERVATION OF DISCLAIMERS BY CERTAIN SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS DESCRIBED.—Section 4(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 614(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking "(b) It shall be unlawful" and inserting "(b)(1) It shall be unlawful"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) In the case of informational materials for or in the interests of a foreign principal

which are transmitted or caused to be transmitted by an agent of a foreign principal by posting on an online platform, the agent shall ensure that the conspicuous statement required to be placed in such materials under this subsection is placed directly with the material posted on the platform and is not accessible only through a hyperlink or other reference to another source.

"(3) If the Attorney General determines that the application of paragraph (2) to materials posted on an online platform is not feasible because the length of the conspicuous statement required to be placed in materials under this subsection makes the inclusion of the entire statement incompatible with the posting of the materials on that platform, an agent may meet the requirements of paragraph (2) by ensuring that an abbreviated version of the statement, stating that the materials are distributed by a foreign agent on behalf of a clearly identified foreign principal, is placed directly with the material posted on the platform.

"(4) An online platform on which informational materials described in paragraph (2) are posted shall ensure that the conspicuous statement described in such paragraph (or, if applicable, the abbreviated statement described in paragraph (3)) is maintained with such materials at all times, including after the material is shared in a social media post on the platform, but only if the platform has 50,000,000 or more unique monthly United States visitors or users for a majority of months during the 12 months preceding the dissemination of the materials."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to materials disseminated on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether or not the Attorney General has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments prior to the expiration of such period.

(b) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS TO PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(b)(1) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 614(b)(1)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by striking "any person within the United States" and inserting "any person".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to materials disseminated on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether or not the Attorney General has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments prior to the expiration of such period.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS DISSEMINATING INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS TRANSMITTED BY AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 614) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) If the Attorney General determines that an agent of a foreign principal transmitted or caused to be transmitted informational materials on an online platform for or in the interests of the foreign principal and did not meet the requirements of subsection (b)(2) (relating to the conspicuous statement required to be placed in such materials)—

"(1) the Attorney General shall notify the online platform; and

"(2) the online platform shall remove such materials and use reasonable efforts to inform recipients of such materials that the materials were disseminated by a foreign agent on behalf of a foreign principal."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to materials disseminated on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which be-

gins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DEFINITION.—Section 1 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 611) is amended by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(j) The term 'online platform' means any public-facing website, web application, or digital application (including a social network, ad network, or search engine)."

SEC. 7106. CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS WHO ENGAGE WITH THE UNITED STATES IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES FOR A FOREIGN PRINCIPAL IN ANY PLACE AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS.

Section 1(c)(1)(i) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(c)(1)(i)) is amended by inserting after "United States" the following: "(whether within or outside of the United States)".

SEC. 7107. ANALYSIS AND REPORT ON CHALLENGES TO ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938.

(a) ANALYSIS.—The Attorney General shall conduct an analysis of the legal, policy, and procedural challenges to the effective enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the analysis conducted under subsection (a), and shall include in the report such recommendations, including recommendations for revisions to the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as the Attorney General considers appropriate to promote the effective enforcement of such Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 476, strike lines 5 through 9 and insert the following:

"(B) a description of the audience targeted by the advertisement, the number of views generated from the advertisement, the number of views by unique individuals generated by the advertisement, the number of times the advertisement was shared, and the date and time that the advertisement is first displayed and last displayed."

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 50, line 14, strike "and" at then end.

Page 50, line 20, insert "and" at the end.

Page 50, after line 20, insert the following:

(G) an explanation of what information the State and local election officials maintain with respect to an individual voter registration status for purposes of elections for Federal office in the State, how that information is shared or sold and with whom, what information is automatically kept confidential, what information is needed to access voter information online, and what privacy programs are available, such as those described in section 1055;

Page 88, after line 8 insert the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1055. REQUIRING STATES TO ESTABLISH AND OPERATE VOTER PRIVACY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall establish and operate a privacy program to enable victims of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, and trafficking to have personally identifiable information that the State or local election officials maintain with respect to an individual voter registration status for purposes of elections for Federal office in the State, including addresses, be kept confidential.

(b) NOTICE.—Each State shall notify residents of that State of the information that

State and local election officials maintain with respect to an individual voter registration status for purposes of elections for Federal office in the State, how that information is shared or sold and with whom, what information is automatically kept confidential, what information is needed to access voter information online, and the privacy programs that are available.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each State shall make information about the program established under subsection (a) available on a publicly accessible website.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The terms “domestic violence”, “stalking”, “sexual assault”, and “dating violence” have the meanings given such terms in section 4002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291).

(2) The term “trafficking” means an act or practice described in paragraph (11) or (12) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 666, insert after line 2 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

SECTION 6010. EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR OFFENSES UNDER FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.

(a) CIVIL OFFENSES.—Section 309(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

“(10) No person shall be subject to a civil penalty under this subsection with respect to a violation of this Act unless a complaint is filed with the Commission with respect to the violation under paragraph (1), or the Commission responds to information with respect to the violation which is ascertained in the normal course of carrying out its supervisory responsibilities under paragraph (2), not later than 15 years after the date on which the violation occurred.”

(b) CRIMINAL OFFENSES.—Section 406(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30145(a)) is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “10 years”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to violations occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 154, beginning line 2, strike “at least one voting system” and insert “a sufficient number, but at least one, of voting systems, as determined by the Commission in consultation with the United States Access Board and the National Institute of Standards and Technology”.

Page 154, beginning line 3, strike “for individuals with disabilities” and insert “to serve individuals with and without disabilities”.

Page 154, beginning line 7, strike “at each polling place” and insert “for all in person voting options”.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 223, line 18, insert “, without being subjected to intimidation or deceptive practices,” after “vote”.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 129, line 8, insert “, including by operating a polling place or ballot box that falsely purports to be an official location established for such an election by a unit of government” before the period.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 220, line 20, strike “clause” and insert “clause, and shall include on the institu-

tion’s website and boost awareness on the institution’s social media platforms.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 94, insert after line 25 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

(c) PRIORITY FOR SCHOOLS RECEIVING TITLE I FUNDS.—In selecting among eligible local educational agencies for receiving funds under the pilot program under this part, the Commission shall give priority to local educational agencies that receive funds under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq).

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 79, insert after line 9 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

“(c) ENSURING AVAILABILITY OF FORMS.—The State shall ensure that each polling place has copies of any forms an individual may be required to complete in order to register to vote or revise the individual’s voter registration information under this section.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 248, line 15, strike the closing quotation mark and the second period.

Page 248, insert after line 15 the following:

“(c) MINIMUM HOURS OF OPERATION OUTSIDE OF TYPICAL WORKING HOURS.—Each State shall establish hours of operation for all polling places in the State on the date of any election for Federal office held in the State such that no polling place is open for less than a total of 4 hours outside of the hours between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm in time zone in which the polling place is located.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 548, strike lines 3 through 12 and insert the following:

(c) STUDY AND REPORT ON IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF VOUCHER PROGRAMS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Federal Election Commission shall conduct a study on the efficacy of political voucher programs, including the program under this part and other similar programs, in expanding and diversifying the pool of individuals who participate in the electoral process, including those who participate as donors and those who participate as candidates.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish and submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), and shall include in the report such recommendations as the Commission considers appropriate which would enable political voucher programs to be implemented on a national scale.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 255, after line 16, insert the following:
SEC. 1909. GAO STUDY ON VOTER TURNOUT RATES.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on voter turnout rates delineated by age in States and localities that permit voters to participate in elections before reaching the age of 18, with a focus on localities that permit voting upon reaching the age of 16.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 255, insert before line 17, the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1909. STUDY ON RANKED-CHOICE VOTING.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study on the implementation and

impact of ranked-choice voting in States and localities with a focus on how to best implement a model for Federal elections nationwide. The study shall include the impact on voter turnout, negative campaigning, and who decides to run for office.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Comptroller General shall transmit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations on how to best implement a ranked-choice voting for Federal elections nationwide.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. UNDERWOOD OF ILLINOIS

In section 542(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 5111 of the bill—

(1) strike “and” at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) redesignate subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(3) insert after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

(E) the extent to which the program increased opportunities for participation by candidates of diverse racial, gender, and socio-economic backgrounds; and

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

On page 124, line 1, strike “criminal penalties” and insert “criminal, civil, or other legal penalties”.

On page 128, line 17, strike “criminal penalties” and insert “criminal, civil, or other legal penalties”.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. WILLIAMS OF GEORGIA

Page 88, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1055. INCLUSION OF VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION WITH CERTAIN LEASES AND VOUCHERS FOR FEDERALLY ASSISTED RENTAL HOUSING AND MORTGAGE APPLICATIONS.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM STATEMENT.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in coordination with the Election Assistance Commission, shall develop a uniform statement designed to provide recipients of such statement pursuant to this section of how they can register to vote and their voting rights under law.

(b) LEASES AND VOUCHERS FOR FEDERALLY ASSISTED RENTAL HOUSING.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall require—

(1) each public housing agency to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) to each lessee of a dwelling unit in public housing administered by such agency—

(A) together with the lease for such a dwelling unit, at the same time such lease is provided to the lessee; and

(B) together with any income verification form, at the same time such form is provided to the lessee;

(2) each public housing agency that administers rental assistance under the Housing Choice Voucher program under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), including the program under paragraph (13) of such section 8(o), to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) to each assisted family or individual—

(A) together with the voucher for such assistance, at the time such voucher is issued for such family or individual; and

(B) together with any income verification form, at the same time such form is provided to the applicant or assisted family or individual; and

(3) each owner of a dwelling unit assisted with Federal project-based rental assistance

to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) to provide to the lessee of such dwelling unit—

(A) together with the lease for such dwelling unit, at the same time such form is provided to the lessee; and

(B) together with any income verification form, at the same time such form is provided to the applicant or tenant;

except that the Secretary of Agriculture shall administer the requirement under this paragraph with respect to Federal project-based rental assistance specified in subsection (e)(1)(D),

(c) APPLICATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall require each creditor that receives an application (within the meaning of such term as used in the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691)) for a residential mortgage loan to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) in written form to the applicant for such residential mortgage loan, within 5 business days of the date of application.

(d) OPTIONAL COMPLETION OF APPLICATION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require any individual to complete an application for voter registration.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) FEDERAL PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—The term “Federal project-based rental assistance” means project-based rental assistance provided under—

(A) section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f);

(B) section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q);

(C) section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013);

(D) title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.), including voucher assistance under section 542 of such title (42 U.S.C. 1490r);

(E) subtitle D of title VIII of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.);

(F) title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.);

(G) the Housing Trust Fund program under section 1338 of the federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4588); or

(H) subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.).

(2) OWNER.—The term “owner” has the meaning given such term in section 8(f) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(f)).

(3) PUBLIC HOUSING; PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY.—The terms “public housing” and “public housing agency” have the meanings given such terms in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)).

(4) RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOAN.—The term “residential mortgage loan” includes any loan which is secured by a first or subordinate lien on residential real property (including individual units of condominiums and cooperatives) designed principally for the occupancy of from 1- to 4- families.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau may issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bloc of amendments provides important additions to H.R. 1 that strengthen the bill and enhance voter access.

Among the amendments in the bloc is an amendment from the gentlewoman from Virginia that would require foreign agent disclaimers to be included on social media content. This increases transparency by requiring disclaimers to be embedded on the face of a social media post itself, and those disclaimers must remain whenever the post is subsequently shared.

There are four amendments from the gentlewoman from California, including one that addresses longstanding privacy concerns of survivors of domestic and sexual abuse who want to register to vote but do not want their personal information to be publicly accessible; and a second that requires all in-person voting locations to have a sufficient number of accessible voting machines for their voters.

There is an amendment from the gentleman from California that clarifies prohibitions on polling places or ballot drop boxes that falsely purport to be an official location established for an election.

I would note that, in California, the Republican Party in southern California established drop boxes that purported to be from the registrar of voters. That was deceptive. An agreement was reached with the secretary of state that they could have the boxes, but they couldn't hold themselves out to be the registrar of voters.

H.R. 1 calls for all States to provide same-day voter registration. The gentlewoman from Michigan's amendment makes an important addition that will help ensure the successful carrying out of this requirement: States must ensure that they have adequate copies of registration forms and other relevant voter registration at polling places.

There is an amendment from the gentleman from New York that requires the GAO to conduct a study on voter turnout rates, broken down by age in States and localities that permit voters to participate in elections before the age of 18. This is an issue that merits examination, and this amendment will ensure that Congress is fully equipped to debate the issue.

There is an amendment from the gentlewoman from Illinois that would require the GAO to review small-donor campaign financing to study the extent to which the program increases opportunities for candidates of diverse racial, gender, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

There is an amendment from the gentlewoman from Georgia that would require the Director of the CFPB to work with the EAC to develop a statement providing certain individuals with information regarding voter registration and their voting rights. This common-

sense reform ensures that tenants and homeowners will have easy access to voter registration and other voter-related information.

Finally, there is an amendment from the gentlewoman from California that would ensure that the bill's prohibitions against election disinformation cover false claims that voters will face civil and other legal penalties for voting.

I support these amendments, and I urge their adoption.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the en bloc. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a good friend and a problem solver.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on an issue that is so important to so many of the people from my district, and that is election integrity.

I am confident in the integrity of our democracy, but the fact remains that over 59 percent of Americans do not have confidence in the integrity of our election process.

Time and time again, I have worked across the aisle with my Democratic colleagues to try to come together on commonsense reforms to address the issue of election integrity, and the issue that I am passionate about today is the question of voter ID.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) and I had an amendment that we asked to be considered and debated on this floor to say that funds under this bill would not go to States that did not have a voter ID law in place. A simple reform to make sure that we have voter ID cards issued across America is a simple, commonsense integrity measure for our election systems to make sure that our votes count and the people casting the votes are those individuals who are registered to make that vote.

We have IDs in America for simple things like buying alcohol, renting a car, and going into your grocery stores to get food stamps. We issue government IDs for EBT cards. There are simple ways to make sure that people have access to identification so that they could perform one of the most fundamental civic duties and fundamental rights that we have, and that is to vote.

To ask an individual to have an ID is a simple measure, and my Democratic colleagues did not allow us to have that debate and have an open, honest conversation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote “no” on these amendments and continue to work with us to ensure that the election integrity of our country is safe and secure.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

My amendment would require the Comptroller General to analyze the impact of the voluntary small-donor financing program on the racial, gender, and socioeconomic diversity of candidates for public office.

As the first woman and first person of color to represent Illinois' 14th Congressional District, I know that Americans with diverse backgrounds and experiences are electable everywhere in this country, but too often, excellent candidates without personal wealth or corporate backing are outspent and overpowered long before the voters get a say.

The Brennan Center found that small-donor financing cannot only make running for public office an opportunity for more Americans, but also increase the racial and gender diversity of our elected officials by giving every candidate a fighting chance.

My amendment would make sure H.R. 1 fulfills its promise of letting the people decide who represents them. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), who can take you on a tour of the best Philly cheesesteak places in the world.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, prior to my coming to Congress, I dedicated my entire life as an FBI agent to fighting corruption and fighting for electoral reform, having overseen that program for the entire Nation. H.R. 1 sets us back.

H.R. 1 should not be called For the People. It should be called for the politicians. We know what we need to do to fix this system, Mr. Speaker.

Several of my colleagues and I have introduced legislation that would actually restore faith in this institution and in the electoral process: term limits, no budget-no pay, a balanced budget amendment, single-issue legislation, abolishing congressional pensions, ending ballot harvesting, providing free photo IDs to every registered voter, ensuring signature matching, and, with the exception of military ballots, requiring that all ballots be received by 8 p.m. on election night.

Mr. Speaker, this is common sense. What this body is doing today is the opposite. My colleagues are further eroding trust in this system, and that is a real shame because we have the opportunity to fix this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know why House leadership refuses to put these issues on the floor that would unequivocally pass with overwhelming margins in the House and the Senate. If it is going to pass overwhelmingly here, that means the American people want it. Let's put those on the floor.

□ 1115

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership and for adding to this legislation—my legislation—the For the People Act, adding the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act that I wrote as long ago as 2006.

Madam Speaker, section 2402 prohibits a State that has been redistricted in accordance with this legislation from doing it in the mid-decennial, waiting till the next time, the decennial apportionment; so no mid-decade kind of redistricting that has been so unhelpful to all of us.

Madam Speaker, I rise, as well, to support the Swalwell amendments regarding the college student voting, as well as prohibiting false voting polling places and adding colleges and universities' responsibility to give civic information to our students.

I also support the privacy information required by the Speier amendment to ensure that there is no domestic violence and dating violence because your voting information gets out.

And I also support the Waters amendment that prohibits misinformation, which threatens potential voters with civil or legal penalties if they exercise their right to vote. I can assure you, this happens in the minority community.

And I do support the 16-years-of-age amendment, because if you can be on the front lines of civil rights and protest for justice and democracy, you have the right to vote.

Madam Speaker, let's educate our young people so they can vote. I am very happy to support the en bloc.

Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the "For the People Act of 2021," which expands access to the ballot box, reduces the influence of big money in politics, and strengthens ethics rules for public servants.

Specifically, the For the People Act will:

Make it easier, not harder, to vote by implementing automatic voter registration, requiring early voting and vote by mail, committing Congress to reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act and ensuring the integrity of our elections by modernizing and strengthening our voting systems and ending partisan redistricting.

Reform the campaign finance system by requiring all political organizations to disclose large donors, updating political advertisement laws for the digital age, establishing a public matching system for citizen-owned elections, and revamping the Federal Election Commission to ensure there's a cop on the campaign finance beat.

Strengthen ethics laws to ensure that public officials work in the public interest by extending conflict of interest laws to the President and Vice President; requiring the release of their tax returns; closing loopholes that allow former members of Congress to avoid cooling-off periods for lobbying; closing the revolving door between industry and the federal government; and establishing a code of conduct for the Supreme Court.

H.R. 1 expands access to the ballot box by taking aim at institutional barriers to voting.

This bill ensures that individuals who have completed felony sentences have their full

rights restored and expands early voting and simplify absentee voting; and modernize the U.S. voting system.

I am particularly proud and appreciative to Chairwoman LOFGREN and Congressman SARBANES that the For The People Act incorporates in Section 2402 of the legislation the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act that I first offered in 2006 during the Judiciary Committee markup of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 reauthorization and as standalone legislation in the 114th Congress.

This provision, section 2402, prohibits a State that has been redistricted in accordance with this legislation from engaging in redistricting again until after the next decennial apportionment unless required by a court to do so to comply with the Constitution of the United States, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Constitution of the State, or the terms or conditions of this subtitle.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is particularly timely because more than 55 years after the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we are still discussing voter suppression—something which should be a bygone relic of the past, but yet continues to disenfranchise racial minorities, immigrants, women, and young people.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a watershed moment for the Civil Rights Movement—it liberated communities of color from legal restrictions barring them from exercising the fundamental right to civic engagement and political representation.

But uncaged by Supreme Court's infamous 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), which neutered the preclearance provision of the Voting Rights Act, 14 states, including my state of Texas, took extreme measures to enforce new voting restrictions before the 2016 presidential election.

If is not a coincidence that many of these same states have experienced increasing numbers of black and Hispanic voters in recent elections.

If not for invidious, state-sponsored voter suppression policies like discriminatory voter ID laws, reduced early voting periods, and voter intimidation tactics that directly or indirectly target racial minorities, the 2016 presidential election might have had a drastically different outcome.

Madam Speaker, let me list some of the salutary features of the legislation that will make it easier for Americans to exercise their right to vote, the most precious right of all because as President Johnson said in securing passage of the Voting Rights Act, the right to vote "is preservative of all other rights."

H.R. 1 modernizes the voter registration system by requiring each state to make available online voter registration, correction, cancellation, and designation of party affiliation.

In addition, H.R. 1:

Requires states to permit voters to register on the day of a federal election, including during early voting.

Limits the authority of states to remove registrants from the official list of eligible voters in elections for federal office in the state based on interstate voter registration crosschecks.

Requires states to provide annual reports on voter registration statistics to the Election Assistance Commission.

Provides HAVA funds to implement the voter registration modernization reforms.

Makes it unlawful to hinder, interfere or prevent an individual from registering to vote.

Instructs the Election Assistance Commission to develop best practices for states to deter and prevent such violations.

H.R. 1 explicitly prohibits ‘voter caging’, the pernicious practice of using returned non-forwardable mail as the basis for removing registered voters from the rolls, and it prohibits challenges to eligibility from individuals who are not election officials without an oath of good faith factual basis.

Importantly, the legislation prohibits providing false information about elections to hinder or discourage voting and increases penalties for voter intimidation.

I support the declaration in the legislation of the right of citizens to vote in federal elections will not be denied because of a criminal conviction unless a citizen is serving a felony sentence in a correctional facility and it requires states and the federal government to notify individuals convicted of a state or federal felony, respectively, of their reenfranchisement

H.R. 1 promotes election accuracy, integrity, and security by requiring states to use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots and that said ballots be counted by hand or an optical character recognition device and that a voter be given the opportunity to correct his or her ballot should a mistake be made; and it also requires that provisional ballots from eligible voters at incorrect polling places be counted.

The legitimacy and stability of democratic governance is always enhanced by increased voter participation in elections, so I am very pleased that H.R. 1 outlaws many practices resorted to by voting opponents to reduce election participation.

In particular, H.R. 1 requires at least 15 consecutive days of early voting for federal elections and that early voting locations be near public transportation, in rural areas, and open for at least 10 hours per day.

Additionally, the legislation prohibits a state from imposing restrictions on an individual’s ability to vote by mail and requires a state to carry out a program to track and confirm the receipt of absentee ballots and to make this information available to the voter who cast the ballot.

Also, the bill requires the prepayment of postage on return envelopes for voting materials, which includes any voter registration form, any application for an absentee ballot, and any blank absentee ballot transmitted by mail.

Madam Speaker, another important feature of H.R. 1 is that it promotes voter access by mandating several improvements to election administration, including:

Treating universities as voter registration agencies;

Requiring states to notify an individual, not later than 7 seven days before election, if the individual’s polling place has changed;

Requiring states to allow voters to sign sworn affidavits to vote in lieu of presenting photo ID;

Providing accommodations for voters residing in Indian lands;

Ensuring equitable and efficient operation of polling places, reducing long lines and wait times for voters;

Requiring states to provide secured drop boxes for voted absentee ballots in elections for federal office;

Prohibiting states from restricting curbside voting;

Imposing requirements for federal election contingency plans in response to natural disasters and emergencies; and

Clarifying that failure to vote is not grounds for removing registered voters from the rolls.

Of course, nothing in this legislation prohibits or restricts the authority of states to provide greater opportunities for voting, and the bill makes that explicitly clear.

This litany of good measures demonstrates all the many ways and means through which H.R. 1 expands voter participation and election integrity, and our experience of the previous four years counsels the urgency of adopting them.

I am much less confident of the ability of one component of the bill—the title mandating creation of “Independent Redistricting Commissions”—to strengthen our democracy; in fact I believe that title of the legislation should be stricken because of its potential to negatively effective marginalized communities and minority groups.

I am not contending that independent redistricting commissions are an unconstitutional usurpation of authority belonging exclusively to state legislatures; that argument was presented and rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Arizona State Legislature v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission*, 576 U.S. 787 (2015).

Instead, the nation’s experience with independent redistricting commissions is still in its early stages, and I believe that instead of mandating a one-size fits all approach, Congress should allow further experimentation to occur in the states, the “laboratories of democracy,” as they were described by Justice Brandeis in *New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann*, 285 U.S. 262 (1932).

In addition, it appears to me that the selection process laid out in the bill for choosing members of the independent redistricting commissions is too random and will not result in a commission comprised of members reflective of the communities directly affected by the work of the commission, particularly members of racial and language minorities.

Madam Speaker, the issue of redistricting and how to do it fairly is a never-ending one, and, as most political scientists agree, it is virtually impossible to draw most congressional and legislative districts in ways that are competitive; redistricting exacerbates geographical polarization, but it does not create it.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1 must be passed because many of the civil rights that I fought for as a student and young lawyer have been undermined or been rolled back by reactionary forces in recent years.

To add insult to injury, the immediately preceding Administration issued an Executive Order establishing a so-called “Election Integrity” Commission to investigate not voter suppression, but so-called “voter fraud” in the 2016 election.

The 45th President and his followers were unceasing in their efforts to perpetuate the myth of voter fraud, but it remains just that: a myth.

Between 2000 and 2014, there were 35 credible allegations of voter fraud out of more than 834 million ballots cast—that is less than 1 in 28 million votes.

An extensive study by social scientists at Dartmouth College uncovered no evidence to

support Trump’s hysterical and outrageous allegations of widespread voter fraud “rigging” the 2016 election.

Just for the record, Madam Speaker, the popular vote of the 2016 presidential election was:

Hillary Clinton: 65,853,5160.

Donald Trump: 62,884,8240.

Trump’s deficit of 2.9 million was the largest of any Electoral College winner in history by a massive margin, and despite the allegations of the current Administration, there have been only 4 documented cases of voter fraud in the 2016 election.

The same is true for the 2020 presidential election, which again Donald Trump claimed was fraudulent after losing the popular vote to President Biden by more than 7 million votes, and the Electoral College by 306–232, the exact margin that he claimed constituted a landslide and epic blowout when he won the Electoral College vote in 2016.

Again, and just for the record, Madam Speaker, the popular vote of the 2020 presidential election was:

Joe Biden: 81,281,502.

Donald Trump: 74,222,593.

The Trump Campaign brought more than 63 legal challenges to the 2020 election, claiming the outcomes were tainted by wide-spread and massive fraud but every court, whether state or federal, and nearly 90 judges, including Trump appointees, summarily rejected these baseless claims for failure of proof.

Of course, this did not deter the reckless 45th President who then went on to threaten and coerce state election officials to corruptly change vote counts and after that ploy failed, incited his loyalists to storm the U.S. Capitol and use force and violence if necessary to prevent the Congress from conducting the constitutionally required Joint Meeting to count the electoral votes cast and announce the winner of the presidential election.

Madam Speaker, the Trump Voter Fraud Commission, like many of Trump’s business schemes, was a massive scam built on countless lies that did not hold up to any level of scrutiny.

As Members of Congress, we should be devoting our time, energy, and resources addressing Russian infiltration of our election infrastructure and campaigns, along with other pressing issues.

Instead of enjoying and strengthening the protections guaranteed in the Voting Rights Act—people of color, women, LGBTQ individuals, and immigrants—have been given the joyless, exhausting task of fending off the constant barrage of attacks leveled at our communities by Trump and other conspiracy theorists.

Not only are we tasked with reversing the current dismal state of voter suppression against minorities; we are forced to refute the blatant, propagandist lie of voter fraud.

To this end, I have been persistent in my efforts to protect the rights of disenfranchised communities in my district of inner-city Houston and across the nation.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have cosponsored dozens of bills, amendments, and resolutions seeking to improve voters’ rights at all stages and levels of the election process.

This includes legislation aimed at:

Increasing voter outreach and turnout;

Ensuring both early and same-day registration;

Standardizing physical and language accessibility at polling places;

Expanding early voting periods;

Decreasing voter wait times;

Guaranteeing absentee ballots, especially for displaced citizens;

Modernizing voting technologies and strengthening our voter record systems;

Establishing the federal Election Day as a national holiday; and

Condemning and criminalizing deceptive practices, voter intimidation, and other suppression tactics.

Along with many of my CBC colleagues, I was an original cosponsor of H.R. 9, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act, which became public law on July 27, 2006.

I also authored H.R. 745 in the 110th Congress, which added the legendary Barbara Jordan to the list of civil rights trailblazers whose memories are honored in the naming of the Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act.

This bill strengthened the original Voting Rights Act by replacing federal voting examiners with federal voting observers—a significant enhancement that made it easier to safeguard against racially biased voter suppression tactics.

As noted earlier, in the 114th Congress, I introduced H.R. 75, the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act of 2015, which prohibits states whose congressional districts have been redistricted after a decennial census from redrawing their district lines until the next census.

Prejudiced redistricting, or gerrymandering as it is more commonly known, has been used for decades to weaken the voting power of African Americans, Latino Americans, and other minorities since the Civil Rights Era.

Immediately after the *Shelby County v. Holder* ruling, which lifted preclearance requirements for states with histories of discrimination seeking to change their voting laws or practices, redistricting became a favorite tool for Republicans who connived to unfairly gain 3 congressional seats in Texas.

In the 110th Congress, I was the original sponsor of H.R. 6778, the Ex Offenders Voting Rights Act of 2008, which prohibited denial of the right to vote in a federal election on the basis of an individual's status as a formerly incarcerated person.

The Ex-Offenders Voting Rights Act sought to reverse discriminatory voter restrictions that disproportionately affect the African American voting population, which continues to be targeted by mass incarceration, police profiling, and a biased criminal justice system.

Those of us who cherish the right to vote justifiably are skeptical of Voter ID laws because we understand how these laws, like poll taxes and literacy tests, can be used to impede or negate the ability of seniors, racial and language minorities, and young people to cast their votes.

Voter ID laws are just one of the means that can be used to abridge or suppress the right to vote but there are others, including:

Curtailing or Eliminating Early Voting;

Ending Same-Day Registration;

Not counting provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct on Election Day;

Eliminating Teenage Pre-Registration;

Shortened Poll Hours;

Lessening the standards governing voter challenges used by vigilantes, like the King Street Patriots in my city of Houston, to cause trouble at the polls;

“Voter Caging,” to suppress the turnout of minority voters by sending non-forwardable mail to targeted populations and, once the mail is returned, using the returned mail to compile lists of voters whose eligibility is then challenged on the basis of residence under state law; and

Employing targeted redistricting techniques to dilute minority voting strength, notably “Cracking” (i.e., fragmenting and dispersing concentrations of minority populations); “Stacking” (combining concentrations of minority voters with greater concentrations of white populations); and “Packing” (i.e., over-concentrating minority voters in as few districts as possible).

Madam Speaker, we must not allow our democracy to slide back into the worst elements of this country's past, to stand idly by as our treasured values of democracy, progress, and equality are poisoned and dismantled.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 1, the “For The People Act of 2021.”

Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the rule governing debate of H.R. 1, the “For the People Act of 2021,” which expands access to the ballot box, reduces the influence of big money in politics, and strengthens ethics rules for public servants.

H.R. 1 is intended to increase public confidence in our democracy by reducing the role of money in politics, restoring ethical standards and integrity to government, and strengthening laws to protect voting.

I am particularly proud and appreciative to Chairwoman LOFGREN and Congressman SARBANES that the For The People Act incorporates in Section 2402 of the legislation the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act that I first offered in 2006 during the Judiciary Committee markup of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 reauthorization and as standalone legislation in the 114th Congress.

This provision, section 2402, prohibits a State that has been redistricted in accordance with this legislation from engaging in redistricting again until after the next decennial apportionment unless required by a court to do so to comply with the Constitution of the United States, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Constitution of the State, or the terms or conditions of this subtitle.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is particularly timely because more than 55 years after the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we are still discussing voter suppression—something which should be a bygone relic of the past, but yet continues to disenfranchise racial minorities, immigrants, women, and young people.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a watershed moment for the Civil Rights Movement—it liberated communities of color from legal restrictions barring them from exercising the fundamental right to civic engagement and political representation.

But uncaged by Supreme Court's infamous 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), which neutered the preclearance provision of the Voting Rights

Act, 14 states, including my state of Texas, took extreme measures to enforce new voting restrictions before the 2016 presidential election.

It is not a coincidence that many of these same states have experienced increasing numbers of black and Hispanic voters in recent elections.

If not for invidious, state-sponsored voter suppression policies like discriminatory voter ID laws, reduced early voting periods, and voter intimidation tactics that directly or indirectly target racial minorities, the 2016 presidential election might have had a drastically different outcome.

H.R. 1 expands access to the ballot box by taking aim at institutional barriers to voting.

Let me list some of the salutary features of the legislation that will make it easier for Americans to exercise their right to vote, the most precious right of all because as President Johnson said in securing passage of the Voting Rights Act, the right to vote “is preservative of all other rights.”

H.R. 1 modernizes the voter registration system by requiring each state to make available online voter registration, correction, cancellation, and designation of party affiliation.

In addition, H.R. 1:

Requires states to permit voters to register on the day of a federal election, including during early voting.

Limits the authority of states to remove registrants from the official list of eligible voters in elections for federal office in the state based on interstate voter registration crosschecks.

Requires states to provide annual reports on voter registration statistics to the Election Assistance Commission.

Provides HAVA funds to implement the voter registration modernization reforms.

Makes it unlawful to hinder, interfere or prevent an individual from registering to vote.

Instructs the Election Assistance Commission to develop best practices for states to deter and prevent such violations.

H.R. 1 explicitly prohibits ‘voter caging’, the pernicious practice of using returned non-forwardable mail as the basis for removing registered voters from the rolls and it prohibits challenges to eligibility from individuals who are not election officials without an oath of good faith factual basis.

Importantly, the legislation prohibits providing false information about elections to hinder or discourage voting and increases penalties for voter intimidation.

I support the declaration in the legislation of the right of citizens to vote in federal elections will not be denied because of a criminal conviction unless a citizen is serving a felony sentence in a correctional facility and it requires states and the federal government to notify individuals convicted of a state or federal felony, respectively, of their reenfranchisement.

H.R. 1 promotes election accuracy, integrity, and security by requiring states to use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots and that said ballots be counted by hand or an optical character recognition device and that a voter be given the opportunity to correct his or her ballot should a mistake be made; and it also requires that provisional ballots from eligible voters at incorrect polling places be counted.

The legitimacy and stability of democratic governance is always enhanced by increased voter participation in elections, so I am very

pleased that H.R. 1 outlaws many practices resorted to by voting opponents to reduce election participation.

In particular, H.R. 1 requires at least 15 consecutive days of early voting for federal elections and that early voting locations be near public transportation, in rural areas and open for at least 10 hours per day.

Additionally, the legislation prohibits a state from imposing restrictions on an individual's ability to vote by mail and requires a state to carry out a program to track and confirm the receipt of absentee ballots and to make this information available to the voter who cast the ballot.

Also, the bill requires the prepayment of postage on return envelopes for voting materials, which includes any voter registration form, any application for an absentee ballot, and any blank absentee ballot transmitted by mail.

Madam Speaker, another important feature of H.R. 1 is that it promotes voter access by mandating several improvements to election administration, including:

Treating universities as voter registration agencies;

Requiring states to notify an individual, not later than 7 seven days before election, if the individual's polling place has changed;

Requiring states to allow voters to sign sworn affidavits to vote in lieu of presenting photo ID;

Providing accommodations for voters residing in Indian lands;

Ensuring equitable and efficient operation of polling places, reducing long lines and wait times for voters;

Requiring states to provide secured drop boxes for voted absentee ballots in elections for federal office;

Prohibiting states from restricting curbside voting;

Imposing requirements for federal election contingency plans in response to natural disasters and emergencies; and

Clarifying that failure to vote is not grounds for removing registered voters from the rolls.

Of course, nothing in this legislation prohibits or restricts the authority of states to provide greater opportunities for voting, and the bill makes that explicitly clear.

This litany of good measures demonstrates all the many ways and means through which H.R. 1 expands voter participation and election integrity and our experience of the previous four years counsels the urgency of adopting them.

I am much less confident of the ability of one component of the bill—the title mandating creation of “Independent Redistricting Commissions”—to strengthen our democracy; in fact I believe that title of the legislation should be stricken because of its potential to negatively effective marginalized communities and minority groups.

I am not contending that independent redistricting commissions are an unconstitutional usurpation of authority belonging exclusively to state legislatures; that argument was presented and rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Arizona State Legislature v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission*, 576 U.S. 787 (2015).

Instead, the nation's experience with independent redistricting commissions is still in its early stages and I believe that instead of mandating a one-size fits all approach, Congress

should allow further experimentation to occur in the states, the “laboratories of democracy,” as they were described by Justice Brandeis in *New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann*, 285 U.S. 262 (1932).

In addition, it appears to me that the selection process laid out in the bill for choosing members of the independent redistricting commissions is too random and will not result in a commission comprised of members reflective of the communities directly affected by the work of the commission, particularly members of racial and language minorities.

Madam Speaker, the issue of redistricting and how to do it fairly is a never-ending one and, as most political scientists agree, it is virtually impossible to draw most congressional and legislative districts in ways that are competitive; redistricting exacerbates geographical polarization, but it does not create it.

For this reason, unlike the other titles of H.R. 1, I withhold my support for Title II, Subtitle E, Part 2.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Naples, Florida, (Mr. DONALDS), my good friend, who represents many of my former constituents from Illinois who have left Illinois because of overtaxation.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the For the People Act. This is really just a take-over of elections by Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, I got a chance to go through some of this bill—790 pages. Most of these things would basically eviscerate Florida's election law.

You see, I served in Florida's legislature. We had the responsibility for adjusting legislation law from time to time. Our State was a State that went through hanging chads in 2000, and we have made the adjustment systematically in the State legislature to make sure that Florida has the very best election laws in these United States.

You see, on election night, November 3, we were done counting around 9:30. We knew the results by 10 o'clock. We have absentee ballots, we have voter ID, we have early voting, and we have a robust count system on election day.

The people of Florida have never been disenfranchised when it comes to elections. The people of Florida have come accustomed to having a voter system that works. And what this body is trying to do with H.R. 1 is completely destroy Florida's election laws. That is, to me, ridiculous. This Capitol should never allow that. If we are going to do anything, we should replicate what Florida has actually done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD). The gentleman needs to put his mask up.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, I am sorry. It keeps falling down.

Madam Speaker, I was trying to make a point—

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, the point is clear: 33 States have voter ID

laws. Many States have already taken care of these problems themselves. State legislatures should be changing their laws. This Capitol should not. And the people of the State of Florida definitely do not want the things that are in this bill. Our system is the best. Frankly, leave Florida alone.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, before I reserve, can I make a parliamentary inquiry?

When a mask falls down unintentionally from a speaker, what is the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members must properly wear their masks at all times.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Is this being enforced equally on the majority and minority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not answer a hypothetical question, but the Speaker's announced policy applies to all Members.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. So I should ask the second-rate parliamentarian off the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 4½ minutes. The gentleman from Illinois has 6 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1 to crack down on foreign-backed disinformation and propaganda on social media. This amendment is the text of the Bipartisan Foreign Agent Disclaimer Enhancement—FADE—Act.

Under the FADE Act, political ads, issue campaigns, and content funded or directed by a foreign principal and intended to influence the American people must be disclosed to the Department of Justice. But too often, this rule does not extend to the world of social media.

Additionally, foreign agents acting from abroad too often evade current disclaimer requirements. Amid the pandemic and following the 2020 general election, foreign governments continue to exploit existing vulnerabilities in our national security, including influencing Americans directly and infiltrating public discourse without their knowledge. Foreign adversaries, such as Russia, China, and Iran, are among the most active, and they are increasingly assertive in their efforts.

Madam Speaker, this amendment will help protect against foreign influence that seeks to sow political division and promote dangerous information contrary to the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

My amendment would require disclaimers—clearly stating this content is coming from a foreign principal.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW), my good friend and best-dressed member of our conference.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I am not so sure about that, but I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1.

We were warned for years about the rise of socialism. Well, here it is, served on a platter, using your money to pay for politicians campaigns.

Do you like those robocalls during campaign season?

How about the negative TV ads and the mailers?

Or how about all of the political stuff that just comes out?

Well, your tax dollars are paying for them. And, yes, this is taxpayer dollars, no matter how they tell you otherwise.

Madam Speaker, this bill puts Washington, D.C., in charge of our States' elections and how those elections are run. It would keep the status quo, like we saw this past November, with voter rolls that are not up to date and live ballots being mailed to voters who have died, moved, or even multiple ballots to the same voter.

Madam Speaker, elections do have consequences. And when leaders said the goal was to change America, they were telling the truth; and here we are.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. WILLIAMS), who serves in the seat of our late, beloved John Lewis.

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is our duty to not only do the work of the people, but to ensure that people have a voice in our democracy.

H.R. 1 amplifies the voice of the people, empowers individuals to shape our democracy, and breaks down barriers to voting. It is historymaking by design, as a portion of H.R. 1 was written by my predecessor, Congressman John Lewis. We must honor his legacy and take this necessary step forward because Georgians and all people in this country deserve to retain their right to accessible elections.

Madam Speaker, I have added provisions to this bill that underscore not only the importance of voting, but making it easier for hardworking people to do so. And making it easier, not harder to vote, should always be our main concern.

Madam Speaker, this week, Georgia's legislators moved forward to further restrict Black and Brown communities from voting by enacting new ID laws for absentee ballot applications and limiting the use of ballot drop boxes—old tactics, but the same tricks. We cannot let self-serving politicians stack the deck through voter suppression and discrimination.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1 so that we can make it easier for peo-

ple to cast their ballots and have their voices be heard.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a summary of letters submitted yesterday by the Institute for Free Speech and others opposing H.R. 1.

INSTITUTE FOR FREE SPEECH,

March 3, 2021.

Re H.R. 1 Would Greatly Harm Free Speech.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Institute for Free Speech strongly opposes H.R. 1, the Orwellian For the People Act. More appropriately known as the For the Politicians Act, this radical bill would, in fact, greatly harm the ability of the people to freely speak, publish, organize into groups, and petition their elected representatives in pursuit of a better government.

In particular, H.R. 1 would impose onerous and unworkable standards on the ability of Americans and groups of Americans to discuss the policy issues of the day with elected officials and the public. Certain sections of the bill would violate the privacy of advocacy groups and their supporters, limit political speech on the internet, and compel speakers to recite lengthy government-mandated messages identifying some of their supporters by name in their communications.

Importantly, these restrictions would reach far beyond campaign speech to regulate discussion of legislative issues and public affairs. For advocacy groups, unions, and trade associations, several of the limits proposed in H.R. 1 would operate as a total ban on speech.

If signed into law, all of these provisions would be interpreted and enforced by a newly partisan Federal Election Commission. Under H.R. 1, the Commission would be radically transformed from its historic and deliberately bipartisan structure to one under partisan control of the president. As nine former members of the Federal Election Commission with a combined 60 plus years of service warned in a recent letter to Congress, the likely impact would be to shrink public confidence in the impartial enforcement of campaign finance laws, weaponize these regulations for partisan gain, and silence much political speech through new rules on groups that speak about public affairs.

H.R. 1 would also force Americans to pay for speech they oppose. This new financing system is a riverboat gamble on an untested—and costly—scheme that would have many unforeseen effects. Existing research has proven that similar schemes elsewhere have failed to achieve proponents' stated goals. Instead, the program will likely incentivize—and subsidize—candidates with hateful messages, create new avenues for corruption, increase polarization, give government greater control over campaigns, waste tax dollars, and fail markedly at improving the quality of governance or the diversity of those who are elected to higher office.

At its core, H.R. 1 would greatly increase the already high legal and administrative compliance costs, liability risk, and costs to donor and associational privacy for civic groups that speak about policy issues. Organizations will be further deterred from speaking or will have to divert additional resources away from their advocacy activities to pay for compliance staff and lawyers. Some groups will not be able to afford these costs or will violate the law unwittingly. The effect will be less speech by Americans and organizations, allowing politicians to act with less accountability to public opinion and criticism.

Few bills are more antithetical to the text of and principles underlying the First Amendment than H.R. 1. The numerous, overlapping, and interrelated provisions in this legislation combine to impose and tighten severe government controls on speech about campaigns, judicial nominees, and policy issues in truly shocking ways. Any American lacking expertise in campaign finance law would have little to no hope of understanding this bill or the voluminous restrictions it proposes on political speech and association. The sad result will be a political discourse dominated by Washington, DC insiders. Far from being For the People, H.R. 1 is truly For the Politicians.

The best way to give the American people a voice and to safeguard democracy is to protect and enhance the right to free speech guaranteed by the First Amendment. While the Institute takes no position on the myriad provisions in H.R. 1 that deal with election administration, voting rights, and redistricting, the portions of H.R. 1 that trample on free speech are sufficient to warrant our firm opposition to this measure. For the above reasons, the Institute for Free Speech strongly opposes passage of H.R. 1.

Sincerely,

DAVID KEATING,
President.

ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Springfield, IL, February 19, 2021.

To: Illinois Federal Delegation

Fr: Illinois Representative Joe Sosnowski,
69th District, Illinois House of Representatives

TO THE ILLINOIS FEDERAL DELEGATION: As a state legislator elected to be a voice for the people of Illinois, I write to express my opposition to H.R. 1/S. 1, an unconstitutional takeover of citizens' right to free speech and association.

As elected officials, we both have a duty to represent our constituents best interests and a responsibility to defend the United States Constitution. Therefore, it is my obligation to urge you to oppose the deceptively named For the People Act. The legislation is ill-considered and deeply unconstitutional, and I have seen firsthand the chilling effects of the donor disclosure provisions that it would enact.

As a member of the American Legislative Exchange Council, a membership organization of state legislators dedicated to principles of limited government, free markets and federalism. In 2013, activists launched a campaign to reveal, then harass and shame, the ALEC donor base. Their goal was simple: Harassing ALEC donors and corporate members would chill their participation with and support for the organization, ultimately cutting off a funding source for ALEC.

Worse, public elected officials used their platform to heighten this threat of donor disclosure in order to further intimidate ALEC supporters. In 2013, every company tangentially associated with ALEC received an official letter from US Senator Richard Durbin, demanding to know whether it had served as a member of ALEC or provided any funding to ALEC, with the intent of intimidating them. Durbin wrote that he would read their responses into the official Congressional record, forever memorializing their support and creating a public target list for activists opposed to the organization. Even the Chicago Tribune, the Senator's hometown newspaper that had endorsed his candidacy, rebuked Durbin's attempt at creating an enemies list by using his high federal office as a cudgel against his enemies.

H.R. 1/S. 1 would institutionalize this harassment and intimidation and extend it to all nonprofits, regardless of their issue area or political persuasion. Whatever issues you

support or oppose, this should be of serious concern to you. If this legislation is enacted, passionate activists on both sides of the aisle would have access to a government-run database of donors who give to every organization from ALEC and the Family Research Council to the ACLU and Planned Parenthood. Does anyone doubt that the blunt instrument of donor disclosure in H.R. 1/S. 1 would put millions of Americans' peace and livelihoods at risk of significant, material harm?

These tactics are flimsy bureaucratic structures designed to harass nonprofits and chill speech, despite fundamental violations of the First Amendment. In keeping with today's cancel culture, H.R. 1/S. 1 is a government-sanctioned attempt to chill speech and participation. Good governance watchdogs argue this measure increases transparency. Transparency is good when applied to government, but when it strips away Constitutionally protected privacy for individuals, it is exceedingly dangerous. For the federal government to expose our constituents as supporters of any nonprofit's cause would be an enormous overreach of centralized power.

If passed, the donor disclosure provisions in H.R. 1/S. 1 would bludgeon our democratic institutions and threaten the safety and peace of our everyday constituents. It would further normalize the darkness of cancel culture and intimidation through overregulation in American society. Therefore, we call on you to oppose H.R. 1/S. 1.

Sincerely,

Representative JOE
SOSNOWSKI,
69th District, Illinois
House of Representatives,
Illinois ALEC
State Chair.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, over the last couple of days, I have spoken a lot about my opposition to this bill's creation of a public fund filled with dollars from corporate fines to directly fund the campaign coffers of every Member of this institution and candidates.

And my Democrat colleagues have continued to say this isn't public funding or corporate donations because it is corporate fines.

So what is the truth?

I think my chart here tells the story. So we have corporate fines. That is corporate dollars, something that we, as Members of Congress in our campaigns, cannot accept right now. Those corporate dollars that pay these corporate fines that we set the levels of in this institution, they then go to the U.S. Government in this new—that H.R. 1 creates—the Freedom From Influence Fund.

It is really a laundering machine. So they launder that corporate money that we cannot accept right now into the Treasury and it comes out clean as public money. It is money that used to be used for things like the Crime Victims Fund. Instead, this new laundered money, this taxpayer money—because it is public, it is under the control of us—then goes out exponentially to all of us, to our campaigns to pay for attack ads, fundraisers, mailers, phone calls, whatever you want.

But either way, it is government spending—government sending cor-

porate dollars directly to us. This is, and should be, prohibited, but H.R. 1 changes that and it puts more money into politics and not less.

How about the Crime Victims Fund or victims of domestic violence get these dollars?

Let's make sure that we address programs that deal with sexual assault, child abuse, and other crimes. This money will not go into the Crime Victims Fund because it is going to all of us. All 50 State attorneys general have told us that this vital Crime Victims Fund is nearly depleted. But instead of plussing it up, here we are today, funding our own campaigns with a "yes" vote.

Madam Speaker, this bill isn't for the people. It is for the politicians. This is why I am offering a motion to recommit so that we can put forward a bill that works for the American people.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt this motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on House Administration to consider an amendment to remove all public financing from this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, it is one reason I am opposed to H.R. 1, and giving Democrats another chance to join me, stopping this charade, stopping enriching themselves in their own campaign. This is one last chance before you do it again.

Madam Speaker, another reason I oppose H.R. 1 is because the election mandates on States in this bill go against what our Founding Fathers intended and essentially nationalizes our election system.

If signed into law, H.R. 1 would be the greatest expansion of the Federal Government's role in our elections than we have ever seen. By moving these decisions to D.C., we are further removing people from the laws that govern their elections. People should have more say in how their elections are run, not less. Our goal is to always ensure all eligible voters are able to vote and all lawful votes are counted. That is not what H.R. 1 does. And the only witness who has run an election before said during the single House Administration hearing held on this bill that H.R. 1 will undermine many of the election laws States have put into place to make it easier for people to vote and improve their election process for their voters.

One-size-fits-all mandates from Washington will not fix the problems we have seen in elections across the country. They will just cause more chaos and confusion. These issues need to be solved at the local and State level. Instead of dictating to States, we

should be working with them and localities to address these issues. And I stand ready and willing to work with my Democrat colleagues to do just that, but I will not vote for a Federal takeover of elections and I will not vote to use the Federal Government to put more money into my campaign. It is bad policy and it is bad for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for the motion to recommit at the appropriate time, and I urge a "no" vote on the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1130

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman is ready to yield back or use the rest of his time.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I would like to request a meeting with the Parliamentarian. I personally witnessed one of my Democratic colleagues immediately remove his mask and was never told to put it back on from the Chair at the time. So all we ask for is consistency.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this bill. I urge support for the motion to recommit. I urge my Democratic colleagues: Don't vote to put money into your own campaigns.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the secretary of state of Colorado, with a number of other secretary of states, urging support for this bill; and a letter from former leaders of the American Civil Liberties Union and concerned first amendment scholars urging support.

JENA GRISWOLD,
COLORADO SECRETARY OF STATE,
March 2, 2021.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER PELOSI, LEADER MCCONNELL, AND LEADER MCCARTHY: It's no accident that the 2020 elections were the most secure in American history. A monumental effort by election administrators—from board of elections officials, to county clerks, to poll workers—ensured our country's democratic process was stronger than ever, even with the unique challenge posed by the COVID-19 pandemic.

While the 2020 elections proved that our democracy is resilient, the elections also showed us that they cannot be taken for granted. Our elections were safe, secure, and successful because countless patriotic Americans took action to protect them. The policies that gave voters better options to safely

register to vote and cast a ballot in the face of the pandemic were a resounding success and must now be made permanent.

Modernizing elections meant that eligible voters did not have to choose between casting a ballot and risking their health. It also resulted in record turnout for both parties. Policies like vote-by mail for all and early voting saw resounding success in states and municipalities across the country. Now, only Congress can ensure that every eligible voter across America has access to these voting options in the future. That's why we need to immediately enact the *For The People Act* (H.R. 1) into law.

The *For The People Act* offers a comprehensive path to securing and modernizing American democracy for generations to come. The bill provides clear guidance for all 50 states and the District of Columbia to implement election processes that work for administrators and voters alike, and its adoption into law is critical to the future of American elections. Proven policies such as automatic and same-day voter registration will remove administrative obstacles for eligible voters while maintaining up-to-date and accurate voter rolls. Voter-verified paper ballots will ensure every vote is accurately recorded and allow administrators to run key audits to verify election results. Other provisions, such as independent redistricting commissions to combat gerrymandering and shining light on dark money, will further strengthen the integrity of our elections.

As the chief elections officials in our respective states, and as the administrators who will be tasked with executing many of the policies proposed in H.R. 1, we can confidently state that this bill is designed to make our democracy stronger and safer than ever. We proudly and firmly support the *For The People Act*, and we strongly recommend its passage in the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate.

Sincerely,

Katie Hobbs, Arizona Secretary of State; Shirley Weber, California Secretary of State; Jena Griswold, Colorado Secretary of State; Denise Merrill, Connecticut Secretary of State; Kimberly Bassett, Secretary of the District of Columbia; Shenna Bellows, Maine Secretary of State; Jocelyn Benson, Michigan Secretary of State; Steve Simon, Minnesota Secretary of State; Maggie Toulouse Oliver, New Mexico Secretary of State; Shemia Fagan, Oregon Secretary of State; Nellie Gorbea, Rhode Island Secretary of State; Jim Condos, Vermont Secretary of State.

FORMER LEADERS OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION AND CONCERNED FIRST AMENDMENT SCHOLARS,

February 18, 2021.

Re H.R. 1, For the People Act.

Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
Chair, House Administration Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN SARBANES,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chair, House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR LOFGREN, CHAIR NADLER, AND REP. SARBANES: The undersigned are former leaders of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and concerned academics who have devoted much of their careers to the defense of the First Amendment and the protection of American democracy. We write in support of speedy House enactment of H.R.1, the *For the People Act*.

American democracy is at a perilous crossroads. H.R.1 responds with sweeping reforms countering voter suppression and partisan

gerrymandering that have targeted communities of color; overhauling our deeply inequitable campaign finance system; and reducing the influence of secret "dark money" in federal elections. We view H.R. 1 as the most significant prodemocracy legislation since the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Some have argued that despite the overwhelmingly positive content of H.R.1, enactment should be delayed in the House pending legislative hearings and efforts to amend certain provisions in the 700-page legislation, especially provisions requiring disclosure of the identities of large donors to tax-exempt organizations operating on the margins of electoral politics. We agree that, ordinarily, best legislative practice would call for hearings designed to resolve First Amendment concerns over important legislation. But, given the importance of shoring up the democratic process, the limited window of opportunity for passage of H.R.1, the likely delay in Senate consideration, and the nature of the First Amendment objections to disclosure, we believe that immediate passage of H.R.1 in its present form is the preferable course of action.

Objectors to immediate passage of HR 1 appear to us to: (1) underestimate the risks to enacting HR 1 posed by substantial delay in House passage; (2) understate the importance of closing loopholes in our campaign finance disclosure laws; and (3) overstate the risks to First Amendment freedom posed by the bill's disclosure provisions. We live in a democratic culture saturated by great wealth. The Supreme Court has rendered it almost impossible to directly regulate the role of money in determining electoral outcomes. One of the few practical reform windows left open is public disclosure of the sources of money-driven influence over electoral politics. Such disclosure is important, not only to prevent corruption, but to allow ordinary citizens to evaluate the truth of electoral speech by knowing who is paying for it. We recognize the need to preserve anonymity for persons whose speech or association might be deterred by fear of disclosure. That is why the H.R.1 disclosure rules apply only to large donations exceeding \$10,000. Moreover, current First Amendment doctrine already provides an "as applied" exception to disclosure rules if a genuine fear of retaliatory action were to exist.

In short, we do not view First Amendment concerns over the precise scope of disclosure requirements affecting large donors to tax exempt organizations operating on the margins of electoral politics as outweighing the need for expeditious enactment of the clearly desirable aspects of H.R.1 into law.

We urge you to press for speedy enactment of H.R. 1 in its current form.

Respectfully submitted,

Aryeh Neier, President Emeritus of the Open Society Foundations, ACLU Executive Director, 1970-78; Burt Neuborne, Norman Dorsen Professor of Civil Liberties Emeritus at NYU School of Law, ACLU National Legal Director, 1981-86; Helen Hershkoff, Herbert Mand. Svetlana Wachtel/Professor of Constitutional Law and Civil Liberties at NYU School of Law, ACLU Associate Legal Director, 1987-95; John Shattuck, Senior Fellow at the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy, Harvard Kennedy School, Professor of Practice in Diplomacy, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, Director of the ACLU's Washington office, 1976-84; Judith Resnik, Arthur Liman Professor of Law at Yale Law School; Erwin Chemerinsky, Dean and Jesse Choper Distinguished Professor of Law at Berkeley Law School, University of California; Robert Post, Sterling Professor of Law and former Dean of Yale Law School; Geoffrey Stone, Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law and

former Dean of the University of Chicago Law School.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate that the ranking member has shown us this chart because he has proven that all of the Republican Members claiming that there was tax money funding the pilot project for the small matching donors were wrong.

This is a pilot project that is funded by an additional fine on corporate wrongdoing. It doesn't take money away from anything else. It is an additional fine that, if H.R. 1 doesn't pass, will not be imposed.

I was interested to hear our colleague from New Jersey say it is your money that will be used. Well, it is only your money if you are a corporate malfeasance individual, a corporate wrongdoer that gets fined; and I don't think very many of us have sympathy for that crew.

I would like to just give some perspective here because all over the United States, because of the pandemic, efforts were made to allow for people to vote and not have to endanger their health. So absentee voting became more of the norm. There were more early voting efforts, a lot of things of that nature, because of the pandemic.

And what happened?

There was a huge increase in turnout, both among Republicans and Democrats. It was a safe and secure election, the most safe and secure election in modern history. There wasn't a bunch of fraud.

Some of my colleagues said that people don't trust our system.

Why is that?

Because there are politicians in this country that are misleading the American public about that election. And I would say the former President is first among them, telling things that are not true and convincing people of that.

So now that we have had this huge turnout because of the pandemic, we are seeing States—Republicans, I must say, unfortunately, all over the United States trying to cut off access to the ballot.

In Georgia, they just passed a whole slew of voter restriction measures to try and tamp down turnout, and we see hundreds of bills being introduced to do that.

I urge a "yes" vote on this en bloc and on the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

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

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

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

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1 is postponed.

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 11 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1215

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further 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, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 37, printed in part B of House Report 117-9, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 125, nays 302, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—125

Adams	Bowman	Casten
Auchincloss	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)
Bass	F.	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brown	Chu
Beyer	Brownley	Cicilline
Blumenauer	Bush	Clark (MA)
Blunt Rochester	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Bonamici	Carson	Cleaver

Clyburn	Kafele	Quigley
Cooper	Khanna	Raskin
Correa	Kildee	Rice (NY)
Crist	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny K.	Kim (NJ)	Ruiz
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
DeBene	Lamb	Rush
Delgado	Langevin	Ryan
DeSaulnier	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Deutch	Lee (NV)	Schiff
Dingell	Leger Fernandez	Sewell
Doggett	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Escobar	Levin (MI)	Soto
Eshoo	Lieu	Speier
Espallat	Lowenthal	Stanton
Evans	Malinowski	Strickland
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell
Frankel, Lois	McGovern	Takano
Gallego	Meng	Thompson (MS)
Garcia (IL)	Moulton	Tlaib
Golden	Murphy (FL)	Tonko
Gomez	Neal	Torres (NY)
Gonzalez,	Neguse	Trahan
Vicente	Newman	Underwood
Green, Al (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	Vargas
Grijalva	Omar	Norcross
Haaland	Pallone	Norman
Hastings	Panetta	Nunes
Hayes	Pascrell	O'Halleran
Higgins (NY)	Payne	Obermole
Jackson Lee	Phillips	Owens
Jacobs (CA)	Pingree	Palazzo
Jayapal	Pocan	Palmer
Johnson (TX)	Pressley	Pappas
Jones	Price (NC)	Pence

NAYS—302

Aderholt	Davidson	Hinson
Aguilar	Davidson	Hollingsworth
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Houlahan
Allred	Dean	Hoyer
Amodei	DeGette	Hudson
Armstrong	DeLauro	Huffman
Arrington	Demings	Huizenga
Axne	DesJarlais	Issa
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Jackson
Bacon	Donalds	Jacobs (NY)
Baird	Duncan	Jeffries
Balderson	Emmer	Johnson (GA)
Banks	Estes	Johnson (LA)
Barr	Fallon	Johnson (OH)
Barragán	Feenstra	Johnson (SD)
Bentz	Ferguson	Jordan
Bera	Fischbach	Joyce (OH)
Bergman	Fitzgerald	Joyce (PA)
Bice (OK)	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Biggs	Fleischmann	Katko
Bilirakis	Fletcher	Keating
Bishop (GA)	Portenberry	Keller
Bishop (NC)	Franklin, C.	Kelly (IL)
Boebert	Scott	Kelly (MS)
Bost	Fudge	Kelly (PA)
Bourdeaux	Fulcher	Kim (CA)
Brady	Gaetz	Kind
Brooks	Gallagher	Kinzinger
Buchanan	Garamendi	Krishnamoorthi
Buck	Garbarino	Kuster
Bucshon	Garcia (CA)	Kustoff
Budd	Garcia (TX)	LaHood
Burchett	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Burgess	Gimenez	Lamborn
Bustos	Gohmert	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Gonzales, Tony	Larsen (CT)
Calvert	Gonzalez (OH)	Latta
Cammack	Good (VA)	LaTurner
Cárdenas	Gooden (TX)	Lawrence
Carl	Gosar	Lawson (FL)
Carter (GA)	Gottheimer	Lesko
Carter (TX)	Granger	Lofgren
Cartwright	Graves (LA)	Long
Case	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Cawthorn	Green (TN)	Lucas
Chabot	Greene (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Cheney	Griffith	Luria
Cline	Grothman	Lynch
Cloud	Guest	Mace
Clyde	Guthrie	Malliotakis
Cohen	Hagedorn	Maloney,
Cole	Harder (CA)	Carolyn B.
Comer	Harris	Mann
Connelly	Harshbarger	Manning
Costa	Hartzler	Massie
Courtney	Hern	Mast
Craig	Herrell	Matsui
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	McBath
Crenshaw	Hice (GA)	McCarthy
Crow	Higgins (LA)	McCauley
Cuellar	Hill	McClain
Curtis	Himes	McClintock

McCollum	Posey	Steil
McEachin	Reed	Steube
McHenry	Reschenthaler	Stevens
McKinley	Rice (SC)	Stewart
McNerney	Rodgers (WA)	Stivers
Meeks	Rogers (AL)	Suozzi
Meijer	Rogers (KY)	Taylor
Meuser	Rose	Tenney
Mfume	Rosendale	Thompson (CA)
Miller (IL)	Ross	Thompson (PA)
Miller (WV)	Rouzer	Tiffany
Miller-Meeks	Roy	Timmons
Moolenaar	Rutherford	Titus
Mooney	Salazar	Torres (CA)
Moore (AL)	Sánchez	Trone
Moore (UT)	Sarbanes	Turner
Moore (WI)	Scalise	Upton
Morelle	Scanlon	Valadao
Mrvan	Schneider	Van Drew
Mullin	Schrader	Van Dyne
Murphy (NC)	Schrier	Veasey
Nadler	Schweikert	Vela
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Wagner
Nehls	Scott, Austin	Walberg
Newhouse	Scott, David	Walorski
Norcross	Sessions	Waltz
Norman	Sherman	Weber (TX)
Nunes	Sherrill	Webster (FL)
O'Halleran	Simpson	Wenstrup
Obermole	Sires	Westerman
Owens	Slotkin	Wexton
Palazzo	Smith (MO)	Wild
Palmer	Smith (NE)	Williams (TX)
Pappas	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Pence	Smucker	Wittman
Perlmutter	Spanberger	Womack
Perry	Spartz	Young
Peters	Stauber	Zeldin
Pfleger	Steel	
Porter	Stefanik	

NOT VOTING—4

Doyle, Michael F.	Dunn	Horsford
	Foxx	

□ 1304

Messrs. THOMPSON of California and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. DINGELL, Messrs. GOLDEN and KIM of New Jersey changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)	Kelly (IL)	Neguse (Perlmutter)
Buchanan (LaHood)	(Kuster)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Langevin (Lynch)	Pingree (Kuster)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Lieu (Beyer) (Beyer)	Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Gaetz (McHenry)	Meng (Clark (MA))	Ruiz (Aguilar) (Rush)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Moore (WI) (Beyer)	(Underwood) (Speier (Scanlon))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Moulton (McGovern)	Vargas (Correa)
Huffman (McNerney)	Nadler (Jeffries)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
	Napolitano (Correa)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 4, printed in part B of House Report 117-9, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 208, not voting 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]
YEAS—223

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

NAYS—208

Aderholt	Bacon	Bergman
Allen	Baird	Bice (OK)
Amodi	Balderson	Biggs
Armstrong	Banks	Bilirakis
Arrington	Barr	Bishop (NC)
Babin	Bentz	Boebert

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

□ 1349

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Boyle, Brendan	Kelly (IL)	Neguse
F. (Jeffries)	(Kuster)	(Perlmutter)
Buchanan	Kirkpatrick	Palazzo
(LaHood)	(Stanton)	(Fleischmann)
Cardenas	Langevin	Payne
(Gomez)	(Lynch)	(Wasserman)
DeSaulnier	Lawson (FL)	Schultz
(Matsui)	(Evans)	Pingree (Kuster)
Deutch (Rice	Lieu (Beyer)	Rodgers (WA)
(NY))	Lowenthal	(Joyce (PA))
Frankel, Lois	(Beyer)	Roybal-Allard
(Clark (MA))	Meng (Clark	(Escobar)
Gaetz	(MA))	Ruiz (Aguilar)
(McHenry)	Moore (WI)	Rush
Grijalva (Garcia	(Beyer)	(Underwood)
(IL))	Moulton	Speier (Scanlon)
Hastings	(McGovern)	Vargas (Correa)
(Wasserman	Nadler (Jeffries)	Watson Coleman
Schultz)	Napolitano	(Pallone)
Huffman	(Correa)	Wilson (FL)
(McNerney)		(Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN of Michigan). The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1 is postponed.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117-20)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2021.

President Emmerson Mnangagwa has not made the necessary political and economic reforms that would warrant terminating the existing targeted sanctions program. Throughout the last year, government security services routinely intimidated and violently repressed citizens, including members of opposition political parties, union members, and journalists. The absence of progress on the most fundamental reforms needed to ensure the rule of law, democratic governance, and the protection of human rights leaves Zimbabweans vulnerable to ongoing repression and presents a continuing threat to peace and security in the region.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288, as amended, with respect to

Zimbabwe and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 2021.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117-21)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, with respect to Ukraine is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2021.

The actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets, and the actions and policies of the Government of the Russian Federation, including its purported annexation of Crimea and its use of force in Ukraine, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 with respect to Ukraine.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 2021.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO VENEZUELA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117-22)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes

in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, with respect to the situation in Venezuela is to continue in effect beyond March 8, 2021.

The situation in Venezuela continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 with respect to the situation in Venezuela.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 2021.

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 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1815

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ESPAILLAT) at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further 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, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on House Administration.

The material previously referred to by Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois is as follows:

Strike subtitle B of title V.
Strike section 5218.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

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

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1 is postponed.

GEORGE FLOYD JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 179, I call up 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 ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1280

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

Subtitle A—Holding Police Accountable in the Courts

Sec. 101. Deprivation of rights under color of law.
Sec. 102. Qualified immunity reform.
Sec. 103. Pattern and practice investigations.
Sec. 104. Independent investigations.

Subtitle B—Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act

Sec. 111. Short title.
Sec. 112. Definitions.
Sec. 113. Accreditation of law enforcement agencies.
Sec. 114. Law enforcement grants.
Sec. 115. Attorney General to conduct study.
Sec. 116. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 117. National task force on law enforcement oversight.

Sec. 118. Federal data collection on law enforcement practices.

TITLE II—POLICING TRANSPARENCY THROUGH DATA

Subtitle A—National Police Misconduct Registry

Sec. 201. Establishment of National Police Misconduct Registry.
Sec. 202. Certification requirements for hiring of law enforcement officers.

Subtitle B—PRIDE Act

Sec. 221. Short title.
Sec. 222. Definitions.
Sec. 223. Use of force reporting.
Sec. 224. Use of force data reporting.
Sec. 225. Compliance with reporting requirements.
Sec. 226. Federal law enforcement reporting.
Sec. 227. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—IMPROVING POLICE TRAINING AND POLICIES

Subtitle A—End Racial and Religious Profiling Act

Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Definitions.

PART I—PROHIBITION OF RACIAL PROFILING

Sec. 311. Prohibition.
Sec. 312. Enforcement.

PART II—PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE RACIAL PROFILING BY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Sec. 321. Policies to eliminate racial profiling.

PART III—PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE RACIAL PROFILING BY STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Sec. 331. Policies required for grants.
Sec. 332. Involvement of Attorney General.
Sec. 333. Data collection demonstration project.
Sec. 334. Development of best practices.
Sec. 335. Authorization of appropriations.

PART IV—DATA COLLECTION

Sec. 341. Attorney General to issue regulations.
Sec. 342. Publication of data.
Sec. 343. Limitations on publication of data.

PART V—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REGULATIONS AND REPORTS ON RACIAL PROFILING IN THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 351. Attorney General to issue regulations and reports.

Subtitle B—Additional Reforms

Sec. 361. Training on racial bias and duty to intervene.
Sec. 362. Ban on no-knock warrants in drug cases.
Sec. 363. Incentivizing banning of chokeholds and carotid holds.
Sec. 364. PEACE Act.
Sec. 365. Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act.
Sec. 366. Public safety innovation grants.

Subtitle C—Law Enforcement Body Cameras

PART 1—FEDERAL POLICE CAMERA AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Sec. 371. Short title.
Sec. 372. Requirements for Federal law enforcement officers regarding the use of body cameras.
Sec. 373. Patrol vehicles with in-car video recording cameras.
Sec. 374. Facial recognition technology.
Sec. 375. GAO study.
Sec. 376. Regulations.
Sec. 377. Rule of construction.

PART 2—POLICE CAMERA ACT

Sec. 381. Short title.
Sec. 382. Law enforcement body-worn camera requirements.

TITLE IV—CLOSING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSENT LOOPHOLE

Sec. 401. Short title.
Sec. 402. Prohibition on engaging in sexual acts while acting under color of law.
Sec. 403. Enactment of laws penalizing engaging in sexual acts while acting under color of law.
Sec. 404. Reports to Congress.
Sec. 405. Definition.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Severability.
Sec. 502. Savings clause.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **BYRNE GRANT PROGRAM.**—The term “Byrne grant program” means any grant program under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10151 et seq.),

without regard to whether the funds are characterized as being made available under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Program, the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, or otherwise.

(2) **COPS GRANT PROGRAM.**—The term “COPS grant program” means the grant program authorized under section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381).

(3) **FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.**—The term “Federal law enforcement agency” means any agency of the United States authorized to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of Federal criminal law.

(4) **FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “Federal law enforcement officer” has the meaning given the term in section 115 of title 18, United States Code.

(5) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian Tribe” has the meaning given the term “Indian tribe” in section 901 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251).

(6) **LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “local law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a State or unit of local government authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of any violation of criminal law.

(7) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the meaning given the term in section 901 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251).

(8) **TRIBAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “tribal law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of an Indian tribe, or the Bureau of Indian Affairs, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of any violation of criminal law.

(9) **UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “unit of local government” has the meaning given the term in section 901 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251).

(10) **DEADLY FORCE.**—The term “deadly force” means that force which a reasonable person would consider likely to cause death or serious bodily harm, including—

(A) the discharge of a firearm;
(B) a maneuver that restricts blood or oxygen flow to the brain, including chokeholds, strangleholds, neck restraints, neckholds, and carotid artery restraints; and
(C) multiple discharges of an electronic control weapon.

(11) **USE OF FORCE.**—The term “use of force” includes—

(A) the use of a firearm, electronic control weapon, explosive device, chemical agent (such as pepper spray), baton, impact projectile, blunt instrument, hand, fist, foot, canine, or vehicle against an individual;
(B) the use of a weapon, including a personal body weapon, chemical agent, impact weapon, extended range impact weapon, sonic weapon, sensory weapon, conducted energy device, or firearm, against an individual; or
(C) any intentional pointing of a firearm at an individual.

(12) **LESS LETHAL FORCE.**—The term “less lethal force” means any degree of force that is not likely to cause death or serious bodily injury.

(13) **FACIAL RECOGNITION.**—The term “facial recognition” means an automated or semi-automated process that analyzes biometric data of an individual from video footage to

identify or assist in identifying an individual.

TITLE I—POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

Subtitle A—Holding Police Accountable in the Courts

SEC. 101. DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

Section 242 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “willfully” and inserting “knowingly or recklessly”;

(2) by striking “, or may be sentenced to death”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of this section, an act shall be considered to have resulted in death if the act was a substantial factor contributing to the death of the person.”.

SEC. 102. QUALIFIED IMMUNITY REFORM.

Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by adding at the end the following: “It shall not be a defense or immunity in any action brought under this section against a local law enforcement officer (as such term is defined in section 2 of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021), or in any action under any source of law against a Federal investigative or law enforcement officer (as such term is defined in section 2680(h) of title 28, United States Code), that—

“(1) the defendant was acting in good faith, or that the defendant believed, reasonably or otherwise, that his or her conduct was lawful at the time when the conduct was committed; or

“(2) the rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws were not clearly established at the time of their deprivation by the defendant, or that at such time, the state of the law was otherwise such that the defendant could not reasonably have been expected to know whether his or her conduct was lawful.”.

SEC. 103. PATTERN AND PRACTICE INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) **SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.**—Section 210401 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12601) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “, by prosecutors,” after “conduct by law enforcement officers”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “subsection (a)”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out the authority in subsection (b), the Attorney General may require by subpoena the production of all information, documents, reports, answers, records, accounts, papers, and other data in any medium (including electronically stored information), as well as any tangible thing and documentary evidence, and the attendance and testimony of witnesses necessary in the performance of the Attorney General under subsection (b). Such a subpoena, in the case of contumacy or refusal to obey, shall be enforceable by order of any appropriate district court of the United States.

“(d) **CIVIL ACTION BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.**—Whenever it shall appear to the attorney general of any State, or such other official as a State may designate, that a violation of subsection (a) has occurred within their State, the State attorney general or official, in the name of the State, may bring a civil action in the appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate equitable and declaratory relief to eliminate the pattern or practice. In carrying out the authority in this subsection, the State attorney general or official shall have the same subpoena authority as is available to the Attorney General under subsection (c).

“(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the Attorney General under subsection (b) in any case in which a State attorney general has brought a civil action under subsection (d).

“(f) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—On the date that is one year after the enactment of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021, and annually thereafter, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall make publicly available on an internet website a report on, during the previous year—

“(1) the number of preliminary investigations of violations of subsection (a) that were commenced;

“(2) the number of preliminary investigations of violations of subsection (a) that were resolved; and

“(3) the status of any pending investigations of violations of subsection (a).”.

(b) **GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Attorney General may award a grant to a State to assist the State in conducting pattern and practice investigations under section 210401(d) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12601).

(2) **APPLICATION.**—A State seeking a grant under paragraph (1) shall submit an application in such form, at such time, and containing such information as the Attorney General may require.

(3) **FUNDING.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 to the Attorney General for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2024 to carry out this subsection.

(c) **DATA ON EXCESSIVE USE OF FORCE.**—Section 210402 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12602) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “The Attorney General” and inserting the following:

“(1) **FEDERAL COLLECTION OF DATA.**—The Attorney General”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **STATE COLLECTION OF DATA.**—The attorney general of a State may, through appropriate means, acquire data about the use of excessive force by law enforcement officers and such data may be used by the attorney general in conducting investigations under section 210401. This data may not contain any information that may reveal the identity of the victim or any law enforcement officer.”; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) **LIMITATION ON USE OF DATA ACQUIRED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—Data acquired under subsection (a)(1) shall be used only for research or statistical purposes and may not contain any information that may reveal the identity of the victim or any law enforcement officer.”.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT OF PATTERN OR PRACTICE RELIEF.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, a State or unit of local government that receives funds under the Byrne grant program or the COPS grant program during a fiscal year may not make available any amount of such funds to a local law enforcement agency if that local law enforcement agency enters into or renews any contractual arrangement, including a collective bargaining agreement with a labor organization, that—

(1) would prevent the Attorney General from seeking or enforcing equitable or declaratory relief against a law enforcement agency engaging in a pattern or practice of unconstitutional misconduct; or

(2) conflicts with any terms or conditions contained in a consent decree.

SEC. 104. INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION.**—The term “independent investigation” means a criminal investigation or prosecution of a law enforcement officer’s use of deadly force, including one or more of the following:

(i) Using an agency or civilian review board that investigates and independently reviews all allegations of use of deadly force made against law enforcement officers in the jurisdiction.

(ii) Assigning of the attorney general of the State in which the alleged use of deadly force was committed to conduct the criminal investigation and prosecution.

(iii) Adopting a procedure under which an independent prosecutor is assigned to investigate and prosecute the case, including a procedure under which an automatic referral is made to an independent prosecutor appointed and overseen by the attorney general of the State in which the alleged use of deadly force was committed.

(iv) Adopting a procedure under which an independent prosecutor is assigned to investigate and prosecute the case.

(v) Having law enforcement agencies agree to and implement memoranda of understanding with other law enforcement agencies under which the other law enforcement agencies—

(I) shall conduct the criminal investigation into the alleged use of deadly force; and

(II) upon conclusion of the criminal investigation, shall file a report with the attorney general of the State containing a determination regarding whether—

(aa) the use of deadly force was appropriate; and

(bb) any action should be taken by the attorney general of the State.

(vi) Any substantially similar procedure to ensure impartiality in the investigation or prosecution.

(B) **INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT STATUTE.**—The term “independent investigation of law enforcement statute” means a statute requiring an independent investigation in a criminal matter in which—

(i) one or more of the possible defendants is a law enforcement officer;

(ii) one or more of the alleged offenses involves the law enforcement officer’s use of deadly force in the course of carrying out that officer’s duty; and

(iii) the non-Federal law enforcement officer’s use of deadly force resulted in a death or injury.

(C) **INDEPENDENT PROSECUTOR.**—The term “independent prosecutor” means, with respect to a criminal investigation or prosecution of a law enforcement officer’s use of deadly force, a prosecutor who—

(i) does not oversee or regularly rely on the law enforcement agency by which the law enforcement officer under investigation is employed; and

(ii) would not be involved in the prosecution in the ordinary course of that prosecutor’s duties.

(2) **GRANT PROGRAM.**—The Attorney General may award grants to eligible States and Indian Tribes to assist in implementing an independent investigation of law enforcement statute.

(3) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible for a grant under this subsection, a State or Indian Tribe shall have in effect an independent investigation of law enforcement statute.

(4) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General \$750,000,000 for fiscal years 2022 through 2024 to carry out this subsection.

(b) **COPS GRANT PROGRAM USED FOR CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARDS.**—Part Q of title I of the of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1701(b) (34 U.S.C. 10381(b))—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (22) and (23) as paragraphs (23) and (24), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (23), as so redesignated, by striking “(21)” and inserting “(22)”; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (21) the following:

“(22) to develop best practices for and to create civilian review boards;”;

(2) in section 1709 (34 U.S.C. 10389), by adding at the end the following:

“(8) ‘civilian review board’ means an administrative entity that investigates civilian complaints against law enforcement officers and—

“(A) is independent and adequately funded;

“(B) has investigatory authority and subpoena power;

“(C) has representative community diversity;

“(D) has policy making authority;

“(E) provides advocates for civilian complainants;

“(F) may conduct hearings; and

“(G) conducts statistical studies on prevailing complaint trends.”.

Subtitle B—Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act

SEC. 111. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2021”.

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION.**—The term “community-based organization” means a grassroots organization that monitors the issue of police misconduct and that has a local or national presence and membership, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), UnidosUS, the National Urban League, the National Congress of American Indians, or the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium (NAPALC).

(2) **LAW ENFORCEMENT ACCREDITATION ORGANIZATION.**—The term “law enforcement accreditation organization” means a professional law enforcement organization involved in the development of standards of accreditation for law enforcement agencies at the national, State, regional, or Tribal level, such as the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA).

(3) **LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.**—The term “law enforcement agency” means a State, local, Indian tribal, or campus public agency engaged in the prevention, detection, investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of violations of criminal laws.

(4) **PROFESSIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSOCIATION.**—The term “professional law enforcement association” means a law enforcement membership association that works for the needs of Federal, State, local, or Indian tribal law enforcement agencies and with the civilian community on matters of common interest, such as the Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association (HAPCOA), the National Asian Pacific Officers Association (NAPOA), the National Black Police Association (NBPA), the National Latino Peace Officers Association (NLPOA), the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), Women in Law Enforcement, the Native American Law Enforcement Association (NALEA), the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the National Sheriffs’ Association (NSA), the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), or the National Association of School Resource Officers.

(5) PROFESSIONAL CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION.—The term “professional civilian oversight organization” means a membership organization formed to address and advance civilian oversight of law enforcement and whose members are from Federal, State, regional, local, or Tribal organizations that review issues or complaints against law enforcement agencies or officers, such as the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE).

SEC. 113. ACCREDITATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

(a) STANDARDS.—

(1) INITIAL ANALYSIS.—The Attorney General shall perform an initial analysis of existing accreditation standards and methodology developed by law enforcement accreditation organizations nationwide, including national, State, regional, and Tribal accreditation organizations. Such an analysis shall include a review of the recommendations of the Final Report of the President’s Taskforce on 21st Century Policing, issued by the Department of Justice, in May 2015.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM STANDARDS.—After completion of the initial review and analysis under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall—

(A) recommend, in consultation with law enforcement accreditation organizations and community-based organizations, the adoption of additional standards that will result in greater community accountability of law enforcement agencies and an increased focus on policing with a guardian mentality, including standards relating to—

(i) early warning systems and related intervention programs;

(ii) use of force procedures;

(iii) civilian review procedures;

(iv) traffic and pedestrian stop and search procedures;

(v) data collection and transparency;

(vi) administrative due process requirements;

(vii) video monitoring technology;

(viii) youth justice and school safety; and

(ix) recruitment, hiring, and training; and

(B) recommend additional areas for the development of national standards for the accreditation of law enforcement agencies in consultation with existing law enforcement accreditation organizations, professional law enforcement associations, labor organizations, community-based organizations, and professional civilian oversight organizations.

(3) CONTINUING ACCREDITATION PROCESS.—The Attorney General shall adopt policies and procedures to partner with law enforcement accreditation organizations, professional law enforcement associations, labor organizations, community-based organizations, and professional civilian oversight organizations to—

(A) continue the development of further accreditation standards consistent with paragraph (2); and

(B) encourage the pursuit of accreditation of Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies by certified law enforcement accreditation organizations.

(b) USE OF FUNDS REQUIREMENTS.—Section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant will use not less than 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award for the fiscal year to assist law enforcement agencies of the applicant, including campus public safety departments, gain or maintain accreditation from certified law enforcement accreditation organizations in accordance with section 113 of the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2021.”.

(c) ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN GRANT FUNDS.—The Attorney General shall, as appropriate and consistent with applicable law, allocate Department of Justice discretionary grant funding only to States or units of local government that require law enforcement agencies of that State or unit of local government to gain and maintain accreditation from certified law enforcement accreditation organizations in accordance with this section.

SEC. 114. LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.

(a) USE OF FUNDS REQUIREMENT.—Section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)), as amended by section 113, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant will use not less than 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award for the fiscal year to study and implement effective management, training, recruiting, hiring, and oversight standards and programs to promote effective community and problem solving strategies for law enforcement agencies in accordance with section 114 of the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2021.”.

(b) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS.—The Attorney General may make grants to community-based organizations to study and implement—

(1) effective management, training, recruiting, hiring, and oversight standards and programs to promote effective community and problem solving strategies for law enforcement agencies; or

(2) effective strategies and solutions to public safety, including strategies that do not rely on Federal and local law enforcement agency responses.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant amounts described in paragraph (8) of section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)), as added by subsection (a) of this section, and grant amounts awarded under subsection (b) shall be used to—

(1) study management and operations standards for law enforcement agencies, including standards relating to administrative due process, residency requirements, compensation and benefits, use of force, racial profiling, early warning and intervention systems, youth justice, school safety, civilian review boards or analogous procedures, or research into the effectiveness of existing programs, projects, or other activities designed to address misconduct; and

(2) develop pilot programs and implement effective standards and programs in the areas of training, hiring and recruitment, and oversight that are designed to improve management and address misconduct by law enforcement officers.

(d) COMPONENTS OF PILOT PROGRAM.—A pilot program developed under subsection (c)(2) shall include implementation of the following:

(1) TRAINING.—The implementation of policies, practices, and procedures addressing training and instruction to comply with accreditation standards in the areas of—

(A) the use of deadly force, less lethal force, and de-escalation tactics and techniques;

(B) investigation of officer misconduct and practices and procedures for referring to prosecuting authorities allegations of officer use of excessive force or racial profiling;

(C) disproportionate contact by law enforcement with minority communities;

(D) tactical and defensive strategy;

(E) arrests, searches, and restraint;

(F) professional verbal communications with civilians;

(G) interactions with—

(i) youth;

(ii) individuals with disabilities;

(iii) individuals with limited English proficiency; and

(iv) multi-cultural communities;

(H) proper traffic, pedestrian, and other enforcement stops; and

(I) community relations and bias awareness.

(2) RECRUITMENT, HIRING, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION OF DIVERSE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Policies, procedures, and practices for—

(A) the hiring and recruitment of diverse law enforcement officers who are representative of the communities they serve;

(B) the development of selection, promotion, educational, background, and psychological standards that comport with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.); and

(C) initiatives to encourage residency in the jurisdiction served by the law enforcement agency and continuing education.

(3) OVERSIGHT.—Complaint procedures, including the establishment of civilian review boards or analogous procedures for jurisdictions across a range of sizes and agency configurations, complaint procedures by community-based organizations, early warning systems and related intervention programs, video monitoring technology, data collection and transparency, and administrative due process requirements inherent to complaint procedures for members of the public and law enforcement.

(4) YOUTH JUSTICE AND SCHOOL SAFETY.—Uniform standards on youth justice and school safety that include best practices for law enforcement interaction and communication with children and youth, taking into consideration adolescent development and any disability, including—

(A) the right to effective and timely notification of a parent or legal guardian of any law enforcement interaction, regardless of the immigration status of the individuals involved; and

(B) the creation of positive school climates by improving school conditions for learning by—

(i) eliminating school-based arrests and referrals to law enforcement;

(ii) using evidence-based preventative measures and alternatives to school-based arrests and referrals to law enforcement, such as restorative justice and healing practices; and

(iii) using school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports.

(5) VICTIM SERVICES.—Counseling services, including psychological counseling, for individuals and communities impacted by law enforcement misconduct.

(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may provide technical assistance to States and community-based organizations in furtherance of the purposes of this section.

(2) MODELS FOR REDUCTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT MISCONDUCT.—The technical assistance provided by the Attorney General may include the development of models for States and community-based organizations to reduce law enforcement officer misconduct. Any development of such models shall be in consultation with community-based organizations.

(f) USE OF COMPONENTS.—The Attorney General may use any component or components of the Department of Justice in carrying out this section.

(g) APPLICATIONS.—An application for a grant under subsection (b) shall be submitted in such form, and contain such information, as the Attorney General may prescribe by rule.

(h) PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.—

(1) MONITORING COMPONENTS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Each program, project, or activity funded under this section shall contain a monitoring component, which shall be developed pursuant to rules made by the Attorney General.

(B) **REQUIREMENT.**—Each monitoring component required under subparagraph (A) shall include systematic identification and collection of data about activities, accomplishments, and programs throughout the duration of the program, project, or activity and presentation of such data in a usable form.

(2) EVALUATION COMPONENTS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Selected grant recipients shall be evaluated on the local level or as part of a national evaluation, pursuant to rules made by the Attorney General.

(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—An evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A) may include independent audits of police behavior and other assessments of individual program implementations. For community-based organizations in selected jurisdictions that are able to support outcome evaluations, the effectiveness of funded programs, projects, and activities may be required.

(3) **PERIODIC REVIEW AND REPORTS.**—The Attorney General may require a grant recipient to submit biannually to the Attorney General the results of the monitoring and evaluations required under paragraphs (1) and (2) and such other data and information as the Attorney General determines to be necessary.

(4) **REVOCAION OR SUSPENSION OF FUNDING.**—If the Attorney General determines, as a result of monitoring under subsection (h) or otherwise, that a grant recipient under the Byrne grant program or under subsection (b) is not in substantial compliance with the requirements of this section, the Attorney General may revoke or suspend funding of that grant, in whole or in part.

(5) **CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARD DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “civilian review board” means an administrative entity that investigates civilian complaints against law enforcement officers and—

- (1) is independent and adequately funded;
- (2) has investigatory authority and subpoena power;
- (3) has representative community diversity;
- (4) has policy making authority;
- (5) provides advocates for civilian complainants;
- (6) may conduct hearings; and
- (7) conducts statistical studies on prevalent complaint trends.

(6) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2022 to carry out the grant program authorized under subsection (b).

SEC. 115. ATTORNEY GENERAL TO CONDUCT STUDY.**(a) STUDY.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General shall conduct a nationwide study of the prevalence and effect of any law, rule, or procedure that allows a law enforcement officer to delay the response to questions posed by a local internal affairs officer, or review board on the investigative integrity and prosecution of law enforcement misconduct, including pre-interview warnings and termination policies.

(2) **INITIAL ANALYSIS.**—The Attorney General shall perform an initial analysis of existing State laws, rules, and procedures to determine whether, at a threshold level, the effect of the type of law, rule, or procedure that raises material investigatory issues that could impair or hinder a prompt and thorough investigation of possible misconduct, including criminal conduct.

(3) **DATA COLLECTION.**—After completion of the initial analysis under paragraph (2), and considering material investigatory issues, the Attorney General shall gather additional data nationwide on similar laws, rules, and procedures from a representative and statistically significant sample of jurisdictions, to determine whether such laws, rules, and procedures raise such material investigatory issues.

(b) REPORTING.—

(1) **INITIAL ANALYSIS.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall—

(A) submit to Congress a report containing the results of the initial analysis conducted under subsection (a)(2);

(B) make the report submitted under subparagraph (A) available to the public; and

(C) identify the jurisdictions for which the study described in subsection (a)(3) is to be conducted.

(2) **DATA COLLECTED.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the data collected under this section and publish the report in the Federal Register.

SEC. 116. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2022, in addition to any other sums authorized to be appropriated—

(1) \$25,000,000 for additional expenses relating to the enforcement of section 210401 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12601), criminal enforcement under sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, and administrative enforcement by the Department of Justice of such sections, including compliance with consent decrees or judgments entered into under such section 210401; and

(2) \$3,300,000 for additional expenses related to conflict resolution by the Department of Justice’s Community Relations Service.

SEC. 117. NATIONAL TASK FORCE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OVERSIGHT.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established within the Department of Justice a task force to be known as the Task Force on Law Enforcement Oversight (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Task Force”).

(b) **COMPOSITION.**—The Task Force shall be composed of individuals appointed by the Attorney General, who shall appoint not less than 1 individual from each of the following:

- (1) The Special Litigation Section of the Civil Rights Division.
- (2) The Criminal Section of the Civil Rights Division.
- (3) The Federal Coordination and Compliance Section of the Civil Rights Division.
- (4) The Employment Litigation Section of the Civil Rights Division.
- (5) The Disability Rights Section of the Civil Rights Division.
- (6) The Office of Justice Programs.
- (7) The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS).
- (8) The Corruption/Civil Rights Section of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- (9) The Community Relations Service.
- (10) The Office of Tribal Justice.

(11) The unit within the Department of Justice assigned as a liaison for civilian review boards.

(c) **POWERS AND DUTIES.**—The Task Force shall consult with professional law enforcement associations, labor organizations, and community-based organizations to coordinate the process of the detection and referral of complaints regarding incidents of alleged law enforcement misconduct.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year to carry out this section.

SEC. 118. FEDERAL DATA COLLECTION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT PRACTICES.

(a) **AGENCIES TO REPORT.**—Each Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agency shall report data of the practices enumerated in subsection (c) of that agency to the Attorney General.

(b) **BREAKDOWN OF INFORMATION BY RACE, ETHNICITY, AND GENDER.**—For each practice enumerated in subsection (c), the reporting law enforcement agency shall provide a breakdown of the numbers of incidents of that practice by race, ethnicity, age, and gender of the officers of the agency and of members of the public involved in the practice.

(c) **PRACTICES TO BE REPORTED ON.**—The practices to be reported on are the following:

- (1) Traffic violation stops.
- (2) Pedestrian stops.
- (3) Frisk and body searches.
- (4) Instances where law enforcement officers used deadly force, including—

(A) a description of when and where deadly force was used, and whether it resulted in death;

(B) a description of deadly force directed against an officer and whether it resulted in injury or death; and

(C) the law enforcement agency’s justification for use of deadly force, if the agency determines it was justified.

(d) **RETENTION OF DATA.**—Each law enforcement agency required to report data under this section shall maintain records relating to any matter reported for not less than 4 years after those records are created.

(e) **PENALTY FOR STATES FAILING TO REPORT AS REQUIRED.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For any fiscal year, a State shall not receive any amount that would otherwise be allocated to that State under section 505(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10156(a)), or any amount from any other law enforcement assistance program of the Department of Justice, unless the State has ensured, to the satisfaction of the Attorney General, that the State and each local law enforcement agency of the State is in substantial compliance with the requirements of this section.

(2) **REALLOCATION.**—Amounts not allocated by reason of this subsection shall be reallocated to States not disqualified by failure to comply with this section.

(f) **REGULATIONS.**—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

TITLE II—POLICING TRANSPARENCY THROUGH DATA**Subtitle A—National Police Misconduct Registry****SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL POLICE MISCONDUCT REGISTRY.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish a National Police Misconduct Registry to be compiled and maintained by the Department of Justice.

(b) **CONTENTS OF REGISTRY.**—The Registry required to be established under subsection (a) shall contain the following data with respect to all Federal and local law enforcement officers:

(1) Each complaint filed against a law enforcement officer, aggregated by—

(A) complaints that were found to be credible or that resulted in disciplinary action against the law enforcement officer, disaggregated by whether the complaint involved a use of force or racial profiling (as such term is defined in section 302);

(B) complaints that are pending review, disaggregated by whether the complaint involved a use of force or racial profiling; and

(C) complaints for which the law enforcement officer was exonerated or that were determined to be unfounded or not sustained, disaggregated by whether the complaint involved a use of force or racial profiling.

(2) Discipline records, disaggregated by whether the complaint involved a use of force or racial profiling.

(3) Termination records, the reason for each termination, disaggregated by whether the complaint involved a use of force or racial profiling.

(4) Records of certification in accordance with section 202.

(5) Records of lawsuits against law enforcement officers and settlements of such lawsuits.

(6) Instances where a law enforcement officer resigns or retires while under active investigation related to the use of force.

(c) FEDERAL AGENCY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the head of each Federal law enforcement agency shall submit to the Attorney General the information described in subsection (b).

(d) STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act and each fiscal year thereafter in which a State receives funds under the Byrne grant program, the State shall, once every 180 days, submit to the Attorney General the information described in subsection (b) for the State and each local law enforcement agency within the State.

(e) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REGISTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In establishing the Registry required under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall make the Registry available to the public on an internet website of the Attorney General in a manner that allows members of the public to search for an individual law enforcement officer's records of misconduct, as described in subsection (b), involving a use of force or racial profiling.

(2) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to supersede the requirements or limitations under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the "Privacy Act of 1974").

SEC. 202. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR HIRING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, a State or unit of local government, other than an Indian Tribe, may not receive funds under the Byrne grant program for that fiscal year if, on the day before the first day of the fiscal year, the State or unit of local government has not—

(1) submitted to the Attorney General evidence that the State or unit of local government has a certification and decertification program for purposes of employment as a law enforcement officer in that State or unit of local government that is consistent with the rules made under subsection (c); and

(2) submitted to the National Police Misconduct Registry established under section 201 records demonstrating that all law enforcement officers of the State or unit of local government have completed all State certification requirements during the 1-year period preceding the fiscal year.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The Attorney General shall make available to law enforcement agencies all information in the registry under section 201 for purposes of compliance with the certification and decertification programs described in subsection (a)(1) and considering applications for employment.

(c) RULES.—The Attorney General shall make rules to carry out this section and section 201, including uniform reporting standards.

Subtitle B—PRIDE Act

SEC. 221. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Police Reporting Information, Data, and Evidence Act of 2021" or the "PRIDE Act of 2021".

SEC. 222. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term "local educational agency" has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term "local law enforcement officer" has the meaning given the term in section 2, and includes a school resource officer.

(3) SCHOOL.—The term "school" means an elementary school or secondary school (as those terms are defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)).

(4) SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER.—The term "school resource officer" means a sworn law enforcement officer who is—

(A) assigned by the employing law enforcement agency to a local educational agency or school;

(B) contracting with a local educational agency or school; or

(C) employed by a local educational agency or school.

SEC. 223. USE OF FORCE REPORTING.

(a) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act and each fiscal year thereafter in which a State or Indian Tribe receives funds under a Byrne grant program, the State or Indian Tribe shall—

(A) report to the Attorney General, on a quarterly basis and pursuant to guidelines established by the Attorney General, information regarding—

(i) any incident involving the use of deadly force against a civilian by—

(I) a local law enforcement officer who is employed by the State or by a unit of local government in the State; or

(II) a tribal law enforcement officer who is employed by the Indian Tribe;

(ii) any incident involving the shooting of a local law enforcement officer or tribal law enforcement officer described in clause (i) by a civilian;

(iii) any incident involving the death or arrest of a local law enforcement officer or tribal law enforcement officer;

(iv) any incident during which use of force by or against a local law enforcement officer or tribal law enforcement officer described in clause (i) occurs, which is not reported under clause (i), (ii), or (iii);

(v) deaths in custody; and

(vi) uses of force in arrests and booking;

(B) establish a system and a set of policies to ensure that all use of force incidents are reported by local law enforcement officers or tribal law enforcement officers; and

(C) submit to the Attorney General a plan for the collection of data required to be reported under this section, including any modifications to a previously submitted data collection plan.

(2) REPORT INFORMATION REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The report required under paragraph (1)(A) shall contain information that includes, at a minimum—

(i) the national origin, sex, race, ethnicity, age, disability, English language proficiency, and housing status of each civilian against whom a local law enforcement officer or tribal law enforcement officer used force;

(ii) the date, time, and location, including whether it was on school grounds, and the zip code, of the incident and whether the jurisdiction in which the incident occurred allows for the open-carry or concealed-carry of a firearm;

(iii) whether the civilian was armed, and, if so, the type of weapon the civilian had;

(iv) the type of force used against the officer, the civilian, or both, including the types of weapons used;

(v) the reason force was used;

(vi) a description of any injuries sustained as a result of the incident;

(vii) the number of officers involved in the incident;

(viii) the number of civilians involved in the incident; and

(ix) a brief description regarding the circumstances surrounding the incident, which shall include information on—

(I) the type of force used by all involved persons;

(II) the legitimate police objective necessitating the use of force;

(III) the resistance encountered by each local law enforcement officer or tribal law enforcement officer involved in the incident;

(IV) the efforts by local law enforcement officers or tribal law enforcement officers to—

(aa) de-escalate the situation in order to avoid the use of force; or

(bb) minimize the level of force used; and

(V) if applicable, the reason why efforts described in subclause (IV) were not attempted.

(B) INCIDENTS REPORTED UNDER DEATH IN CUSTODY REPORTING ACT.—A State or Indian Tribe is not required to include in a report under subsection (a)(1) an incident reported by the State or Indian Tribe in accordance with section 20104(a)(2) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12104(a)(2)).

(C) RETENTION OF DATA.—Each law enforcement agency required to report data under this section shall maintain records relating to any matter so reportable for not less than 4 years after those records are created.

(3) AUDIT OF USE-OF-FORCE REPORTING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, each State or Indian Tribe described in paragraph (1) shall—

(A) conduct an audit of the use of force incident reporting system required to be established under paragraph (1)(B); and

(B) submit a report to the Attorney General on the audit conducted under subparagraph (A).

(4) COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE.—Prior to submitting a report under paragraph (1)(A), the State or Indian Tribe submitting such report shall compare the information compiled to be reported pursuant to clause (i) of paragraph (1)(A) to publicly available sources, and shall revise such report to include any incident determined to be missing from the report based on such comparison. Failure to comply with the procedures described in the previous sentence shall be considered a failure to comply with the requirements of this section.

(b) INELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For any fiscal year in which a State or Indian Tribe fails to comply with this section, the State or Indian Tribe, at the discretion of the Attorney General, shall be subject to not more than a 10-percent reduction of the funds that would otherwise be allocated for that fiscal year to the State or Indian Tribe under a Byrne grant program.

(2) REALLOCATION.—Amounts not allocated under a Byrne grant program in accordance with paragraph (1) to a State for failure to comply with this section shall be reallocated under the Byrne grant program to States

that have not failed to comply with this section.

(3) **INFORMATION REGARDING SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS.**—The State or Indian Tribe shall ensure that all schools and local educational agencies within the jurisdiction of the State or Indian Tribe provide the State or Indian Tribe with the information needed regarding school resource officers to comply with this section.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DATA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Attorney General shall publish, and make available to the public, a report containing the data reported to the Attorney General under this section.

(2) **PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to supersede the requirements or limitations under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Privacy Act of 1974”).

(d) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall issue guidance on best practices relating to establishing standard data collection systems that capture the information required to be reported under subsection (a)(2), which shall include standard and consistent definitions for terms.

SEC. 224. USE OF FORCE DATA REPORTING.

(a) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible law enforcement agencies to be used for the activities described in subsection (c).

(b) **ELIGIBILITY.**—In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section a law enforcement agency shall—

(1) be a tribal law enforcement agency or be located in a State that receives funds under a Byrne grant program;

(2) employ not more than 100 local or tribal law enforcement officers;

(3) demonstrate that the use of force policy for local law enforcement officers or tribal law enforcement officers employed by the law enforcement agency is publicly available; and

(4) establish and maintain a complaint system that—

(A) may be used by members of the public to report incidents of use of force to the law enforcement agency;

(B) makes all information collected publicly searchable and available; and

(C) provides information on the status of an investigation related to a use of force complaint.

(c) **ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.**—A grant made under this section may be used by a law enforcement agency for—

(1) the cost of assisting the State or Indian Tribe in which the law enforcement agency is located in complying with the reporting requirements described in section 223;

(2) the cost of establishing necessary systems required to investigate and report incidents as required under subsection (b)(4);

(3) public awareness campaigns designed to gain information from the public on use of force by or against local and tribal law enforcement officers, including shootings, which may include tip lines, hotlines, and public service announcements; and

(4) use of force training for law enforcement agencies and personnel, including training on de-escalation, implicit bias, crisis intervention techniques, and adolescent development.

SEC. 225. COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Attorney General

shall conduct an audit and review of the information provided under this subtitle to determine whether each State or Indian Tribe described in section 223(a)(1) is in compliance with the requirements of this subtitle.

(b) **CONSISTENCY IN DATA REPORTING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any data reported under this subtitle shall be collected and reported—

(A) in a manner consistent with existing programs of the Department of Justice that collect data on local law enforcement officer encounters with civilians; and

(B) in a manner consistent with civil rights laws for distribution of information to the public.

(2) **GUIDELINES.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall—

(A) issue guidelines on the reporting requirement under section 223; and

(B) seek public comment before finalizing the guidelines required under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 226. FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT REPORTING.

The head of each Federal law enforcement agency shall submit to the Attorney General, on a quarterly basis and pursuant to guidelines established by the Attorney General, the information required to be reported by a State or Indian Tribe under section 223.

SEC. 227. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General such sums as are necessary to carry out this subtitle.

TITLE III—IMPROVING POLICE TRAINING AND POLICIES

Subtitle A—End Racial and Religious Profiling Act

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “End Racial and Religious Profiling Act of 2021” or “ERRPA”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **COVERED PROGRAM.**—The term “covered program” means any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under—

(A) a Byrne grant program; and

(B) the COPS grant program, except that no program, project, or other activity specified in section 1701(b)(13) of part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381 et seq.) shall be a covered program under this paragraph.

(2) **GOVERNMENTAL BODY.**—The term “governmental body” means any department, agency, special purpose district, or other instrumentality of Federal, State, local, or Indian Tribal government.

(3) **HIT RATE.**—The term “hit rate” means the percentage of stops and searches in which a law enforcement agent finds drugs, a gun, or something else that leads to an arrest. The hit rate is calculated by dividing the total number of searches by the number of searches that yield contraband. The hit rate is complementary to the rate of false stops.

(4) **LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.**—The term “law enforcement agency” means any Federal, State, or local public agency engaged in the prevention, detection, or investigation of violations of criminal, immigration, or customs laws.

(5) **LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENT.**—The term “law enforcement agent” means any Federal, State, or local official responsible for enforcing criminal, immigration, or customs laws, including police officers and other agents of a law enforcement agency.

(6) **RACIAL PROFILING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “racial profiling” means the practice of a law en-

forcement agent or agency relying, to any degree, on actual or perceived race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, gender identity, or sexual orientation in selecting which individual to subject to routine or spontaneous investigatory activities or in deciding upon the scope and substance of law enforcement activity following the initial investigatory procedure, except when there is trustworthy information, relevant to the locality and timeframe, that links a person with a particular characteristic described in this paragraph to an identified criminal incident or scheme.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a tribal law enforcement officer exercising law enforcement authority within Indian country, as that term is defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code, is not considered to be racial profiling with respect to making key jurisdictional determinations that are necessarily tied to reliance on actual or perceived race, ethnicity, or tribal affiliation.

(7) **ROUTINE OR SPONTANEOUS INVESTIGATORY ACTIVITIES.**—The term “routine or spontaneous investigatory activities” means the following activities by a law enforcement agent:

(A) Interviews.

(B) Traffic stops.

(C) Pedestrian stops.

(D) Frisks and other types of body searches.

(E) Consensual or nonconsensual searches of the persons, property, or possessions (including vehicles) of individuals using any form of public or private transportation, including motorists and pedestrians.

(F) Data collection and analysis, assessments, and predicated investigations.

(G) Inspections and interviews of entrants into the United States that are more extensive than those customarily carried out.

(H) Immigration-related workplace investigations.

(I) Such other types of law enforcement encounters compiled for or by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics.

(8) **REASONABLE REQUEST.**—The term “reasonable request” means all requests for information, except for those that—

(A) are immaterial to the investigation;

(B) would result in the unnecessary disclosure of personal information; or

(C) would place a severe burden on the resources of the law enforcement agency given its size.

PART I—PROHIBITION OF RACIAL PROFILING

SEC. 311. PROHIBITION.

No law enforcement agent or law enforcement agency shall engage in racial profiling.

SEC. 312. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **REMEDY.**—The United States, or an individual injured by racial profiling, may enforce this part in a civil action for declaratory or injunctive relief, filed either in a State court of general jurisdiction or in a district court of the United States.

(b) **PARTIES.**—In any action brought under this part, relief may be obtained against—

(1) any governmental body that employed any law enforcement agent who engaged in racial profiling;

(2) any agent of such body who engaged in racial profiling; and

(3) any person with supervisory authority over such agent.

(c) **NATURE OF PROOF.**—Proof that the routine or spontaneous investigatory activities of law enforcement agents in a jurisdiction have had a disparate impact on individuals with a particular characteristic described in section 302(6) shall constitute prima facie evidence of a violation of this part.

(d) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—In any action or proceeding to enforce this part against any governmental body, the court may allow a prevailing plaintiff, other than the United States, reasonable attorney's fees as part of the costs, and may include expert fees as part of the attorney's fee. The term "prevailing plaintiff" means a plaintiff that substantially prevails pursuant to a judicial or administrative judgment or order, or an enforceable written agreement.

PART II—PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE RACIAL PROFILING BY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 321. POLICIES TO ELIMINATE RACIAL PROFILING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Federal law enforcement agencies shall—

(1) maintain adequate policies and procedures designed to eliminate racial profiling; and

(2) cease existing practices that permit racial profiling.

(b) POLICIES.—The policies and procedures described in subsection (a)(1) shall include—

(1) a prohibition on racial profiling;

(2) training on racial profiling issues as part of Federal law enforcement training;

(3) the collection of data in accordance with the regulations issued by the Attorney General under section 341;

(4) procedures for receiving, investigating, and responding meaningfully to complaints alleging racial profiling by law enforcement agents; and

(5) any other policies and procedures the Attorney General determines to be necessary to eliminate racial profiling by Federal law enforcement agencies.

PART III—PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE RACIAL PROFILING BY STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 331. POLICIES REQUIRED FOR GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An application by a State or a unit of local government for funding under a covered program shall include a certification that such State, unit of local government, and any law enforcement agency to which it will distribute funds—

(1) maintains adequate policies and procedures designed to eliminate racial profiling; and

(2) has eliminated any existing practices that permit or encourage racial profiling.

(b) POLICIES.—The policies and procedures described in subsection (a)(1) shall include—

(1) a prohibition on racial profiling;

(2) training on racial profiling issues as part of law enforcement training;

(3) the collection of data in accordance with the regulations issued by the Attorney General under section 341; and

(4) participation in an administrative complaint procedure or independent audit program that meets the requirements of section 332.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 332. INVOLVEMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(a) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and in consultation with stakeholders, including Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and community, professional, research, and civil rights organizations, the Attorney General shall issue regulations for the operation of administrative complaint procedures and independent audit programs to ensure that such procedures and programs provide an appropriate response to allegations of racial profiling by law enforcement agents or agencies.

(2) GUIDELINES.—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) shall contain guidelines

that ensure the fairness, effectiveness, and independence of the administrative complaint procedures and independent auditor programs.

(b) NONCOMPLIANCE.—If the Attorney General determines that the recipient of a grant from any covered program is not in compliance with the requirements of section 331 or the regulations issued under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall withhold, in whole or in part (at the discretion of the Attorney General), funds for one or more grants to the recipient under the covered program, until the recipient establishes compliance.

(c) PRIVATE PARTIES.—The Attorney General shall provide notice and an opportunity for private parties to present evidence to the Attorney General that a recipient of a grant from any covered program is not in compliance with the requirements of this part.

SEC. 333. DATA COLLECTION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR DATA COLLECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may, through competitive grants or contracts, carry out a 2-year demonstration project for the purpose of developing and implementing data collection programs on the hit rates for stops and searches by law enforcement agencies. The data collected shall be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, and religion.

(2) NUMBER OF GRANTS.—The Attorney General shall provide not more than 5 grants or contracts under this section.

(3) ELIGIBLE GRANTEEES.—Grants or contracts under this section shall be awarded to law enforcement agencies that serve communities where there is a significant concentration of racial or ethnic minorities and that are not already collecting data voluntarily.

(b) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—Activities carried out with a grant under this section shall include—

(1) developing a data collection tool and reporting the compiled data to the Attorney General; and

(2) training of law enforcement personnel on data collection, particularly for data collection on hit rates for stops and searches.

(c) EVALUATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall enter into a contract with an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) to analyze the data collected by each of the grantees funded under this section.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out activities under this section—

(1) \$5,000,000, over a 2-year period, to carry out the demonstration program under subsection (a); and

(2) \$500,000 to carry out the evaluation under subsection (c).

SEC. 334. DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.

(a) USE OF FUNDS REQUIREMENT.—Section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)), as amended by sections 113 and 114, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant will use not less than 10 percent of the total amount of the grant award for the fiscal year to develop and implement best practice devices and systems to eliminate racial profiling in accordance with section 334 of the End Racial and Religious Profiling Act of 2021.”.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.—Grant amounts described in paragraph (9) of section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime

Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)), as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall be for programs that include the following:

(1) The development and implementation of training to prevent racial profiling and to encourage more respectful interaction with the public.

(2) The acquisition and use of technology to facilitate the accurate collection and analysis of data.

(3) The development and acquisition of feedback systems and technologies that identify law enforcement agents or units of agents engaged in, or at risk of engaging in, racial profiling or other misconduct.

(4) The establishment and maintenance of an administrative complaint procedure or independent auditor program.

SEC. 335. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General such sums as are necessary to carry out this part.

PART IV—DATA COLLECTION

SEC. 341. ATTORNEY GENERAL TO ISSUE REGULATIONS.

(a) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with stakeholders, including Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and community, professional, research, and civil rights organizations, shall issue regulations for the collection and compilation of data under sections 321 and 331.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations issued under subsection (a) shall—

(1) provide for the collection of data on all routine and spontaneous investigatory activities;

(2) provide that the data collected shall—

(A) be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, disability, and religion;

(B) include the date, time, and location of such investigatory activities;

(C) include detail sufficient to permit an analysis of whether a law enforcement agency is engaging in racial profiling; and

(D) not include personally identifiable information;

(3) provide that a standardized form shall be made available to law enforcement agencies for the submission of collected data to the Department of Justice;

(4) provide that law enforcement agencies shall compile data on the standardized form made available under paragraph (3), and submit the form to the Civil Rights Division and the Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics;

(5) provide that law enforcement agencies shall maintain all data collected under this subtitle for not less than 4 years;

(6) include guidelines for setting comparative benchmarks, consistent with best practices, against which collected data shall be measured;

(7) provide that the Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics shall—

(A) analyze the data for any statistically significant disparities, including—

(i) disparities in the percentage of drivers or pedestrians stopped relative to the proportion of the population passing through the neighborhood;

(ii) disparities in the hit rate; and

(iii) disparities in the frequency of searches performed on racial or ethnic minority drivers and the frequency of searches performed on nonminority drivers; and

(B) not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter—

(i) prepare a report regarding the findings of the analysis conducted under subparagraph (A);

(ii) provide such report to Congress; and
 (iii) make such report available to the public, including on a website of the Department of Justice, and in accordance with accessibility standards under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.); and

(8) protect the privacy of individuals whose data is collected by—

(A) limiting the use of the data collected under this subtitle to the purposes set forth in this subtitle;

(B) except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, limiting access to the data collected under this subtitle to those Federal, State, or local employees or agents who require such access in order to fulfill the purposes for the data set forth in this subtitle;

(C) requiring contractors or other non-governmental agents who are permitted access to the data collected under this subtitle to sign use agreements incorporating the use and disclosure restrictions set forth in subparagraph (A); and

(D) requiring the maintenance of adequate security measures to prevent unauthorized access to the data collected under this subtitle.

SEC. 342. PUBLICATION OF DATA.

The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the Department of Justice shall provide to Congress and make available to the public, together with each annual report described in section 341, the data collected pursuant to this subtitle, excluding any personally identifiable information described in section 343.

SEC. 343. LIMITATIONS ON PUBLICATION OF DATA.

The name or identifying information of a law enforcement agent, complainant, or any other individual involved in any activity for which data is collected and compiled under this subtitle shall not be—

(1) released to the public;

(2) disclosed to any person, except for—

(A) such disclosures as are necessary to comply with this subtitle;

(B) disclosures of information regarding a particular person to that person; or

(C) disclosures pursuant to litigation; or

(3) subject to disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), except for disclosures of information regarding a particular person to that person.

PART V—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REGULATIONS AND REPORTS ON RACIAL PROFILING IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 351. ATTORNEY GENERAL TO ISSUE REGULATIONS AND REPORTS.

(a) REGULATIONS.—In addition to the regulations required under sections 333 and 341, the Attorney General shall issue such other regulations as the Attorney General determines are necessary to implement this subtitle.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on racial profiling by law enforcement agencies.

(2) SCOPE.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a summary of data collected under sections 321(b)(3) and 331(b)(3) and from any other reliable source of information regarding racial profiling in the United States;

(B) a discussion of the findings in the most recent report prepared by the Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics under section 341(b)(7);

(C) the status of the adoption and implementation of policies and procedures by Federal law enforcement agencies under section 321 and by the State and local law enforcement agencies under sections 331 and 332; and

(D) a description of any other policies and procedures that the Attorney General believes would facilitate the elimination of racial profiling.

Subtitle B—Additional Reforms

SEC. 361. TRAINING ON RACIAL BIAS AND DUTY TO INTERVENE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall establish—

(1) a training program for law enforcement officers to cover racial profiling, implicit bias, and procedural justice; and

(2) a clear duty for Federal law enforcement officers to intervene in cases where another law enforcement officer is using excessive force against a civilian, and establish a training program that covers the duty to intervene.

(b) MANDATORY TRAINING FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The head of each Federal law enforcement agency shall require each Federal law enforcement officer employed by the agency to complete the training programs established under subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, a State or unit of local government may not receive funds under the Byrne grant program for a fiscal year if, on the day before the first day of the fiscal year, the State or unit of local government does not require each law enforcement officer in the State or unit of local government to complete the training programs established under subsection (a).

(d) GRANTS TO TRAIN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ON USE OF FORCE.—Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(I) Training programs for law enforcement officers, including training programs on use of force and a duty to intervene.”.

SEC. 362. BAN ON NO-KNOCK WARRANTS IN DRUG CASES.

(a) BAN ON FEDERAL WARRANTS IN DRUG CASES.—Section 509 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 879) is amended by adding at the end the following: “A search warrant authorized under this section shall require that a law enforcement officer execute the search warrant only after providing notice of his or her authority and purpose.”.

(b) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, a State or unit of local government may not receive funds under the COPS grant program for a fiscal year if, on the day before the first day of the fiscal year, the State or unit of local government does not have in effect a law that prohibits the issuance of a no-knock warrant in a drug case.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “no-knock warrant” means a warrant that allows a law enforcement officer to enter a property without requiring the law enforcement officer to announce the presence of the law enforcement officer or the intention of the law enforcement officer to enter the property.

SEC. 363. INCENTIVIZING BANNING OF CHOKEHOLDS AND CAROTID HOLDS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “chokehold or carotid hold” means the application of any pressure to the throat or windpipe, the use of maneuvers that restrict blood or oxygen flow to the brain, or carotid artery restraints that prevent or hinder breathing or reduce intake of air of an individual.

(b) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins

after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, a State or unit of local government may not receive funds under the Byrne grant program or the COPS grant program for a fiscal year if, on the day before the first day of the fiscal year, the State or unit of local government does not have in effect a law that prohibits law enforcement officers in the State or unit of local government from using a chokehold or carotid hold.

(c) CHOKEHOLDS AS CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.—

(1) SHORT TITLE.—This subsection may be cited as the “Eric Garner Excessive Use of Force Prevention Act”.

(2) CHOKEHOLDS AS CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.—Section 242 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 101, is amended by adding at the end the following: “For the purposes of this section, the application of any pressure to the throat or windpipe, use of maneuvers that restrict blood or oxygen flow to the brain, or carotid artery restraints which prevent or hinder breathing or reduce intake of air is a punishment, pain, or penalty.”.

SEC. 364. PEACE ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Police Exercising Absolute Care With Everyone Act of 2021” or the “PEACE Act of 2021”.

(b) USE OF FORCE BY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) DEESCALATION TACTICS AND TECHNIQUES.—The term “deescalation tactics and techniques” means proactive actions and approaches used by a Federal law enforcement officer to stabilize the situation so that more time, options, and resources are available to gain a person’s voluntary compliance and reduce or eliminate the need to use force, including verbal persuasion, warnings, tactical techniques, slowing down the pace of an incident, waiting out a subject, creating distance between the officer and the threat, and requesting additional resources to resolve the incident.

(B) NECESSARY.—The term “necessary” means that another reasonable Federal law enforcement officer would objectively conclude, under the totality of the circumstances, that there was no reasonable alternative to the use of force.

(C) REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term “reasonable alternatives” means tactics and methods used by a Federal law enforcement officer to effectuate an arrest that do not unreasonably increase the risk posed to the law enforcement officer or another person, including verbal communication, distance, warnings, deescalation tactics and techniques, tactical repositioning, and other tactics and techniques intended to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the risk so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force.

(ii) DEADLY FORCE.—With respect to the use of deadly force, the term “reasonable alternatives” includes the use of less lethal force.

(D) TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES.—The term “totality of the circumstances” means all credible facts known to the Federal law enforcement officer leading up to and at the time of the use of force, including the actions of the person against whom the Federal law enforcement officer uses such force and the actions of the Federal law enforcement officer.

(2) PROHIBITION ON LESS LETHAL FORCE.—A Federal law enforcement officer may not use any less lethal force unless—

(A) the form of less lethal force used is necessary and proportional in order to effectuate an arrest of a person who the officer has probable cause to believe has committed a criminal offense; and

(B) reasonable alternatives to the use of the form of less lethal force have been exhausted.

(3) PROHIBITION ON DEADLY USE OF FORCE.—A Federal law enforcement officer may not use deadly force against a person unless—

(A) the form of deadly force used is necessary, as a last resort, to prevent imminent and serious bodily injury or death to the officer or another person;

(B) the use of the form of deadly force creates no substantial risk of injury to a third person; and

(C) reasonable alternatives to the use of the form of deadly force have been exhausted.

(4) REQUIREMENT TO GIVE VERBAL WARNING.—When feasible, prior to using force against a person, a Federal law enforcement officer shall identify himself or herself as a Federal law enforcement officer, and issue a verbal warning to the person that the Federal law enforcement officer seeks to apprehend, which shall—

(A) include a request that the person surrender to the law enforcement officer; and

(B) notify the person that the law enforcement officer will use force against the person if the person resists arrest or flees.

(5) GUIDANCE ON USE OF FORCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with impacted persons, communities, and organizations, including representatives of civil and human rights organizations, victims of police use of force, and representatives of law enforcement associations, shall provide guidance to Federal law enforcement agencies on—

(A) the types of less lethal force and deadly force that are prohibited under paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(B) how a Federal law enforcement officer can—

(i) assess whether the use of force is appropriate and necessary; and

(ii) use the least amount of force when interacting with—

(I) pregnant individuals;

(II) children and youth under 21 years of age;

(III) elderly persons;

(IV) persons with mental, behavioral, or physical disabilities or impairments;

(V) persons experiencing perceptual or cognitive impairments due to use of alcohol, narcotics, hallucinogens, or other drugs;

(VI) persons suffering from a serious medical condition; and

(VII) persons with limited English proficiency.

(6) TRAINING.—The Attorney General shall provide training to Federal law enforcement officers on interacting people described in subclauses (I) through (VII) of paragraph (5)(B)(ii).

(7) LIMITATION ON JUSTIFICATION DEFENSE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1123. Limitation on justification defense for Federal law enforcement officers

“(a) IN GENERAL.—It is not a defense to an offense under section 1111 or 1112 that the use of less lethal force or deadly force by a Federal law enforcement officer was justified if—

“(1) that officer’s use of use of such force was inconsistent with section 364(b) of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021; or

“(2) that officer’s gross negligence, leading up to and at the time of the use of force, con-

tributed to the necessity of the use of such force.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the terms ‘deadly force’ and ‘less lethal force’ have the meanings given such terms in section 2 and section 364 of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021; and

“(2) the term ‘Federal law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given such term in section 115.”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1122 the following:

“1123. Limitation on justification defense for Federal law enforcement officers.”.

(c) LIMITATION ON THE RECEIPT OF FUNDS UNDER THE EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) LIMITATION.—A State or unit of local government, other than an Indian Tribe, may not receive funds that the State or unit of local government would otherwise receive under a Byrne grant program for a fiscal year if, on the day before the first day of the fiscal year, the State or unit of local government does not have in effect a law that is consistent with subsection (b) of this section and section 1123 of title 18, United States Code, as determined by the Attorney General.

(2) SUBSEQUENT ENACTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If funds described in paragraph (1) are withheld from a State or unit of local government pursuant to paragraph (1) for 1 or more fiscal years, and the State or unit of local government enacts or puts in place a law described in paragraph (1), and demonstrates substantial efforts to enforce such law, subject to subparagraph (B), the State or unit of local government shall be eligible, in the fiscal year after the fiscal year during which the State or unit of local government demonstrates such substantial efforts, to receive the total amount that the State or unit of local government would have received during each fiscal year for which funds were withheld.

(B) LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF PRIOR YEAR FUNDS.—A State or unit of local government may not receive funds under subparagraph (A) in an amount that is more than the amount withheld from the State or unit of local government during the 5-fiscal-year period before the fiscal year during which funds are received under subparagraph (A).

(3) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with impacted persons, communities, and organizations, including representatives of civil and human rights organizations, individuals against whom a law enforcement officer used force, and representatives of law enforcement associations, shall make guidance available to States and units of local government on the criteria that the Attorney General will use in determining whether the State or unit of local government has in place a law described in paragraph (1).

(4) APPLICATION.—This subsection shall apply to the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 365. STOP MILITARIZING LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, the Department of Defense is authorized to provide excess property to local law enforcement agencies. The Defense Logistics Agency, administers such section

by operating the Law Enforcement Support Office program.

(2) New and used material, including mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles and weapons determined by the Department of Defense to be ‘military grade’ are transferred to Federal, Tribal, State, and local law enforcement agencies through the program.

(3) As a result local law enforcement agencies, including police and sheriff’s departments, are acquiring this material for use in their normal operations.

(4) As a result of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, military equipment purchased for, and used in, those wars has become excess property and has been made available for transfer to local and Federal law enforcement agencies.

(5) In Fiscal Year 2017, \$504,000,000 worth of property was transferred to law enforcement agencies.

(6) More than \$6,800,000,000 worth of weapons and equipment have been transferred to police organizations in all 50 States and four territories through the program.

(7) In May 2012, the Defense Logistics Agency instituted a moratorium on weapons transfers through the program after reports of missing equipment and inappropriate weapons transfers.

(8) Though the moratorium was widely publicized, it was lifted in October 2013 without adequate safeguards.

(9) On January 16, 2015, President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13688 to better coordinate and regulate the federal transfer of military weapons and equipment to State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies.

(10) In July, 2017, the Government Accountability Office reported that the program’s internal controls were inadequate to prevent fraudulent applicants’ access to the program.

(11) On August, 28, 2017, President Donald Trump rescinded Executive Order 13688 despite a July 2017 Government Accountability Office report finding deficiencies with the administration of the 1033 program.

(12) As a result, Federal, State, and local law enforcement departments across the country are eligible again to acquire free ‘military-grade’ weapons and equipment that could be used inappropriately during policing efforts in which people and taxpayers could be harmed.

(13) The Department of Defense categorizes equipment eligible for transfer under the 1033 program as ‘controlled’ and ‘uncontrolled’ equipment. ‘Controlled equipment’ includes weapons, explosives such as flash-bang grenades, mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles, long-range acoustic devices, aircraft capable of being modified to carry armament that are combat coded, and silencers, among other military grade items.

(b) LIMITATION ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TRANSFER OF PERSONAL PROPERTY TO LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ‘counterdrug, counterterrorism, and border security activities’ and inserting ‘counterterrorism’; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘, the Director of National Drug Control Policy,’;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by striking ‘and’ at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

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

“(7) the recipient submits to the Department of Defense a description of how the recipient expects to use the property;

“(8) the recipient certifies to the Department of Defense that if the recipient determines that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient, the recipient will return the property to the Department of Defense;

“(9) with respect to a recipient that is not a Federal agency, the recipient certifies to the Department of Defense that the recipient notified the local community of the request for personal property under this section by—

“(A) publishing a notice of such request on a publicly accessible Internet website;

“(B) posting such notice at several prominent locations in the jurisdiction of the recipient; and

“(C) ensuring that such notices were available to the local community for a period of not less than 30 days; and

“(10) the recipient has received the approval of the city council or other local governing body to acquire the personal property sought under this section.”;

(C) by striking subsection (d);

(D) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (o) and (p), respectively; and

(E) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

“(d) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION ACCOUNTING FOR TRANSFERRED PROPERTY.—(1) For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress certification in writing that each Federal or State agency to which the Secretary has transferred property under this section—

“(A) has provided to the Secretary documentation accounting for all controlled property, including arms and ammunition, that the Secretary has transferred to the agency, including any item described in subsection (f) so transferred before the date of the enactment of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021; and

“(B) with respect to a non-Federal agency, carried out each of paragraphs (5) through (8) of subsection (b).

“(2) If the Secretary does not provide a certification under paragraph (1) for a Federal or State agency, the Secretary may not transfer additional property to that agency under this section.

“(e) ANNUAL REPORT ON EXCESS PROPERTY.—Before making any property available for transfer under this section, the Secretary shall annually submit to Congress a description of the property to be transferred together with a certification that the transfer of the property would not violate this section or any other provision of law.

“(f) LIMITATIONS ON TRANSFERS.—(1) The Secretary may not transfer to Federal, Tribal, State, or local law enforcement agencies the following under this section:

“(A) Firearms, ammunition, bayonets, grenade launchers, grenades (including stun and flash-bang), and explosives.

“(B) Vehicles, except for passenger automobiles (as such term is defined in section 32901(a)(18) of title 49, United States Code) and bucket trucks.

“(C) Drones.

“(D) Controlled aircraft that—

“(i) are combat configured or combat coded; or

“(ii) have no established commercial flight application.

“(E) Silencers.

“(F) Long-range acoustic devices.

“(G) Items in the Federal Supply Class of banned items.

“(2) The Secretary may not require, as a condition of a transfer under this section, that a Federal or State agency demonstrate the use of any small arms or ammunition.

“(3) The limitations under this subsection shall also apply with respect to the transfer of previously transferred property of the Department of Defense from one Federal or State agency to another such agency.

“(4)(A) The Secretary may waive the applicability of paragraph (1) to a vehicle described in subparagraph (B) of such paragraph (other than a mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicle), if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is necessary for disaster or rescue purposes or for another purpose where life and public safety are at risk, as demonstrated by the proposed recipient of the vehicle.

“(B) If the Secretary issues a waiver under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

“(i) submit to Congress notice of the waiver, and post such notice on a public Internet website of the Department, by not later than 30 days after the date on which the waiver is issued; and

“(ii) require, as a condition of the waiver, that the recipient of the vehicle for which the waiver is issued provides public notice of the waiver and the transfer, including the type of vehicle and the purpose for which it is transferred, in the jurisdiction where the recipient is located by not later than 30 days after the date on which the waiver is issued.

“(5) The Secretary may provide for an exemption to the limitation under subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1) in the case of parts for aircraft described in such subparagraph that are transferred as part of regular maintenance of aircraft in an existing fleet.

“(6) The Secretary shall require, as a condition of any transfer of property under this section, that the Federal or State agency that receives the property shall return the property to the Secretary if the agency—

“(A) is investigated by the Department of Justice for any violation of civil liberties; or

“(B) is otherwise found to have engaged in widespread abuses of civil liberties.

“(g) CONDITIONS FOR EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year may not be obligated or expended to carry out this section unless the Secretary submits to Congress certification that for the preceding fiscal year that—

“(1) each Federal or State agency that has received controlled property transferred under this section has—

“(A) demonstrated 100 percent accountability for all such property, in accordance with paragraph (2) or (3), as applicable; or

“(B) been suspended from the program pursuant to paragraph (4);

“(2) with respect to each non-Federal agency that has received controlled property under this section, the State coordinator responsible for each such agency has verified that the coordinator or an agent of the coordinator has conducted an in-person inventory of the property transferred to the agency and that 100 percent of such property was accounted for during the inventory or that the agency has been suspended from the program pursuant to paragraph (4);

“(3) with respect to each Federal agency that has received controlled property under this section, the Secretary of Defense or an agent of the Secretary has conducted an in-person inventory of the property transferred to the agency and that 100 percent of such property was accounted for during the inventory or that the agency has been suspended from the program pursuant to paragraph (4);

“(4) the eligibility of any agency that has received controlled property under this section for which 100 percent of the property was not accounted for during an inventory described in paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable, to receive any property transferred under this section has been suspended; and

“(5) each State coordinator has certified, for each non-Federal agency located in the State for which the State coordinator is responsible that—

“(A) the agency has complied with all requirements under this section; or

“(B) the eligibility of the agency to receive property transferred under this section has been suspended; and

“(6) the Secretary of Defense has certified, for each Federal agency that has received property under this section that—

“(A) the agency has complied with all requirements under this section; or

“(B) the eligibility of the agency to receive property transferred under this section has been suspended.

“(h) PROHIBITION ON OWNERSHIP OF CONTROLLED PROPERTY.—A Federal or State agency that receives controlled property under this section may not take ownership of the property.

“(i) NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF PROPERTY DOWNGRADES.—Not later than 30 days before downgrading the classification of any item of personal property from controlled or Federal Supply Class, the Secretary shall submit to Congress notice of the proposed downgrade.

“(j) NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF PROPERTY CANNIBALIZATION.—Before the Defense Logistics Agency authorizes the recipient of property transferred under this section to cannibalize the property, the Secretary shall submit to Congress notice of such authorization, including the name of the recipient requesting the authorization, the purpose of the proposed cannibalization, and the type of property proposed to be cannibalized.

“(k) QUARTERLY REPORTS ON USE OF CONTROLLED EQUIPMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the last day of a fiscal quarter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on any uses of controlled property transferred under this section during that fiscal quarter.

“(l) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after the last day of a fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the following for the preceding fiscal year:

“(1) The percentage of equipment lost by recipients of property transferred under this section, including specific information about the type of property lost, the monetary value of such property, and the recipient that lost the property.

“(2) The transfer of any new (condition code A) property transferred under this section, including specific information about the type of property, the recipient of the property, the monetary value of each item of the property, and the total monetary value of all such property transferred during the fiscal year.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any transfer of property made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 366. PUBLIC SAFETY INNOVATION GRANTS.

(a) BYRNE GRANTS USED FOR LOCAL TASK FORCES ON PUBLIC SAFETY INNOVATION.—Section 501(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10151(a)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) LOCAL TASK FORCES ON PUBLIC SAFETY INNOVATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A law enforcement program under paragraph (1)(A) may include the development of best practices for and the creation of local task forces on public safety innovation, charged with exploring and developing new strategies for public safety, including non-law enforcement strategies.

“(B) DEFINITION.—The term ‘local task force on public safety innovation’ means an administrative entity, created from partnerships between community-based organizations and other local stakeholders, that may develop innovative law enforcement and non-law enforcement strategies to enhance just and equitable public safety, repair breaches of trust between law enforcement agencies

and the community they pledge to serve, and enhance accountability of law enforcement officers.”.

(b) **CRISIS INTERVENTION TEAMS.**—Section 501(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In the case of crisis intervention teams funded under subsection (a)(1)(H), a program assessment under this subsection shall contain a report on best practices for crisis intervention.”.

(c) **USE OF COPS GRANT PROGRAM TO HIRE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO ARE RESIDENTS OF THE COMMUNITIES THEY SERVE.**—Section 1701(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(b)), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (23) and (24) as paragraphs (26) and (27), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (26), as so redesignated, by striking “(22)” and inserting “(25)”;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (22) the following:

“(23) to recruit, hire, incentivize, retain, develop, and train new, additional career law enforcement officers or current law enforcement officers who are willing to relocate to communities—

“(A) where there are poor or fragmented relationships between police and residents of the community, or where there are high incidents of crime; and

“(B) that are the communities that the law enforcement officers serve, or that are in close proximity to the communities that the law enforcement officers serve;

“(24) to collect data on the number of law enforcement officers who are willing to relocate to the communities where they serve, and whether such law enforcement officer relocations have impacted crime in such communities;

“(25) to develop and publicly report strategies and timelines to recruit, hire, promote, retain, develop, and train a diverse and inclusive law enforcement workforce, consistent with merit system principles and applicable law:”.

Subtitle C—Law Enforcement Body Cameras
PART 1—FEDERAL POLICE CAMERA AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

SEC. 371. SHORT TITLE.

This part may be cited as the “Federal Police Camera and Accountability Act”.

SEC. 372. REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS REGARDING THE USE OF BODY CAMERAS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MINOR.**—The term “minor” means any individual under 18 years of age.

(2) **SUBJECT OF THE VIDEO FOOTAGE.**—The term “subject of the video footage”—

(A) means any identifiable Federal law enforcement officer or any identifiable suspect, victim, detainee, conversant, injured party, or other similarly situated person who appears on the body camera recording; and

(B) does not include people who only incidentally appear on the recording.

(3) **VIDEO FOOTAGE.**—The term “video footage” means any images or audio recorded by a body camera.

(b) **REQUIREMENT TO WEAR BODY CAMERA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Federal law enforcement officers shall wear a body camera.

(2) **REQUIREMENT FOR BODY CAMERA.**—A body camera required under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) have a field of view at least as broad as the officer’s vision; and

(B) be worn in a manner that maximizes the camera’s ability to capture video footage of the officer’s activities.

(c) **REQUIREMENT TO ACTIVATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Both the video and audio recording functions of the body camera shall be activated whenever a Federal law enforcement officer is responding to a call for service or at the initiation of any other law enforcement or investigative stop (as such term is defined in section 373) between a Federal law enforcement officer and a member of the public, except that when an immediate threat to the officer’s life or safety makes activating the camera impossible or dangerous, the officer shall activate the camera at the first reasonable opportunity to do so.

(2) **ALLOWABLE DEACTIVATION.**—The body camera shall not be deactivated until the stop has fully concluded and the Federal law enforcement officer leaves the scene.

(d) **NOTIFICATION OF SUBJECT OF RECORDING.**—A Federal law enforcement officer who is wearing a body camera shall notify any subject of the recording that he or she is being recorded by a body camera as close to the inception of the stop as is reasonably possible.

(e) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the following shall apply to the use of a body camera:

(1) Prior to entering a private residence without a warrant or in non-existent circumstances, a Federal law enforcement officer shall ask the occupant if the occupant wants the officer to discontinue use of the officer’s body camera. If the occupant responds affirmatively, the Federal law enforcement officer shall immediately discontinue use of the body camera.

(2) When interacting with an apparent crime victim, a Federal law enforcement officer shall, as soon as practicable, ask the apparent crime victim if the apparent crime victim wants the officer to discontinue use of the officer’s body camera. If the apparent crime victim responds affirmatively, the Federal law enforcement officer shall immediately discontinue use of the body camera.

(3) When interacting with a person seeking to anonymously report a crime or assist in an ongoing law enforcement investigation, a Federal law enforcement officer shall, as soon as practicable, ask the person seeking to remain anonymous, if the person seeking to remain anonymous wants the officer to discontinue use of the officer’s body camera. If the person seeking to remain anonymous responds affirmatively, the Federal law enforcement officer shall immediately discontinue use of the body camera.

(f) **RECORDING OF OFFERS TO DISCONTINUE USE OF BODY CAMERA.**—Each offer of a Federal law enforcement officer to discontinue the use of a body camera made pursuant to subsection (e), and the responses thereto, shall be recorded by the body camera prior to discontinuing use of the body camera.

(g) **LIMITATIONS ON USE OF BODY CAMERA.**—Body cameras shall not be used to gather intelligence information based on First Amendment protected speech, associations, or religion, or to record activity that is unrelated to a response to a call for service or a law enforcement or investigative stop between a law enforcement officer and a member of the public, and shall not be equipped with or employ any facial recognition technologies.

(h) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Federal law enforcement officers—

(1) shall not be required to use body cameras during investigative or enforcement stops with the public in the case that—

(A) recording would risk the safety of a confidential informant, citizen informant, or undercover officer;

(B) recording would pose a serious risk to national security; or

(C) the officer is a military police officer, a member of the United States Army Criminal Investigation Command, or a protective

detail assigned to a Federal or foreign official while performing his or her duties; and

(2) shall not activate a body camera while on the grounds of any public, private or parochial elementary or secondary school, except when responding to an imminent threat to life or health.

(i) **RETENTION OF FOOTAGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Body camera video footage shall be retained by the law enforcement agency that employs the officer whose camera captured the footage, or an authorized agent thereof, for 6 months after the date it was recorded, after which time such footage shall be permanently deleted.

(2) **RIGHT TO INSPECT.**—During the 6-month retention period described in paragraph (1), the following persons shall have the right to inspect the body camera footage:

(A) Any person who is a subject of body camera video footage, and their designated legal counsel.

(B) A parent or legal guardian of a minor subject of body camera video footage, and their designated legal counsel.

(C) The spouse, next of kin, or legally authorized designee of a deceased subject of body camera video footage, and their designated legal counsel.

(D) A Federal law enforcement officer whose body camera recorded the video footage, and their designated legal counsel, subject to the limitations and restrictions in this part.

(E) The superior officer of a Federal law enforcement officer whose body camera recorded the video footage, subject to the limitations and restrictions in this part.

(F) Any defense counsel who claims, pursuant to a written affidavit, to have a reasonable basis for believing a video may contain evidence that exculpates a client.

(3) **LIMITATION.**—The right to inspect subject to subsection (j)(1) shall not include the right to possess a copy of the body camera video footage, unless the release of the body camera footage is otherwise authorized by this part or by another applicable law. When a body camera fails to capture some or all of the audio or video of an incident due to malfunction, displacement of camera, or any other cause, any audio or video footage that is captured shall be treated the same as any other body camera audio or video footage under this part.

(j) **ADDITIONAL RETENTION REQUIREMENTS.**—Notwithstanding the retention and deletion requirements in subsection (i), the following shall apply to body camera video footage under this part:

(1) Body camera video footage shall be automatically retained for not less than 3 years if the video footage captures an interaction or event involving—

(A) any use of force; or

(B) an stop about which a complaint has been registered by a subject of the video footage.

(2) Body camera video footage shall be retained for not less than 3 years if a longer retention period is voluntarily requested by—

(A) the Federal law enforcement officer whose body camera recorded the video footage, if that officer reasonably asserts the video footage has evidentiary or exculpatory value in an ongoing investigation;

(B) any Federal law enforcement officer who is a subject of the video footage, if that officer reasonably asserts the video footage has evidentiary or exculpatory value;

(C) any superior officer of a Federal law enforcement officer whose body camera recorded the video footage or who is a subject of the video footage, if that superior officer reasonably asserts the video footage has evidentiary or exculpatory value;

(D) any Federal law enforcement officer, if the video footage is being retained solely and exclusively for police training purposes;

(E) any member of the public who is a subject of the video footage;

(F) any parent or legal guardian of a minor who is a subject of the video footage; or

(G) a deceased subject's spouse, next of kin, or legally authorized designee.

(K) PUBLIC REVIEW.—For purposes of subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of subsection (j)(2), any member of the public who is a subject of video footage, the parent or legal guardian of a minor who is a subject of the video footage, or a deceased subject's next of kin or legally authorized designee, shall be permitted to review the specific video footage in question in order to make a determination as to whether they will voluntarily request it be subjected to a minimum 3-year retention period.

(1) DISCLOSURE.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), all video footage of an interaction or event captured by a body camera, if that interaction or event is identified with reasonable specificity and requested by a member of the public, shall be provided to the person or entity making the request in accordance with the procedures for requesting and providing government records set forth in the section 552a of title 5, United States Code.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The following categories of video footage shall not be released to the public in the absence of express written permission from the non-law enforcement subjects of the video footage:

(A) Video footage not subject to a minimum 3-year retention period pursuant to subsection (j).

(B) Video footage that is subject to a minimum 3-year retention period solely and exclusively pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) or (2) of subsection (j).

(3) PRIORITY OF REQUESTS.—Notwithstanding any time periods established for acknowledging and responding to records requests in section 552a of title 5, United States Code, responses to requests for video footage that is subject to a minimum 3-year retention period pursuant to subsection (j)(1)(A), where a subject of the video footage is recorded being killed, shot by a firearm, or grievously injured, shall be prioritized and, if approved, the requested video footage shall be provided as expeditiously as possible, but in no circumstances later than 5 days following receipt of the request.

(4) USE OF REDACTION TECHNOLOGY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Whenever doing so is necessary to protect personal privacy, the right to a fair trial, the identity of a confidential source or crime victim, or the life or physical safety of any person appearing in video footage, redaction technology may be used to obscure the face and other personally identifying characteristics of that person, including the tone of the person's voice, provided the redaction does not interfere with a viewer's ability to fully, completely, and accurately comprehend the events captured on the video footage.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The following requirements shall apply to redactions under subparagraph (A):

(i) When redaction is performed on video footage pursuant to this paragraph, an unedited, original version of the video footage shall be retained pursuant to the requirements of subsections (i) and (j).

(ii) Except pursuant to the rules for the redaction of video footage set forth in this subsection or where it is otherwise expressly authorized by this Act, no other editing or alteration of video footage, including a reduction of the video footage's resolution, shall be permitted.

(M) PROHIBITED WITHHOLDING OF FOOTAGE.—Body camera video footage may not be withheld from the public on the basis that it is an investigatory record or was compiled for law enforcement purposes where any person under investigation or whose conduct is under review is a police officer or other law enforcement employee and the video footage relates to that person's conduct in their official capacity.

(N) ADMISSIBILITY.—Any video footage retained beyond 6 months solely and exclusively pursuant to subsection (j)(2)(D) shall not be admissible as evidence in any criminal or civil legal or administrative proceeding.

(O) CONFIDENTIALITY.—No government agency or official, or law enforcement agency, officer, or official may publicly disclose, release, or share body camera video footage unless—

(1) doing so is expressly authorized pursuant to this part or another applicable law; or

(2) the video footage is subject to public release pursuant to subsection (1), and not exempted from public release pursuant to subsection (1)(1).

(P) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER VIEWING OF BODY CAMERA FOOTAGE.—No Federal law enforcement officer shall review or receive an accounting of any body camera video footage that is subject to a minimum 3-year retention period pursuant to subsection (j)(1) prior to completing any required initial reports, statements, and interviews regarding the recorded event, unless doing so is necessary, while in the field, to address an immediate threat to life or safety.

(Q) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS.—Video footage may not be—

(1) in the case of footage that is not subject to a minimum 3-year retention period, viewed by any superior officer of a Federal law enforcement officer whose body camera recorded the footage absent a specific allegation of misconduct; or

(2) divulged or used by any law enforcement agency for any commercial or other non-law enforcement purpose.

(R) THIRD PARTY MAINTENANCE OF FOOTAGE.—Where a law enforcement agency authorizes a third party to act as its agent in maintaining body camera footage, the agent shall not be permitted to independently access, view, or alter any video footage, except to delete videos as required by law or agency retention policies.

(S) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If any Federal law enforcement officer, or any employee or agent of a Federal law enforcement agency fails to adhere to the recording or retention requirements contained in this part, intentionally interferes with a body camera's ability to accurately capture video footage, or otherwise manipulates the video footage captured by a body camera during or after its operation—

(A) appropriate disciplinary action shall be taken against the individual officer, employee, or agent;

(B) a rebuttable evidentiary presumption shall be adopted in favor of a criminal defendant who reasonably asserts that exculpatory evidence was destroyed or not captured; and

(C) a rebuttable evidentiary presumption shall be adopted on behalf of a civil plaintiff suing the Government, a Federal law enforcement agency, or a Federal law enforcement officer for damages based on misconduct who reasonably asserts that evidence supporting their claim was destroyed or not captured.

(2) PROOF COMPLIANCE WAS IMPOSSIBLE.—The disciplinary action requirement and rebuttable presumptions described in paragraph (1) may be overcome by contrary evi-

dence or proof of exigent circumstances that made compliance impossible.

(T) USE OF FORCE INVESTIGATIONS.—In the case that a Federal law enforcement officer equipped with a body camera is involved in, a witness to, or within viewable sight range of either the use of force by another law enforcement officer that results in a death, the use of force by another law enforcement officer, during which the discharge of a firearm results in an injury, or the conduct of another law enforcement officer that becomes the subject of a criminal investigation—

(1) the law enforcement agency that employs the law enforcement officer, or the agency or department conducting the related criminal investigation, as appropriate, shall promptly take possession of the body camera, and shall maintain such camera, and any data on such camera, in accordance with the applicable rules governing the preservation of evidence;

(2) a copy of the data on such body camera shall be made in accordance with prevailing forensic standards for data collection and reproduction; and

(3) such copied data shall be made available to the public in accordance with subsection (1).

(U) LIMITATION ON USE OF FOOTAGE AS EVIDENCE.—Any body camera video footage recorded by a Federal law enforcement officer that violates this part or any other applicable law may not be offered as evidence by any government entity, agency, department, prosecutorial office, or any other subdivision thereof in any criminal or civil action or proceeding against any member of the public.

(V) PUBLICATION OF AGENCY POLICIES.—Any Federal law enforcement agency policy or other guidance regarding body cameras, their use, or the video footage therefrom that is adopted by a Federal agency or department, shall be made publicly available on that agency's website.

(W) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to preempt any laws governing the maintenance, production, and destruction of evidence in criminal investigations and prosecutions.

SEC. 373. PATROL VEHICLES WITH IN-CAR VIDEO RECORDING CAMERAS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AUDIO RECORDING.—The term "audio recording" means the recorded conversation between a Federal law enforcement officer and a second party.

(2) EMERGENCY LIGHTS.—The term "emergency lights" means oscillating, rotating, or flashing lights on patrol vehicles.

(3) ENFORCEMENT OR INVESTIGATIVE STOP.—The term "enforcement or investigative stop" means an action by a Federal law enforcement officer in relation to enforcement and investigation duties, including traffic stops, pedestrian stops, abandoned vehicle contacts, motorist assists, commercial motor vehicle stops, roadside safety checks, requests for identification, or responses to requests for emergency assistance.

(4) IN-CAR VIDEO CAMERA.—The term "in-car video camera" means a video camera located in a patrol vehicle.

(5) IN-CAR VIDEO CAMERA RECORDING EQUIPMENT.—The term "in-car video camera recording equipment" means a video camera recording system located in a patrol vehicle consisting of a camera assembly, recording mechanism, and an in-car video recording medium.

(6) RECORDING.—The term "recording" means the process of capturing data or information stored on a recording medium as required under this section.

(7) RECORDING MEDIUM.—The term "recording medium" means any recording medium for the retention and playback of recorded

audio and video including VHS, DVD, hard drive, solid state, digital, or flash memory technology.

(8) **WIRELESS MICROPHONE.**—The term “wireless microphone” means a device worn by a Federal law enforcement officer or any other equipment used to record conversations between the officer and a second party and transmitted to the recording equipment.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Federal law enforcement agency shall install in-car video camera recording equipment in all patrol vehicles with a recording medium capable of recording for a period of 10 hours or more and capable of making audio recordings with the assistance of a wireless microphone.

(2) **RECORDING EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—In-car video camera recording equipment with a recording medium capable of recording for a period of 10 hours or more shall record activities—

(A) whenever a patrol vehicle is assigned to patrol duty;

(B) outside a patrol vehicle whenever—

(i) a Federal law enforcement officer assigned that patrol vehicle is conducting an enforcement or investigative stop;

(ii) patrol vehicle emergency lights are activated or would otherwise be activated if not for the need to conceal the presence of law enforcement; or

(iii) an officer reasonably believes recording may assist with prosecution, enhance safety, or for any other lawful purpose; and

(C) inside the vehicle when transporting an arrestee or when an officer reasonably believes recording may assist with prosecution, enhance safety, or for any other lawful purpose.

(3) **REQUIREMENTS FOR RECORDING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A Federal law enforcement officer shall begin recording for an enforcement or investigative stop when the officer determines an enforcement stop is necessary and shall continue until the enforcement action has been completed and the subject of the enforcement or investigative stop or the officer has left the scene.

(B) **ACTIVATION WITH LIGHTS.**—A Federal law enforcement officer shall begin recording when patrol vehicle emergency lights are activated or when they would otherwise be activated if not for the need to conceal the presence of law enforcement, and shall continue until the reason for the activation ceases to exist, regardless of whether the emergency lights are no longer activated.

(C) **PERMISSIBLE RECORDING.**—A Federal law enforcement officer may begin recording if the officer reasonably believes recording may assist with prosecution, enhance safety, or for any other lawful purpose; and shall continue until the reason for recording ceases to exist.

(4) **ENFORCEMENT OR INVESTIGATIVE STOPS.**—A Federal law enforcement officer shall record any enforcement or investigative stop. Audio recording shall terminate upon release of the violator and prior to initiating a separate criminal investigation.

(c) **RETENTION OF RECORDINGS.**—Recordings made on in-car video camera recording medium shall be retained for a storage period of at least 90 days. Under no circumstances shall any recording made on in-car video camera recording medium be altered or erased prior to the expiration of the designated storage period. Upon completion of the storage period, the recording medium may be erased and reissued for operational use unless otherwise ordered or if designated for evidentiary or training purposes.

(d) **ACCESSIBILITY OF RECORDINGS.**—Audio or video recordings made pursuant to this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of section 552a of title 5, United States Code. Only recorded portions

of the audio recording or video recording medium applicable to the request will be available for inspection or copying.

(e) **MAINTENANCE REQUIRED.**—The agency shall ensure proper care and maintenance of in-car video camera recording equipment and recording medium. An officer operating a patrol vehicle must immediately document and notify the appropriate person of any technical difficulties, failures, or problems with the in-car video camera recording equipment or recording medium. Upon receiving notice, every reasonable effort shall be made to correct and repair any of the in-car video camera recording equipment or recording medium and determine if it is in the public interest to permit the use of the patrol vehicle.

SEC. 374. FACIAL RECOGNITION TECHNOLOGY.

No camera or recording device authorized or required to be used under this part may be equipped with or employ facial recognition technology, and footage from such a camera or recording device may not be subjected to facial recognition technology.

SEC. 375. GAO STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on Federal law enforcement officer training, vehicle pursuits, use of force, and interaction with citizens, and submit a report on such study to—

(1) the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(3) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 376. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall issue such final regulations as are necessary to carry out this part.

SEC. 377. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this part shall be construed to impose any requirement on a Federal law enforcement officer outside of the course of carrying out that officer’s duty.

PART 2—POLICE CAMERA ACT

SEC. 381. SHORT TITLE.

This part may be cited as the “Police Creating Accountability by Making Effective Recording Available Act of 2021” or the “Police CAMERA Act of 2021”.

SEC. 382. LAW ENFORCEMENT BODY-WORN CAMERA REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **USE OF FUNDS REQUIREMENT.**—Section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)), as amended by section 334, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(10) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant will use not less than 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award for the fiscal year to develop policies and protocols in compliance with part OO.”.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART OO—LAW ENFORCEMENT BODY-WORN CAMERAS AND RECORDED DATA

“SEC. 3051. USE OF GRANT FUNDS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Grant amounts described in paragraph (10) of section 502(a) of this title—

“(1) shall be used—

“(A) to purchase or lease body-worn cameras for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers (as defined in section 2503);

“(B) for expenses related to the implementation of a body-worn camera program in order to deter excessive force, improve ac-

countability and transparency of use of force by law enforcement officers, assist in responding to complaints against law enforcement officers, and improve evidence collection; and

“(C) to implement policies or procedures to comply with the requirements described in subsection (b); and

“(2) may not be used for expenses related to facial recognition technology.

“(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A recipient of a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title shall—

“(1) establish policies and procedures in accordance with the requirements described in subsection (c) before law enforcement officers use of body-worn cameras;

“(2) adopt recorded data collection and retention protocols as described in subsection (d) before law enforcement officers use of body-worn cameras;

“(3) make the policies and protocols described in paragraphs (1) and (2) available to the public; and

“(4) comply with the requirements for use of recorded data under subsection (f).

“(c) **REQUIRED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—A recipient of a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title shall—

“(1) develop with community input and publish for public view policies and protocols for—

“(A) the safe and effective use of body-worn cameras;

“(B) the secure storage, handling, and destruction of recorded data collected by body-worn cameras;

“(C) protecting the privacy rights of any individual who may be recorded by a body-worn camera;

“(D) the release of any recorded data collected by a body-worn camera in accordance with the open records laws, if any, of the State; and

“(E) making recorded data available to prosecutors, defense attorneys, and other officers of the court in accordance with subparagraph (E); and

“(2) conduct periodic evaluations of the security of the storage and handling of the body-worn camera data.

“(d) **RECORDED DATA COLLECTION AND RETENTION PROTOCOL.**—The recorded data collection and retention protocol described in this paragraph is a protocol that—

“(1) requires—

“(A) a law enforcement officer who is wearing a body-worn camera to provide an explanation if an activity that is required to be recorded by the body-worn camera is not recorded;

“(B) a law enforcement officer who is wearing a body-worn camera to obtain consent to be recorded from a crime victim or witness before interviewing the victim or witness;

“(C) the collection of recorded data unrelated to a legitimate law enforcement purpose be minimized to the greatest extent practicable;

“(D) the system used to store recorded data collected by body-worn cameras to log all viewing, modification, or deletion of stored recorded data and to prevent, to the greatest extent practicable, the unauthorized access or disclosure of stored recorded data;

“(E) any law enforcement officer be prohibited from accessing the stored data without an authorized purpose; and

“(F) the law enforcement agency to collect and report statistical data on—

“(i) incidences of use of force, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, and age of the victim;

“(ii) the number of complaints filed against law enforcement officers;

“(iii) the disposition of complaints filed against law enforcement officers;

“(iv) the number of times camera footage is used for evidence collection in investigations of crimes; and

“(v) any other additional statistical data that the Director determines should be collected and reported;

“(2) allows an individual to file a complaint with a law enforcement agency relating to the improper use of body-worn cameras; and

“(3) complies with any other requirements established by the Director.

“(e) REPORTING.—Statistical data required to be collected under subsection (d)(1)(D) shall be reported to the Director, who shall—

“(1) establish a standardized reporting system for statistical data collected under this program; and

“(2) establish a national database of statistical data recorded under this program.

“(f) USE OR TRANSFER OF RECORDED DATA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Recorded data collected by an entity receiving a grant under a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title from a body-worn camera shall be used only in internal and external investigations of misconduct by a law enforcement agency or officer, if there is reasonable suspicion that a recording contains evidence of a crime, or for limited training purposes. The Director shall establish rules to ensure that the recorded data is used only for the purposes described in this paragraph.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), an entity receiving a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title may not transfer any recorded data collected by the entity from a body-worn camera to another law enforcement or intelligence agency.

“(3) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION.—An entity receiving a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title may transfer recorded data collected by the entity from a body-worn camera to another law enforcement agency or intelligence agency for use in a criminal investigation if the requesting law enforcement or intelligence agency has reasonable suspicion that the requested data contains evidence relating to the crime being investigated.

“(B) CIVIL RIGHTS CLAIMS.—An entity receiving a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title may transfer recorded data collected by the law enforcement agency from a body-worn camera to another law enforcement agency for use in an investigation of the violation of any right, privilege, or immunity secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

“(g) AUDIT AND ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this part, the Director of the Office of Audit, Assessment, and Management shall perform an assessment of the use of funds under this section and the policies and protocols of the grantees.

“(2) REPORTS.—Not later than September 1 of each year, beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of this part, each recipient of a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title shall submit to the Director of the Office of Audit, Assessment, and Management a report that—

“(A) describes the progress of the body-worn camera program; and

“(B) contains recommendations on ways in which the Federal Government, States, and units of local government can further support the implementation of the program.

“(3) REVIEW.—The Director of the Office of Audit, Assessment, and Management shall evaluate the policies and protocols of the grantees and take such steps as the Director of the Office of Audit, Assessment, and Man-

agement determines necessary to ensure compliance with the program.

“SEC. 3052. BODY-WORN CAMERA TRAINING TOOLKIT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish and maintain a body-worn camera training toolkit for law enforcement agencies, academia, and other relevant entities to provide training and technical assistance, including best practices for implementation, model policies and procedures, and research materials.

“(b) MECHANISM.—In establishing the toolkit required to under subsection (a), the Director may consolidate research, practices, templates, and tools that been developed by expert and law enforcement agencies across the country.

“SEC. 3053. STUDY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Police Camera Act of 2021, the Director shall conduct a study on—

“(1) the efficacy of body-worn cameras in deterring excessive force by law enforcement officers;

“(2) the impact of body-worn cameras on the accountability and transparency of the use of force by law enforcement officers;

“(3) the impact of body-worn cameras on responses to and adjudications of complaints of excessive force;

“(4) the effect of the use of body-worn cameras on the safety of law enforcement officers on patrol;

“(5) the effect of the use of body-worn cameras on public safety;

“(6) the impact of body-worn cameras on evidence collection for criminal investigations;

“(7) issues relating to the secure storage and handling of recorded data from the body-worn cameras;

“(8) issues relating to the privacy of individuals and officers recorded on body-worn cameras;

“(9) issues relating to the constitutional rights of individuals on whom facial recognition technology is used;

“(10) issues relating to limitations on the use of facial recognition technology;

“(11) issues relating to the public’s access to body-worn camera footage;

“(12) the need for proper training of law enforcement officers that use body-worn cameras;

“(13) best practices in the development of protocols for the safe and effective use of body-worn cameras;

“(14) a review of law enforcement agencies that found body-worn cameras to be unhelpful in the operations of the agencies; and

“(15) any other factors that the Director determines are relevant in evaluating the efficacy of body-worn cameras.

“(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the study required under subsection (a) is completed, the Director shall submit to Congress a report on the study, which shall include any policy recommendations that the Director considers appropriate.”

TITLE IV—CLOSING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSENT LOOPHOLE

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Closing the Law Enforcement Consent Loophole Act of 2021”.

SEC. 402. PROHIBITION ON ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTS WHILE ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2243 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by adding at the end the following: **“or by any person acting under color of law”**;

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) OF AN INDIVIDUAL BY ANY PERSON ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever, acting under color of law, knowingly engages in a sexual act with an individual, including an individual who is under arrest, in detention, or otherwise in the actual custody of any Federal law enforcement officer, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

“(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘sexual act’ has the meaning given the term in section 2246.”; and

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In a prosecution under subsection (c), it is not a defense that the other individual consented to the sexual act.”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 2246 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) the term ‘Federal law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given the term in section 115.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by amending the item related to section 2243 to read as follows:

“2243. Sexual abuse of a minor or ward or by any person acting under color of law.”.

SEC. 403. ENACTMENT OF LAWS PENALIZING ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTS WHILE ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, in the case of a State or unit of local government that does not have in effect a law described in subsection (b), if that State or unit of local government that would otherwise receive funds under the COPS grant program, that State or unit of local government shall not be eligible to receive such funds. In the case of a multi-jurisdictional or regional consortium, if any member of that consortium is a State or unit of local government that does not have in effect a law described in subsection (b), if that consortium would otherwise receive funds under the COPS grant program, that consortium shall not be eligible to receive such funds.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAW.—A law described in this subsection is a law that—

(1) makes it a criminal offense for any person acting under color of law of the State or unit of local government to engage in a sexual act with an individual, including an individual who is under arrest, in detention, or otherwise in the actual custody of any law enforcement officer; and

(2) prohibits a person charged with an offense described in paragraph (1) from asserting the consent of the other individual as a defense.

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—A State or unit of local government that receives a grant under the COPS grant program shall submit to the Attorney General, on an annual basis, information on—

(1) the number of reports made to law enforcement agencies in that State or unit of local government regarding persons engaging in a sexual act while acting under color of law during the previous year; and

(2) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under

color of law was reported during the previous year.

SEC. 404. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) the information required to be reported to the Attorney General under section 403(b); and

(2) information on—

(A) the number of reports made, during the previous year, to Federal law enforcement agencies regarding persons engaging in a sexual act while acting under color of law; and

(B) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under color of law was reported.

(b) REPORT BY GAO.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on any violations of section 2243(c) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 402, committed during the 1-year period covered by the report.

SEC. 405. DEFINITION.

In this title, the term “sexual act” has the meaning given the term in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or the application of such a provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the application of the remaining provisions of this Act to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 502. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) to limit legal or administrative remedies under section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983), section 210401 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12601), title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.), or title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.);

(2) to affect any Federal, State, or Tribal law that applies to an Indian Tribe because of the political status of the Tribe; or

(3) to waive the sovereign immunity of an Indian Tribe without the consent of the Tribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1280.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, last summer, millions of Americans all across the country

took to the streets to demand fundamental change in the culture of law enforcement and to call for meaningful accountability for officers who commit misconduct.

The catalyst for these protests was the tragic and brutal death of George Floyd. None of us can forget the image of that officer’s knee pinned to his neck for nearly 8 agonizing minutes, or the sound of his anguished pleas of “I can’t breathe” that were ignored until his final breath was taken from him.

After his death, the world awoke to daily indignities, and sometimes the brutality, that too many people—disproportionately Black, Latinx, and indigenous people, people living in poverty, and people with disabilities—face in their interactions with law enforcement throughout the country.

We value and respect the many brave and honorable police officers who put their lives on the line every day to protect us and our communities. We know that most law enforcement officers do their jobs with dignity, selflessness, and honor, and they are deserving of our respect and gratitude for all they do to keep us safe. But we must also acknowledge that there are too many exceptions.

The reality for too many Americans, especially many Black Americans, is that police officers are perceived as a threat to their liberties; to their dignity; and, too often, to their safety. Sadly, our country’s history of racism and racially motivated violence continues to haunt our Nation.

We see it in the rates of COVID deaths, in our system of mass incarceration, and in the vast chasm of economic inequality, all of which fall disproportionately on the backs of African Americans. And we see it in the harassment and excessive force that many people of color routinely experience by law enforcement.

That is why we must act today. The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act would allow for meaningful accountability in cases of police misconduct. It also effectively bans choke holds, ends racial and religious profiling, ends no-knock warrants in drug cases, and limits the militarization of local policing.

It encourages departments to meet a gold standard in training and other best practices to reduce police bias and violence. It requires significant data collection, including the first-ever national database on police-misconduct incidents to prevent the movement of dangerous officers from department to department.

In addition, this legislation creates a process to reimagine how public safety could work in a truly equitable and just way in each community.

Last summer, within weeks of the protests that galvanized the Nation, the House passed the legislation before us today. Unfortunately, the pleas for justice that rang out in the streets fell on deaf ears in the Senate.

Since then, over 600 more people—disproportionately people of color—

have been killed by law enforcement officers.

The time for action is now.

I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) for crafting this bold, yet responsible, legislation.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), a retired police officer.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

With something as important as police reform, it is important to garner many perspectives. The JUSTICE Act, legislation Senator SCOTT and I introduced, is a product of my perspective as a law enforcement officer from Minnesota and Senator SCOTT’s perspective as a Black man from South Carolina.

The JUSTICE Act increases body cameras and implements duty to intervene and deescalation training. It improves hiring and recruitment practices. It reinvigorates the principles of community policing to rebuild the relationships between law enforcement officers and the communities that they serve.

The JUSTICE Act, which received bipartisan support last Congress, includes several critical provisions that are supported by Democrats: the Walter Scott Notification Act, the National Criminal Justice Commission Act, and the Closing the Law Enforcement Consent Loophole Act. It even includes legislation that Vice President HARRIS introduced, the Justice for Victims of Lynching Act.

Unfortunately, we are not considering the JUSTICE Act today. We are, instead, once again, exploring political gamesmanship through H.R. 1280.

Now, when we voted on this legislation last year, the Democrats knew it was dead upon passage, but my good friends and I in the Problem Solvers Caucus decided that this conversation was too important to let go. So we worked for months with Representatives from both sides of the aisle, with Representatives from the Congressional Black Caucus, with Representatives from law enforcement and legal backgrounds, on areas where we could find compromise between the Justice in Policing Act and my bill, the JUSTICE Act.

We discussed no-knock warrants, the 1033 program, use of force, record retention, and so much more. We were making such great headway. I truly believed that we could have put together a bipartisan package of reforms for our American communities that have been calling for change.

Unfortunately, the other side walked away. As the election drew near, the priorities of my Democratic colleagues shifted. Their fight to retain power became more important than providing police reform for the American people.

So now we are here again, Mr. Speaker, to vote on the exact same bill without a single change; a bill that has zero

input from Republicans, zero input or support from our law enforcement community. And I will repeat that. Zero input or support from our law enforcement community.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that will, no doubt, make our communities less safe. We all want police reform and we all want change, but until such time as we work together, this legislation is just another messaging bill from my Democrat colleagues.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago today, Rodney King was viciously beaten by police officers in Los Angeles. It would be the first time the world would witness what African Americans had been organizing, marching, and trying to change for over 100 years.

Personally, I was hopeful that once everyone saw what happens in Black communities, policing in America would change. I was certain no one would deny what they saw with their own eyes and that the officers would be convicted. But they were acquitted. Some were even hired by other police departments.

The sad truth was, when people told their stories of abuse or even murder at the hands of police officers, they were simply not believed. The story was always the same: I was in fear of my life. I thought they had a gun. The person was resisting arrest. The individual attempted to assault me.

That is all that was needed for the beating or murder to be discounted, dismissed. The individuals' lives had little value.

Even children. These are children here. This is an 8-year-old, a 10-year-old, a mother, and another child placed on the ground because the mother was suspected of stealing a car.

Several years after Rodney King's beating, cell phone cameras were invented. It has taken technology and active citizen involvement to document and expose this reality. And now there are many tapes, many examples of individuals being shot and killed by officers, yet transformation of policing in America has still not happened.

Passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act will be a critical first step—just a first step—to transform policing in America. The bill raises the standards for policing and holds those officers accountable who fail to uphold the ethic of protecting and serving their communities.

□ 1830

Now, I know that change is difficult, but I am certain that police officers who risk their lives every day are concerned about their profession, and they

don't work in an environment where they are chastised for intervening when they see a fellow officer abuse a citizen or use deadly force when it is not necessary. And I am certain that police officers want to make sure that they are trained in the best practices in policing.

To support officers, this legislation will create the first-ever national accreditation standards for the operation of police departments, set national standards for officers, and establish best practices in training, hiring, deescalation strategies, and bystander duty.

For example, if officers had better training, maybe they would understand that just because someone can verbally express "I can't breathe," does not mean they are faking and the officer can continue to press on the person's chest, back, or neck. And despite our best intentions, there will be some officers who cross over the line.

Mr. Speaker, that is why this bill also includes strong accountability measures, both as a matter of simple justice, and to keep unfit officers off the street. A profession where you have the power to kill should be a profession that requires highly trained officers who are accountable to the public. That is what this bill accomplishes.

Police officers are the first to say it is unfair that they are not trained to be social workers or healthcare providers.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the Justice in Policing Act reinvests in our communities.

If this legislation had been the law of the land several years ago, Eric Garner and George Floyd would be alive today, because the bill bans choke holds.

If the bill had been law last year, Breonna Taylor would not have been shot to death in her sleep, because no-knock warrants for drug offenses would have been illegal.

And if a national registry had been in effect, it would have been revealed that the officer who killed 12-year-old Tamir Rice—

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office confirmed earlier this week that the Justice in Policing Act contains an unfunded mandate by requiring onerous data collection reporting from State and local law enforcement. This includes granular data collection on such basic law enforcement activities, like traffic stops. CBO estimates

that this unfunded mandate placed on State and local law enforcement will cost several hundred million dollars.

The consequences of H.R. 1280 are clear. It will drain resources away from important public safety activities. Instead, law enforcement officers will have to spend their time reporting data to Washington, D.C., from behind a desk. Make no mistake. This bill defunds the police.

Additionally, any Member who is opposed to defunding the police should be opposing this bill. This legislation will also lower the mens rea standard when charging an officer with criminal misconduct. It removes qualified immunity, which will result in an ineffectual police force and leave our communities vulnerable to crime, and it also severely limits the Department of Defense's 1033 program.

Mr. Speaker, but make no mistake, regardless of whatever else you may feel about this bill, this bill defunds police. We can never forget that. If you oppose defunding the police, you should be opposing this bill, like I am.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of George Floyd has awakened the Nation, the world.

Last summer, in response to a call for action from righteous protestors across the Nation, we had to stand up. And we know that 8 minutes and 46 seconds are printed and imprinted in the brains of those around the world. There is no defunding of the police. It is standing up the police and the community.

Today, we are honored that the George Floyd family did not turn to bitterness, but they turned to justice. Their parents, Larcenia and George; his daughter, Gianna; his siblings, Philonise, Zsa Zsa Williams, LaTonya Floyd, Rodney Floyd, Bridgett Floyd, Terrence Floyd, and a nephew, Brandon Williams.

We know that we will be ending racial profiling now. We know that we will have qualified immunity for justice in the courts. We know that there will be training on racial bias. We will ban no-knock. We will ban choke holds. We will make sure that we end the racial profiling that caused George to come out of a grocery store and have someone's knee on his neck for 8 minutes and 46 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the world has stood up and justice is about to be rained on us.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, as an original co-sponsor of the legislation, and the author of several of its key legislative provisions, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021, which marks a defining turning point in our country.

Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that any questions that there continues to exist today racial double-standards, disparities, and system racism in policing and the administration of justice were conclusively laid to rest by

what social scientists would regard as a “natural experiment” that took place in Washington, D.C., beginning in the summer and culminating with the January 6, 2021, insurrection and siege of the U.S. Capitol by Trump seditious incited by the 45th President of the United States.

Mass protests and political rallies took place in Washington, D.C., started May 29, 2020, four days after George Floyd died in Minnesota after a Minneapolis police officer knelt on his neck for more than eight minutes.

By the millions, Americans took to the streets in protest to affirm that no longer will the people of this country tolerate or acquiesce in horrible policing practices that include excessive and unnecessary uses of lethal force that has diminished community trust of policing practices across the country and has angered and terrified communities of color who are overwhelmingly and disproportionately its innocent victims.

Within days of the demonstrations, U.S. Attorney General Bill Barr announced that multiple law enforcement agencies, including the National Guard, Secret Service and Federal Bureau of Investigation, would “flood the zone” in D.C.

Thousands of law enforcement officials, armed with tear gas, rubber bullets and firearms were deployed to protect the city.

Hundreds of people were arrested, D.C. police records show.

More than 300 were arrested on June 1, 2020, the day Attorney General Barr ordered law enforcement to forcefully clear peaceful protesters from a perimeter near the White House, making room for President Trump to pose for cameras while waving a Bible in front of St. John’s Episcopal Church.

It was the largest number of arrests recorded for any day during the summer of events.

Across the nation, law enforcement made an estimated 14,000 arrests in 49 U.S. cities during anti-racism protests in the summer of 2020, according to the Washington Post.

Following the November 3, 2020, election of Joe Biden and running mate KAMALA HARRIS, large groups of Trump supporters held rallies in the city, where they clashed with counter-protesters.

Police made 20 arrests during the so-called Million MAGA March on November 14, 2020, an event in which Trump-supporters, including White nationalists, far-right extremist groups, and conservative politicians gathered in D.C. to protest the election results.

And, incredibly, only 61 arrests were made of rioters, who were overwhelming white and who used violence, that stormed the Capitol on January 6, an attack that claimed the lives of at least six persons, injured hundreds of others, caused horrific damage to property and national treasures, and inflicted emotional scars that will not heal for generations.

But most of these arrests are related to charges involving curfew violations—D.C. mayor Muriel Bowser announced a 6 p.m. curfew, though mobs had broken into the Capitol hours earlier, around 1:30 p.m.

There were only four non-curfew-related arrests, compared to 40 non-curfew-related arrests during Black Lives Matter protests on June 1, 2020.

Mr. Speaker, the horrifying killing of George Floyd on May 25, 2020 by a Minneapolis po-

lice officer shocked and awakened the moral consciousness of the nation.

Untold millions saw the terrifying last 8:46 of life drained from a Black man, George Floyd, taking his last breaths face down in the street with his neck under the knee of a police officer who, along with his three cohorts, was indifferent to his cries for help and pleas that he “can’t breathe.”

In direct response, for past several months civil protests against police brutality have occurred nightly in cities large and small all across the nation.

These protests were a direct reaction to the horrific killing of George Floyd but are most motivated by a deep-seated anger and frustration to the separate and unequal justice African Americans receive at the hands of too many law enforcement officers.

The civil disobedience witnessed nightly in the streets of America were also in memory of countless acts of the inequality and cruelty visited upon young African American men and women no longer with us in body but forever with us in memory.

Beloved souls like Breanna Taylor in Louisville, Kentucky; Eric Garner and Sean Bell in New York City; 12-year old Tamir Rice in Cleveland; and Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri.

They remember the senseless killings as well of Ahmaud Arbery and Trayvon Martin by self-appointed vigilantes.

Stephon Clark, was an unarmed 22-year-old African American male from Sacramento, California, who was shot 23 times and killed by two uniformed members of the Sacramento Police Department on Sunday afternoon, March 18, 2018, in his grandmother’s backyard, leaving behind two small children because police officers claim that he had a gun but no weapon was found at the scene, only a cell phone.

In August 2019, Elijah McClain, a 23-year-old African American man, was simply listening to music while walking home from a convenience store when he was stopped without basis by officers of the Aurora, Colorado Police Department, put into a carotid hold and given multiple doses of ketamine, which caused cardiac arrest from which he fell into a coma and died three days later.

And the continuing need for their activism was reflected in the recent outrage, which began on June 12, 2020, and ended in the senseless slaughter of Rayshard Brooks, who was simply sleeping in his car at a local Wendy’s restaurant, by a uniformed officer of the Atlanta Police Department.

It was reflected again on August 23, 2020, when a Kenosha Police Department officer shot Jacob S. Blake, a 29-year-old black man, in the back seven times—yes seven—as he attempted to enter his SUV where three of his young sons were in the back seat.

We know the pain and heartbreak in my home state of Texas and the City of Houston where Robbie Tolan’s promising Major League Baseball was career was cut short after being shot by Bellaire Police Department officer in the front yard of his parents’ home.

And Sandra Bland, a 28-year-old African American female who was arrested after a traffic stop just outside of Houston, Texas, and found dead in a Waller County jail cell three days later.

Or Pamela Turner, an unarmed 44-year old African American mother of three who suffered

from paranoid schizophrenia, who was killed outside her home in Baytown, Texas, by an officer of the Baytown Police Department, on Monday, May 13, 2019, the day after Mother’s Day.

Or Jordan Baker, an unarmed 26-year-old African American male from Houston, Texas, who was shot to death by an off-duty uniformed member of the Houston Police Department in the parking lot of a Harris County shopping mall on January 16, 2014.

Or Danny Ray Thomas, an unarmed 34-year-old African American male, who was shot to death by a uniformed officer of the Harris County Sheriffs Department on March 22, 2018, in Houston, Texas.

Indeed, the history goes back much further, past Amidou Diallo in New York City, past the Central Park Five, past Emmitt Till, past the racist abuse of law enforcement power during the struggle for civil rights and equal treatment.

Mr. Speaker, the times we are in demand that action be taken and that is precisely what my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, on this committee, and Congressional Democrats did in introducing H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2020.

And we are taking the next bold action today in voting to pass this legislation and send it to the Senate and on to the White House for presidential signature and enactment.

I support this bold legislation not just as a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, who also served on the House Working Group on Police Strategies, but also a mother of a young African American male who knows the anxiety that African American mothers feel until they can hug their sons and daughters who return home safely, and on behalf of all those relatives and friends who grieve over the loss a loved one whose life and future was wrongly and cruelly interrupted or ended by mistreatment at the hands of the police.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021 is designed to destroy the pillars of systemic racism in policing practices that has victimized communities of color, and especially African Americans for decades, is overdue, too long overdue.

This legislation puts the Congress of the United States on record against racial profiling in policing and against the excessive, unjustified, and discriminatory use of lethal and force by law enforcement officers against persons of color.

The legislation means no longer will employment of practices that encourage systemic mistreatment of persons because of their race be ignored or tolerated.

With our vote today to pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021, the government of the United States is declaring firmly, forcefully, and unequivocally that Black Lives Matter.

It is true all lives matter, they always have.

But that Black lives matter too, and in so many other areas of civic life, this nation has not always lived up to its promise but that the promise is worthy of fulfilling.

Every African American parent, and every African American child, knows all too well ‘The Talk’ and the importance of abiding by the rules for surviving interactions with the police.

While many police officers take this responsibility seriously and strive to treat all persons

equally and with respect, their efforts are too often undermined by some of their colleagues who abuse the enormous trust and confidence placed in them.

And systemically racist systems and practices left in place can corrupt even the most virtuous police officers.

So, the most important criminal justice reforms needed to improve the criminal justice system are those that will increase public confidence and build trust and mutual respect between law enforcement and the communities they swear an oath and are willing to risk their lives to protect and serve.

That is the overriding purpose and aim of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021, which contains numerous provisions to weed out and eliminate systemic racism in police practices.

Specifically, this legislation holds police accountable in our courts by:

Amending the mens rea requirement in federal law (18 U.S.C. Section 242) to prosecute police misconduct from “willfulness” to a “recklessness” standard;

Reforming qualified immunity so that individuals are not barred from recovering damages when police violate their constitutional rights;

Incentivizing state attorneys general to conduct pattern and practice investigations and improving the use of pattern and practice investigations at the federal level by granting the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division subpoena power;

Incentivizing states to create independent investigative structures for police involved deaths; and

Creating best practices recommendations based on the Obama 21st Century Policing Task force.

As recognized by scholars at Cato—the conservative think tank Cato—the time has come to abolish qualified immunity.

According to Cato, “qualified immunity is a legally baseless judicial invention” that has “proven unworkable as a matter of judicial doctrine,” and “routinely denies justice to the victims of egregious misconduct and undermines public accountability across the board, especially for members of law enforcement.”

I am particularly pleased that the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act includes the End Racial Profiling Now Act, which I introduced to ban the pernicious practice of racial profiling.

In addition, I am proud that this legislation includes as Title I, Subtitle B, the bipartisan and bicameral George Floyd Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act, which I introduced with Congressman JASON CROW of Colorado in the 116th Congress as H.R. 7100.

This legislation provides incentives for local police organizations to voluntarily adopt performance-based standards to ensure that incidents of deadly force or misconduct will be minimized through appropriate management and training protocols and properly investigated, should they occur.

The legislation directs the Department of Justice to work cooperatively with independent accreditation, law enforcement and community-based organizations to further develop and refine the accreditation standards and grants conditional authority to the Department of Justice to make grants to law enforcement agencies for the purpose of obtaining accreditation from certified law enforcement accreditation organizations.

As I have stated many times, direct action is vitally important but to be effective it must

be accompanied by political, legislative, and governmental action, which is necessary because the strength and foundation of democratic government rests upon the consent and confidence of the governed.

Effective enforcement of the law and administration of justice requires the confidence of the community that the law will be enforced impartially and that all persons are treated equally without regard to race or ethnicity or religion or national origin.

As the great jurist Judge Learned Hand said: “If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: thou shalt not ration justice.”

Equal justice is the proud promise America makes to all persons; the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021 will help make that promise a lived reality for African Americans, who have not ever known it to be true in the area of community-police relations.

And when Black Lives Matter, then and only then can it truthfully be said that all lives matter.

Finally, let me say a few words in memory of the man whose sacrifice of his inalienable right to life has galvanized the world and awakened the sleeping giant of moral decency.

Mr. Speaker, let me pay tribute to the person for whom this legislation is named and to his family.

George Floyd, also known lovingly as “Big Floyd,” “Perry,” or “The Gentle Giant,” loved life, his family, friends, and community and throughout his life used his love of sports and music to leave a positive impact on this world.

Mr. Speaker, rather than giving in to bitterness and hate, the family of George Floyd has channeled the pain and heartbreak of the tragic loss of their beloved George into the creation of a force for good: The George Floyd Memorial Foundation, Inc., a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, to promote global awareness about racial injustice and provide opportunities for others to contribute to the unification of our communities and touch the world.

Let me thank each member of the Floyd family and list them by name: his parents, Larcenia Jones-Floyd and George Perry Floyd, Sr.; his daughter, Gianna Floyd; his siblings Philonise Floyd, Zsa Zsa Williams, LaTonya Floyd, Rodney Floyd, Bridget Floyd, Terrence Floyd; and nephew, Brandon “WOO” Williams.

Mr. Speaker, in Acts 2:23 of the Scriptures it is written that “This man was handed over to you by God’s deliberate plan and foreknowledge; and you with the help of wicked men, put him to death by nailing him to the cross.”

Duty calls us to do improve the quality of policing in America.

We cannot agitate for change one day and then allow things to remain the same, to allow wicked men to keep committing this crime against humanity.

This behavior did not begin with George Floyd; there is a 400-year history here, from slave patrols, to Jim Crow to Bull Connor to the modern-day lynching of George Floyd by Minneapolis police officer Derek Chauvin.

But the good news is that right is on our side; God has stepped in.

In John 1:46 it is said, “can anything good come out of Nazareth?”

When he was growing up, I am sure there were people who saw George Floyd and asked can anything good come out of the Third Ward of Houston?

We now know the answer is clearly yes.

George Floyd was here in service to God’s divine plan.

And as his daughter Gianna said, her Daddy changed the world.

Thank you, George Floyd for what you have done for us, for helping us find our voice and our resolve.

We will not let you down; we will finish the job.

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

The gentlewoman just said that there was no defunding of the police. I would just point out Democrat-controlled cities around the country:

Austin, Texas, \$150 million cut;
Baltimore, Maryland, \$22 million;
Boston, \$12 million;
Burlington, \$1 million;
Columbus, \$23 million;
Denver, \$55 million;
Eureka, California, \$1.2 million;
Hartford, \$2 million;
Los Angeles, \$175 million;
Madison, Wisconsin, \$2 million;
Minneapolis, \$8 million;
New York, \$1 billion;
Norman, \$865,000;
Oakland, \$14.6 million;
Oklahoma City, \$5.5 million;
Philadelphia, \$33 million;
Portland, Oregon, \$15 million;
Salt Lake City, \$5.3 million;
San Francisco, \$120 million;
Seattle, \$69 million;
Washington, D.C., \$15 million cut.

That is what Democrats have done over the last year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1280.

I spent the last week talking to law enforcement officers in Utah. These men and women are heroes. They are good, honest officers who risk their lives every day to keep us safe.

I asked them about H.R. 1280, and this is what they said:

“This will destroy public safety.”

“We haven’t done anything to earn this type of distrust.”

“This will push good law enforcement out of the business.”

“Utah is an amazing place. We have the right people protecting us. Let’s keep them here.”

Mr. Speaker, police reform is necessary. We need to give officers the tools they need to fairly enforce the law. But this legislation paints a target on the back of every police officer in America.

In Salt Lake City, we saw a 38 percent increase in homicides. At the same time, Salt Lake cut \$5.3 million from the police department’s budget. It should be no surprise that voluntary resignations doubled. This bill will make good officers flee the profession when we need them most.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats won’t say this, but this bill simply defunds the police. Not in Utah’s Fourth District; not now; not ever.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out that this bill does

not—all the cities that we talked about, it does not mention any cities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

I started my career as the legal adviser to the Memphis Police Department. There were many fine policemen, and most of them never used a choke hold, never used their gun, and operated admirably. Some did not.

The disproportionate share that African Americans have suffered from killings by police shows we need to act. You can't think about George Floyd being choked with a knee and killed for 8 minutes. You can't think of Eric Garner being wrestled down like a prize trophy animal and killed in Staten Island, or young Tamir Rice, shot without an officer taking a second to think about it.

Mr. Speaker, these deaths require us to act. This is not defund the police. This is reform the police and save human lives. We need to pass this bill today. We should have passed it 40 years ago when I was a police attorney. Pass it now.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong opposition to the efforts by you and your colleagues to defund our police.

This week we will be voting on H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. This bill is named after a man who was murdered by a police officer. The officer responsible should have never been allowed to don a badge and act on behalf of the agency sworn to protect its citizens. He should and is being held accountable.

Now, as a member of a first responder family, I can say definitively on behalf of our officers that there is absolutely nothing, nothing that a good cop hates more than a bad cop. And as the wife of a first responder, this issue could not be more personal to me.

Mr. Speaker, my husband serves our local community as a firefighter and a SWAT medic for our local sheriff's department. And next to me here today, you see one of his SWAT vests.

This is the same vest that he wore for 14 hours while on a massive manhunt for a man who had just been released from prison, who promptly raped and killed his girlfriend.

It is the same vest that he wore while responding to a man who had barricaded himself with weapons, threatened to kill his own children.

These are just some of the scenes that this vest and my husband have seen, like so many of our LEOs. But the real threat here is not the dangerous situations that my husband has seen in protecting his community, it is the fact that this bill—and by extension, you, Mr. Speaker—want to take this vest off my husband's back be-

cause, yes, what this bill does is take this kind of equipment off the backs of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues who are considering voting for this bill:

Are you waking up at 2 a.m. to respond to a gruesome murder?

Are you missing your children's birthday parties to respond to gang shootings?

There is absolutely room for us to improve. There is absolutely room and a necessity for us to do better. But the answer is not to defund the police. It is not the answer. What this bill ultimately does is defund the police.

You want a better trained, more responsive police force in your hometown? Fully fund the police. You say this is a reform bill, and I say that is BS.

Mr. Speaker, your own conference members have been advocating for the defunding of our local police officers, calling them names that I cannot and will not repeat here today. In fact, many of your members have made it a top priority of their platforms.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, George Floyd died under the knee of a police officer 302 days ago. In the time since then, 797 people—more than 2½ every day—have died during encounters with law enforcement.

Black Americans are 2½ times as likely as White Americans to be killed by the police. Police use of force is now the sixth-leading cause of death for young Black men in this country. This cannot continue. It is time to address systemic racism in policing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will begin to do that. It ends choke holds. It will hold bad officers accountable, combat racial profiling, and demilitarize police departments. This bill is about ensuring accountability and restoring trust between law enforcement and their communities. Both the police and the community deserve that and will benefit from it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a co-sponsor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

And I would say, there has been a lot of discussion about defunding the police. The only party in this Chamber defunding the police are the Republicans, who just voted against billions of dollars to support local and State government, first responders, police officers. We supported that. We are funding the police. They voted to defund it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill restores relationships between the police and the community, and I urge its passage.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ).

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this egregious, so-called police reform bill. The process used to craft this bill is nonsense.

In a normal functioning Congress, the Speaker would bring together Re-

publicans and Democrats to discuss ways to push needed police reforms. But in this dysfunctional Congress, we got a bill that strips our frontline police officers from qualified immunity, that will weaken and possibly destroy our communities' police forces.

Mr. Speaker, as mayor and sheriff of Miami-Dade County, and a former SWAT medic myself, I was actually responsible for ensuring my community was kept safe from lawlessness. I understand firsthand the importance of qualified immunity for police officers to carry out their jobs.

Officers perform vital tasks requiring split-second decisions under intense circumstances. Taking away qualified immunity will lead to police officers not taking the decisive actions and rendering it impossible for them to do their job. Without this security, officers will resign and deplete our police force, leaving our communities—the very ones who need a strong police force the most—less safe and costing the lives of countless Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to vote against this dangerous bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act and to say Black Lives Matter.

I rise for Charleena Lyles, Che Taylor, Manuel Ellis, Tommy Le, Tony McDade, George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Eric Garner, Atatiana Jefferson, Ezell Ford, Tanisha Anderson, Tamir Rice, Walter Scott, Philando Castile, Gabriella Nevarez, Botham Jean.

I rise for all of our Black siblings who have been killed by law enforcement, because there are far too many to say all of their names.

I rise for the Black Lives Matter protestors who were met with aggression, tear gas, and force while White domestic terrorists were met with none of these things.

I rise to answer the call of millions of people led by Black voices who have taken to the streets demanding transformative change.

I rise because that change begins today by once again passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

□ 1845

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Nation's law enforcement. Blessed are the peacemakers for they will be called children of God.

Mr. Speaker, since last summer, members of law enforcement have faced attacks and dangerous rhetoric, even from Members of this body. As officers put their lives on the line to protect all of us, our communities, and our families, we have seen nothing but

dangerous attempts from the left to defund, dismantle, and disband the police even as we stand here today, surrounded by razor wire, the National Guard and increased police presence to protect you, but you don't want them to protect our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would end qualified immunity. Qualified immunity is only applicable when they follow their training and protocol and protects officers from being personally sued for official actions. If we repeal qualified immunity, we will not find anyone willing to serve as police officers because they can be sued out of everything they own for doing their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, if that is not enough, this bill would threaten our officers' physical safety by denying them protective gear and equipment. The Democrats and radical left are going to defund and dismantle departments and take away officers' liability protection for doing their job. Then they are going to take away their physical protection from harm. We will be lucky to have a police force in America in 10 years.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of our many officers in Georgia's Sixth Congressional District, here in the Capitol, and those nationwide who do all that they can to keep our families safe.

They have the trust of their communities and, as a result, are better at ensuring everyone's safety. These officers know the people that they serve. They see them as brothers, sisters, and neighbors. They serve with honor and respect the dignity of every citizen.

This bill is about making sure that every officer and every department is held to the same standard as has been set by the officers in my own district.

Mr. Speaker, by passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, we invest in our departments, end harmful profiling, and provide grants to communities finding new and innovative ways to improve safety.

This bill ensures all of our police officers have the resources to become our very best police officers, and that they are all working to make sure that every single one of us is safer.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, whenever the left takes control of local law enforcement, the result is predictable and catastrophic. They act to defund the police, deliberately withhold police protection from law-abiding shopkeepers and citizens, declare sanctuaries for criminal illegal aliens, decline to charge criminals, and prevent law-abiding citizens from protecting themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we are now suffering the result: skyrocketing homicides, shootings, and other violent crimes, preying most of all upon the decent citizens of our inner cities. Now, after

their summer of love and lawlessness, look at the results. Their storefronts are boarded up. Their buildings are burned out. Their streets are increasingly surrendered to the lawless.

Frankly, the Democrats in Congress that have applauded these policies would not be my first choice to micro-manage every police department across our country as this bill does; just saying.

The ultimate target of the left is not isolated abuses by law enforcement officers but, rather, law enforcement itself. As we can now see, without law enforcement, there is no law.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times the other side says that this bill will defund the police, it does not make it true.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it would be an irresponsible policy to defund the police. We are not for that.

Hear me. You can say it over and over and over again. It will be a lie. No matter how well it serves your political purposes, it will be a lie.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I want to thank Representative BASS and members of the Congressional Black Caucus for their leadership last year and now. I also want to thank my friend, Chairman NADLER, and the Judiciary Committee for their hard work.

I am proud to be an original sponsor. If I thought this defunded the police, I would not be for it. Now, that won't affect you and your debate, I understand that, any more than it affected you in recognizing the legitimacy of the Presidential election.

I am proud to be an original sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, in June of last year, the House passed this bill because we recognized that something had to change. Change could not wait. Change waited too long in the Jim Crow South. Change has waited too long throughout this country—North, East, West, and South.

Mr. Speaker, when we mournfully say the names of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Eric Garner, Michael Brown, Philando Castile, Freddie Gray, with a list that goes on and on and on and on, enough, my colleagues, enough.

We must change the psychology of how we treat people. I don't mean police alone. I mean all of us, but all of us don't carry guns. All of us have not been given extraordinary authority by the public we serve. Because we give certain people in this country extraordinary authority to take our freedom away and, yes, to take our lives away, we must ensure accountability for the use of that power, just as the voters ought to ensure accountability for the power that they give to us.

When we hear about African American parents having to teach their sons how to act during encounters with police so that they, too, don't become victims, it is time for change. When we

feel the energy of many millions of Americans of every race, every faith, and every age taking peacefully to the streets in protest against injustice, we know that change must come now.

I know how you lament the use of violence. I saw that on January 6.

Mr. Speaker, peaceful demonstrations, Martin Luther King was locked up. Rosa Parks was locked up. For a crime? Of course, Parks sat in the front of the bus. That was illegal. As King said, an illegal law ought not to be obeyed.

Mr. Speaker, they paid the consequences. They had the courage and fortitude to do that.

That is why we took action last year, passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. This legislation addresses police choke holds like the kind that took George Floyd's life. Stand if you can justify that action.

Mr. Speaker, it addresses no-knock warrants like the one that led to the tragic and preventable death of Breonna Taylor. It would condition Federal funding and resources to police departments on ending racial profiling. Content of character, did we not learn that lesson? It is not the color of your skin, the cut of the cloth you wear, or the part in your hair.

Mr. Speaker, we ask them to follow best practices with that power and authority we have given them, best practices in police training that help ensure the rights of those who encounter police, as well as the safety of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also brings justice to victims and their families by facilitating, under appropriate circumstances, their ability to seek redress of grievances.

This bill is not only intended to protect people who encounter the police, but it is meant to help keep police safe as well, to help them do the difficult job of keeping their communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this body, I think I can safely say, who has attended more frequently the annual National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund ceremony. I am local, but I dare say that no Member in this body has attended that more frequently, been more supportive of law enforcement, or been more supportive of my local sheriffs and police departments. They are critically important. Of course, we don't want to defund them. We have to have a safe society if democracy is going to prevail. That is why we have law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from so many law enforcement officials who are deeply concerned about misconduct and racial bias in policing, just as each one of us ought to be concerned about a politician who commits a crime. Why? It reflects on all of us. All of those politicians are crooks. Somebody out there is saying amen.

That is why this is important, because there are so many hundreds of thousands of honest, hardworking, courageous, dedicated police officers, sheriffs, and constables in this country.

Mr. Speaker, most police officers are good and decent men and women, serving with honor. They want to know that their ranks are free from those who would apply bias and sow mistrust that endangers their and their colleagues' safety. This is just the beginning of a larger effort to reform policing, which will require the Senate and White House to work with us to ensure that victims of misconduct and their families get the justice they deserve, while police departments have the support, the funding, if you will, they need to keep our communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, when we passed this bill last year, the Republican-controlled Senate refused even to consider it. They were in charge. They put no bill of their own on the floor. I apologize. I retract that. Mr. JORDAN is correct.

Now, however, with this Democratic Senate majority, I hope I can see action, work with Senator SCOTT, and come to a resolution, because this problem will not go away if we don't help it. We will not save lives if we don't act.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this is a top priority for Senate Democrats, as well as for President Biden and Vice President Harris. So, I hope that we will not only see the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act pass the House today but also be signed into law this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is a necessary bill to respond to a crisis throughout our country, certainly not by every member of law enforcement, but by the minority of law enforcement officers, just as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are a credit to the service in this House, not all, but the overwhelming majority.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass this bill. Let's act for justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to each other.

□ 1900

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

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader just said: Enough, my colleagues, enough.

I couldn't agree more.

Last summer, Democrats called for unrest in the streets. They raised bail money for rioters. They called antifa a myth. They voted and pushed for defunding the police all across this country.

Guess what? When you call for unrest in the streets while there is unrest in the streets, guess what happens?

You get more unrest in the streets.

When you raise money to bail out rioters, guess what happens?

You get more rioters.

When you call antifa a myth, guess what happens?

You get more attacks on property and on people.

Guess what also happens when you call for defunding the police?

You get more crime.

And when you fail to condemn violence—all violence, whether it happens on January 6 or last summer—you get more violence.

Everyone understands that. Everyone should understand that, but it seems Democrats don't.

We had a bill in the House, just like Senator SCOTT's bill, and Representative STAUBER was the sponsor. Last year, when we had a markup, we offered 12 amendments in committee. They wouldn't take any of them. Some of the amendments, the Democrats actually supported them. But nope, nope, got to be this bill.

They didn't want to work with us to deal with the real concern, because we all know what happened to Mr. Floyd was as wrong as wrong could be. We were willing to work, but, no, they wouldn't take any of our amendments and said the things they said last summer. We should work together on this, but they don't want to. They don't want to do it.

They want their own bill. They don't want Republicans to vote for it. They want to play politics. We would actually like to solve the problem. We would actually like to solve the problem.

You know what else happens when you call for defunding the police?

The police retire. There is a 72 percent increase in retirement of police officers in New York City alone. Think of what it is like around the country. That is what happens when you send the message that Democrats sent all last summer. It is wrong. We shouldn't stand for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, Officer Tiffany-Victoria Enriquez, Officer Kaulike Kalama, Sheriff Sheldon Gordon Whiteman, Officer Katherine Mary Thyne, I could go on and on 113 times with the names of law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty, who were killed last year in 2020—113.

And we are on the floor of the House of Representatives with a bill gutting the qualified immunity that helps protect our law enforcement officers without so much as a hearing, without so much as coming back to talk to us and work with us since last June.

Why?

Because this is all political. This is all political.

We talk about defunding. I am from Austin, Texas; \$150 million cut from the police budget there.

And what did my Democrat colleagues do last Friday?

Jammed through \$500 billion for State and local governments, funding the very Democratic cities that are gutting our law enforcement officers, taking away what they need to be able to exist.

And with what happened in Austin, a 50 percent increase in murder rate. We lost the greatest cadet class we had.

This bill is a sham. We should oppose it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times Republicans may say the contrary, Democrats have never called for defunding the police.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, we respect every single officer who has died in the line of duty.

The question is: Why don't you respect those Black and Latino individuals who were shot in the back, choked to death, beaten nearly unconscious, or have a knee to the neck, strangling the life out of them for 8 minutes and 46 seconds? Why don't you respect them?

That is what the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is all about.

We respect police officers, those who protect and serve; but we have a challenge with police violence, police brutality. The police abuse of force cannot be denied, video after video after video. Don't believe us, believe your own eyes.

Thirty years ago, Rodney King was beaten on this very day, and we thought it would be different. But 30 years later, nothing has changed in terms of accountability and reining in those officers who cross the line.

It is time to pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, and do it now.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, this bill ignores the harm that anti-law enforcement rhetoric and unchecked violence have inflicted on our communities and our police.

Since last year, we have seen businesses and communities terrorized, burned, and looted by criminal gangs and thugs, while some elected officials justified the violence, called for defunding the police, and moved to tie the hands of law enforcement. In essence, lawlessness prevailed and accountability failed. This legislation doubles down on that failed policy.

In my home State of Wisconsin, we watched city officials in Madison, Kenosha, and Milwaukee stand by as violent rioters destroyed property, monuments, shops, and livelihoods. Sheriffs in my home State tell me they are having significant retention and recruiting issues. This will only exacerbate that. It is a back door to the misguided defund the police efforts. Defunding the police does not make the police safer.

Mr. Speaker, this bill empowers criminals, while stripping cops of the tools they need to do their jobs and due process guaranteed to them by the Constitution. It exposes law enforcement officers and their families to potential retribution by criminals.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I, like so many in my community of Minneapolis, are still traumatized. I watched horrified for 8 minutes and 46 seconds as George Floyd's life was

taken from him, another innocent Black man murdered by the police in our community.

Time and time again, we have witnessed the people who are sworn to protect our communities abuse their power. My city is not an outlier, but, rather, an example of the inequalities our country has struggled with for centuries. Brutality against unarmed Black men and women is not a new phenomenon.

Today, we find ourselves at a crossroad. Will we have the moral courage to pursue justice and secure meaningful change? Or will we succumb to this moment?

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH).

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again: about to vote on a divisive bill being pushed through by the majority without any Republican input. Disguised as accountability, this bill hinders law enforcement's ability to do their jobs, limits the readiness of law enforcement, and demonizes an entire profession for the actions of a few.

A bill from my Minnesota colleague, Mr. STAUBER, a former police officer himself, accomplishes many of the aims of this bill before us today, and has bipartisan support from the stakeholders involved; but Democrats rejected it, picking partisanship over real reform to help and improve law enforcement.

We do not deny there is work to be done, but the path to getting it done is working together to ensure that law enforcement developed the necessary tools to keep our communities safe and protect the rights of people they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and to work on a bill that will really help law enforcement and the citizens.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, any man's death diminishes me. We will never forget, the world will never forget, as we watched as a police officer knelt on George Floyd's neck for more than 8 minutes.

George Floyd cried out for his mother, saying "Mama, mama, mama, mama, mama, mama, I can't breathe. I love you. Tell my kids I love them. I am dead."

As he was murdered by an officer sworn to protect and serve, Americans of all races and backgrounds flooded the streets all across this Nation, demanding long overdue accountability so that no one has to live in fear of the police.

They demanded that we recognize George Floyd's death and the deaths of so many others at the hands of the police. These killings have left the Black community and, much more importantly, our entire community trauma-

tized and scared. Wounds cannot heal without accountability.

This is not an anti-police bill. The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is for Eric Garner, Tamir Rice, Breonna Taylor, Elijah McClain, and so many more.

Any man's death diminishes me.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1280 and defunding the police.

When vandalism and violence plagued cities across the country last summer, our law enforcement officers were the thin blue line protecting us. The violence reached communities from New York City to Portland. It even hit places in my district, and we saw our local law enforcement act heroically.

Unfortunately, as both the son and father of law enforcement officials, this bill is a step in the wrong direction. The bill substantially reduces due process for police officers, restricts access to needed equipment, and makes it more difficult to get critical funding.

Our law enforcement officers need more funding, not less. More funding will help our officers get additional training to deescalate conflicts and get more equipment to keep all parties safe. Instead of focusing on how we can help the police build trust in the communities, this bill focuses on how we can take from the police.

Clearly, the bill is designed to satisfy those that seek to defund and dismantle the police. None of this bill serves to build trust between law enforcement and their communities. Like every occupation, law enforcement has bad apples that must be held accountable.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee, for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

I commend Congresswoman KAREN BASS for her great leadership in this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, nearly 1 year ago, George Floyd gasped his last words, "I can't breathe," and ignited a nationwide reckoning on the racial injustice and police brutality in America.

Americans from every corner of the country took to the streets to peacefully protest violence against Black Americans: waving Black Lives Matter flags, chanting the names of the murdered, repeating George Floyd's dying words, "I can't breathe." They turned their agony into action.

But, tragically, despite these mass protests, the injustice, the killing, continues. Those protests were global. They were all over the world.

Here, as Members of Congress, and as Americans, we cannot accept this epidemic of injustice. We cannot stay silent when our most vulnerable and historically marginalized communities—people of color, those living in poverty, Americans with disabilities—are being targeted and sometimes killed.

That is why today the House will again pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act and send it to the Senate and the President's desk, so that it can finally become the law of the land.

□ 1915

I salute Congresswoman KAREN BASS, who has been relentless, persistent, and absolutely courageous in her leadership on this legislation. I thank the Congressional Black Caucus and its chairperson, JOYCE BEATTY; and Judiciary chair, JERRY NADLER.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act fundamentally transforms the culture of policing with strong, unprecedented reform. This legislation will not erase centuries of systemic racism and excessive policing in America. It will not bring back George Floyd, Breonna Taylor—say her name, Breonna Taylor—Ahmaud Arbery, or the countless other men and women who died or were senselessly injured. But it will take a tremendous step forward to stop the violence, stem the suffering, and start to build a healthier and better relationship between law enforcement and communities that they protect.

All of us here salute and are profoundly grateful for our law enforcement heroes. I grew up in a public service family. My father, my whole life at home, was the mayor of Baltimore. My brother was mayor later, Thomas D'Alesandro, in Baltimore. They had a motto about the police: Be true to the men in blue.

Of course, this was a long time ago. Be true to the men in blue. I was raised with that respect.

But then, prayerfully, these people, our men and women—now men and women—in uniform, whether they are police or fire, but addressing police here, our first responders left home when they left to go to work, not knowing, and their families not knowing, if they would return home because they were risking their lives to save lives and to protect all of us. So it was with great prayerful gratitude to most of the men and women in blue that we, sadly, have to say that our appreciation for them cannot lapse into apathy or acceptance of actions that are fundamentally incompatible with the purpose of policing.

Of course, there is not anyone on our side of the aisle who has advocated any policy in this body to defund the police, contrary to misrepresentations that are coming forth. All of us here, again, salute and are profoundly grateful for our law enforcement heroes.

As the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives writes:

The passage of this act is paramount in achieving the fundamental principle of a police force that "protects and serves" every

citizen of their community with fairness, accountability, and transparency in their actions.

The Democratic Congress, together with the Biden-Harris administration, is committed to not only ensuring that this legislation becomes law, but to take further action to end violence and advance justice in America. Let us ensure that the passage of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is the first of many steps in this direction.

The family of George Floyd, who came here when the bill was being reviewed by Chairman NADLER's committee, asked me: Madam Speaker, will you name this bill for our brother?

His brother asked that question. The gentleman remembers that day. We couldn't be in the committee room because of COVID.

I said: Only if you think it is worthy of your brother.

I think of George Floyd at least once a day and sometimes more.

Do you know why?

Not just because of the sadness of it all, but I think of him because they tell us that, in order to be safe from COVID, we must wash our hands for 20 seconds. So as I'm washing my hands for 20 seconds, after about 8 or 9 seconds, I am thinking that this is taking forever; I can't do this for 20 seconds; it takes too long. Then I think of George Floyd—8 minutes and 46 seconds. It is a long time. It is a long time, as Congresswoman DEAN said, calling out for his mother and extending love to his family.

Let us ensure that George's brother, Philonise, when he said that George's name means something; and that as his daughter, Gianna, said, "Daddy changed the world," with this legislation, let us take an important step in changing the world for George's family, for all communities of color, for all Americans, and for the whole world.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote in the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, and I thank KAREN BASS, again, for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, nearly one year ago, George Floyd gasped his last words—"I can't breathe"—and ignited a nationwide reckoning on the racial injustice and police brutality in America.

Americans from every corner of the country took to the streets to peacefully protest violence against Black Americans: waving Black Lives Matter flags, chanting the names of the murdered, repeating George Floyd's dying words.

They turned their agony into action, but tragically, despite these mass protests, the injustice—the killing—continues.

Last year, 1,127 people were killed by police, far more than in the year before. In the months following George Floyd's murder, 645 people were killed—and hundreds more were attacked and assaulted, including Jacob Blake: shot seven times in the back in front of his three children.

As George Floyd's brother Philonise recently said, "As a Black man in the United States, I want to be able to go outside and protest, because at this time, I don't know who is going to survive or not."

As Members of Congress and as Americans, we cannot accept this epidemic of injustice. We cannot stay silent, when our most vulnerable and historically marginalized communities—people of color, those living in poverty, Americans with disabilities—are being targeted and killed.

That is why, today, the House will again pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act—and send it to the Senate and the President's desk, so that it can finally become law.

I salute Congresswoman KAREN BASS, who has been relentless, persistent and absolutely courageous in her leadership on this legislation. Thank you to the CBC and Chair JOYCE BEATTY, and Judiciary Chair JERRY NADLER.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act fundamentally transforms the culture of policing with strong, unprecedented reforms, including: banning chokeholds; stopping no-knock warrants; ending the court-created qualified immunity doctrine; combating racial profiling; and establishing strong new standards and protections to prevent and combat police misconduct.

This legislation will not erase centuries of systemic racism and excessive policing in America.

It will not bring back George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery or the countless other men and women who died or were senselessly injured.

But it will take a tremendous step forward to stop the violence, stem the suffering and start to build a healthier, better relationship between law enforcement and the communities that they protect.

All of us here salute and are profoundly grateful for our law enforcement heroes. But our appreciation cannot lapse into apathy or acceptance of actions that are fundamentally incompatible with the purpose of policing.

As the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives writes, "The passage of this act is paramount in achieving the fundamental principle of a police force that 'protects and serves' every citizen of their community, with fairness, accountability and transparency in their actions."

The Democratic Congress, together with the Biden-Harris Administration, is committed to not only ensuring that this legislation becomes law—but to taking further action to end violence and advance justice in America.

Let us ensure that the passage of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is the first of many steps in this mission.

And let us ensure that, as George's brother said, "George's name means something"; and that, as his daughter Gianna said, "Daddy changed the world."

With this legislation, let us take a small step to "changing the world"—for George's family, for all communities of color, and for all Americans.

With that, I urge a strong, bipartisan vote for the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I will just point out that the Speaker of the House said we should respect the police, but the Speaker of the House named an individual to conduct a review of the breach of the Capitol on January 6, and that individual has insulted the very police who protect us.

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

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1280.

Do you know what is terrifying to the American people?

Watching Democrats try to pass a defund the police bill; the same Democrats who cheered on and supported riots that burned American cities, and the same Democrats who shared Minnesota Freedom Fund bail bond links supporting criminals and helping them get out of jail.

This bill is atrocious. Shame on all of you. This hurts our police officers.

April 29, 2010, my friend, Jonathan Edwards, was shot in the line of duty. If that happened today and this bill is passed, getting rid of qualified immunity allows the criminal who shot him to be able to sue him simply because they are upset that they were arrested.

This same bill will also allow that criminal who shot him to be able to put his name on a national hit list that will be made public, whether police officers are found to have done wrong or not.

This is shameful.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. OMAR). Members are reminded to direct remarks to the Chair and not each other.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is a critical step towards ensuring a country where Black people are treated as equal citizens, not just in theory, but in real life. This bill weaves into our laws the truism that Black Lives Matter. This bill will help build trust between law enforcement and the communities that they are sworn to protect and serve.

"Equal Justice Under the Law" may be etched atop the entrance to this Nation's highest court, but it is not a privilege enjoyed by each of us. We must act now to ensure that we protect the humanity of every person. Stand up for the principle of equal justice for all.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to vote "yes" for the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, the death of George Floyd last year led to communities across the Nation to come together to speak out against injustices, call for additional accountability and transparency in policing, and advocate for solutions that could move us forward together as a nation.

But instead of working with Republicans to find a bipartisan solution, the Democrat majority has, once again, written a partisan bill to ram through the House with no committee markup,

no open amendments, and no meaningful bipartisan collaboration. That is not what the American people sent us here to do.

This legislation will impede the ability of good police officers to do their jobs effectively and uphold the rule of law. Our dedicated police officers who serve our communities work tirelessly to ensure that lawlessness does not prevail in our streets and neighborhoods.

The effect of this bill on law enforcement is to levy unfunded mandates on local governments, force law enforcement to leave the profession, and, yes, defund the police.

Madam Speaker, as you said, defund the police is not a slogan, but a policy demand.

Madam Speaker, I will vote “no” on this, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California, KAREN BASS, for her leadership; as well as the Congressional Black Caucus for always speaking truth to power.

Madam Speaker, today we take a stride towards ending racism in policing. But this is just the beginning. We must recognize that systemic racism extends well beyond law enforcement. Systemic racism is the way governments have deliberately impoverished Black families, then condition necessary medical care on our ability to pay.

It is the way we fund our public schools, a property tax-based system that concentrates tens of billions more dollars in White communities than in Black and Brown communities.

In America, it is the way we run our elections, purging Black voters, especially in Southern States, from the rolls and closing the polls in Black neighborhoods. We can’t stop until we have eradicated systemic racism in all of its forms.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the insidious and false pretext for this legislation endangers and ends lives. The bill rests on a false premise and promotes a false narrative that police are racists and use their power to advance racist ends. This narrative is a false and despicable slander.

Police officers do not leave their loved ones and risk their own lives every shift to oppress or discriminate. They do it to serve. They do it without fanfare and for little pay, and they have come to anticipate abuse in place of the respect that they deserve. They do it to save lives.

But the reckless “defund the police” rhetoric behind this legislation is forc-

ing police to retreat and to leave the vulnerable at the mercy of those who prey upon them.

Madam Speaker, you should run from that rhetoric, as you are. Madam Speaker, you called the police “rotten to the root” and called for it to be “dismantled.”

That rhetoric is killing people. Please stop the political games. Stop slandering law enforcement, and stop endangering our communities. Back the blue.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, no matter how many times Republicans say that this bill defunds the police, it doesn’t change the fact that it does not defund the police.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH).

Ms. BUSH. Madam Speaker, first of all, we shouldn’t be talking about good police and bad police. There should just be police who are doing their job to serve and protect the people. So let’s make that clear.

There is no such thing as good police. There is no good nursing. When you go get food, you don’t go look for: This place has a good chef; this one has the bad chef; I am going to go where the bad chef is.

We don’t need this good police/bad police. We need police if we are going to have police. But I will move on.

Madam Speaker, St. Louis and I rise on behalf of the more than 788 people who have been killed by law enforcement over the last year. We rise 30 years to the day after the ruthless beating of Rodney King. We rise in honor of Breonna Taylor, who was brutally gunned down by police in her home last March. We rise for George Floyd and all those who have been killed by police since his torture and murder.

Those names: William Burgess, Mark Brewer, Dion Johnson, Tony McDade, Rayshard Brooks, Modesto Reyes, Ruben Smith, David McAtee, Kamal Flowers, Robert Harris, Joseph Denton, Vincent Truitt, Sincere Pierce, Jeremy Southern, Angelo Crooms, and Amir Johnson.

Madam Speaker, St. Louis and I rise on behalf of the more than 788 people who have been killed by law enforcement over the last year. We rise 30 years to the day after the ruthless beating of Rodney King. We rise in honor of Breonna Taylor who was brutally gunned down by police in her home last March.

We rise for George Floyd and all those who’ve been killed by police since his torture and murder:

1. William Burgess III
2. Mark Brewer
3. Dion Johnson
4. Tony McDade
5. Rayshard Brooks
6. Modesto Reyes
7. Ruben Smith III
8. Jarvis Sullivan
9. David McAtee
10. Kamal Flowers
11. Michael Thomas
12. Robert Harris

13. Rasheed Moorman
14. Ky Johnson
15. Kevan Ruffin
16. Joseph Denton
17. The more than 100 people whose names have been withheld by police
18. Erroll Johnson
19. Malik Canty
20. Richard Price
21. Hakim Littleton
22. Vincent Truitt
23. Aaron Hudson
24. Darius Washington
25. Vincent Harris
26. Jeremy Southern
27. David Brooks Jr.
28. Darrien Walker
29. Ashton Broussard
30. Amir Johnson
31. Julian Lewis
32. Rafael Minniefield
33. Kendrell Watkins
34. Anthony McClain
35. Adrian Roberts
36. Trayford Pellerin
37. Damian Daniels
38. Michael Harris
39. Name withheld by police
40. Robert Jackson
41. Dijon Kizzee
42. Deon Kay
43. Steven D. Smith
44. Major Carvel Baldwin
45. Steve Gilbert
46. Jonathan Darsaw
47. Robert Coleman
48. Caine Van Pelt
49. Darrell Zemault Sr.
50. Aloysius Keaton
51. Charles Eric Moses Jr.
52. Dearian Bell
53. Kurt Reinhold
54. Salaythis Melvin
55. Willie Shropshire Jr.
56. DeMarco Riley
57. Jonathan Price
58. Tyran Dent
59. Momodou Lamin Sisay
60. Stanley Cochran
61. Anthony Jones
62. Kevin Carr
63. Brandon Gardner
64. Donald Ward
65. Terron Jammal Boone
66. Skyleur Young
67. Dana Mitchell Young Jr.
68. Fred Williams III
69. Akbar Muhammad Eaddy
70. Dominique Mulkey
71. Marcellis Stinnette
72. Rodney Arnez Barnes
73. Gregory Jackson
74. Mark Matthew Bender
75. Ennice “Lil Rocc” Ross Jr.
76. Jakerion Shmond Jackson
77. Walter Wallace Jr.
78. Maurice Parker
79. Kevin Peterson Jr.
80. Name withheld by police
81. Justin Reed
82. Reginald Alexander Jr.
83. Tutuila Pine Koonwaiyou
84. Fredrick Cox Jr.
85. Rodney Eubanks
86. Brandon Milburn
87. Sincere Pierce
88. Angelo “AJ” Crooms
89. Tracey Leon McKinney
90. Name withheld by police
91. Shane K. Jones
92. Shawn Lequin Braddy
93. Javon Brice
94. Kenneth Jones
95. Rodney Applewhite
96. Rondell Gopy
97. Ellis Frye Jr.
98. Terrell Mitchell
99. Mickee McArthur

100. James David Hawley
 101. Julius Paye Kehyei
 102. Kevin Fox
 103. Dominique Harris
 104. Andre K. Sterling
 105. Casey Christopher Goodson Jr.
 106. Kwamaine O'Neal
 107. Donald Edwin Saunders
 108. Joshua Feast
 109. Bennie Edwards
 110. Charles E. Jones
 111. Jeremy Maurice Daniels
 112. Larry Taylor
 113. Andre Maurice Hill
 114. Sheikh Mustafa Davis
 115. Shamar Ogman
 116. Marquavious Rashod Parks
 117. Larry Hamm
 118. Jaquan Haynes
 119. Jason Cooper
 120. Dolal Idd
 121. Carl Dorsey III
 122. Tre-Kedrian Tyquan White
 123. La Garion Smith
 124. Vincent Belmonte
 125. Robert "Lil Rob" Howard
 126. Matthew Oxendine
 127. Jason Nightengale
 128. Patrick Warren Sr.
 129. Heba Momtaz Alazhari
 130. Lymond Maurice Moses
 131. Kershawn Geiger
 132. Zonterious Johnson
 133. Christopher Harris
 134. Eusi Malik Kater Jr.
 135. Tyree Kajawn Rogers
 136. Roger D. Hipskind
 137. Karl Walker
 138. Marvon Payton Jr.
 139. Chazz Halley
 140. Patches Vojon Holmes Jr.
 141. Treyh Webster
 142. Dontae Green
 143. Andrew Hogan
 144. Dustin Demaurean Powell
 145. Gregory Taylor
 146. Joe Louis Castellanos
 147. Robert Avitia
 148. John Alvarado
 149. Name withheld by police
 150. Rommel Mendoza
 151. Jorge Gomez
 152. Sean Monterrosa
 153. Eric Anthony Galvan
 154. Erik Salgado
 155. Juan Carlos Alvarez
 156. Anthony Angel Armenta
 157. Andres Guardado
 158. Michael Kristopher Torres
 159. Kevin Pulido
 160. Martin Humberto Sanchez Fregoso
 161. Leonardo Hurtado Ibarra
 162. Nick Costales
 163. James "Jay" Porter Garcia
 164. Axel Perez
 165. Carlos Baires
 166. Name withheld by police
 167. Antonio Mancinone
 168. Julio Jaramillo
 169. Cristhian Eliud Ramos-Murillo
 170. Julio Cesar Virula
 171. Ray Adrian Lara
 172. Gabriel Salinas
 173. Ramon Timothy Lopez
 174. Roberto Hernandez Jr.
 175. Name withheld by police
 176. Ryan Shane Hinojo
 177. Americo C. Reyes Jr.
 178. Jose Vallejos
 179. Name withheld by police
 180. Daniel Rivera
 181. Ronnie Kong
 182. Jose Manuel Castro
 183. Santos Anthony Villegas
 184. Everardo Gonzalez Santana
 185. Marco Antonio Sigala Jr.
 186. Samuel Mata
 187. Cesar Sanchez Ruiz
 188. Name withheld by police
 189. Jesus Alvarez Pulido
 190. Julio Cesar Moran-Ruiz
 191. Jesse David Nava
 192. Miguel Vega
 193. Marco Antonio Benito
 194. Christopher Escobedo
 195. Ricardo Miguel Munoz
 196. Name withheld by police
 197. Victor Sanchez
 198. Angel Benitez
 199. Isaiah Pama
 200. Name withheld by police
 201. Jason Rodriguez
 202. Diego Eguino-Alcala
 203. Juan Adrian Garcia
 204. Nick Burgos
 205. Douglas Sanchez
 206. Cesar Vargas
 207. Matthew Montoya
 208. Jose Marcos Ramirez
 209. Miguel A. Nevarez Jr.
 210. Yoel Arnaldo Mejia Santel
 211. Edwin Morales
 212. Alberto Rivas
 213. Jose Alfredo Castro-Gutierrez
 214. Emmett Cocreham
 215. George Cocreham
 216. Francisco Danny Flores
 217. Daniel Angel Villalobos-Baldovinos
 218. Marc Nevarez
 219. Name withheld by police
 220. Charles Robert Arviso
 221. Justin Esqueda
 222. Rodolfo "Rudy" Martinez-Cortez
 223. Luis Robert Zaragoza Barbosa
 224. Augustine Morales
 225. Pedro Martinez
 226. Anthony Arias
 227. Stavian Rodriguez
 228. Nicolas Segura
 229. Michael Anthony Pena
 230. Adam Lee Mendez
 231. Dolores Hernandez
 232. Christian Juarez
 233. Evelia Rivera
 234. Luis Manuel Vasquez Gomez
 235. Reno E. Casanova
 236. Andrew Mansilla
 237. Leonel Salinas
 238. Paul Peraza
 239. Christopher Cuevas
 240. Name withheld by police
 241. Jesus Perez
 242. Bryan Cruz-Soto
 243. Rodolfo Caraballo Moreno
 244. Frank Gonzales
 245. David Tovar Jr.
 246. Felix Santos
 247. Omar Felix Cueva
 248. Josue Drummond-Cruz
 249. Edwin Adan Velasquez
 250. Juan Carlos Pena-Noda
 251. Erick Mejia
 252. Henry Barnes Jr.
 253. Brandon R. Laducer
 254. Antonio Black Bear
 255. Nicholas Morales-Bessannia
 256. Cole F. Stump
 257. Trifton Stacy Wacoche
 258. Ernie Teddy Serrano
 259. Caillen Paoakea Gentzler
 260. Peter K. England
 261. Christian Hall
 262. Reyamar Gagarin
 263. John A. Vik
 264. Gary P. Dorton
 265. Justin Mink
 266. Name withheld by police
 267. Kenneth Bennett
 268. Alexander Scott
 269. Name withheld by police
 270. James Pharr
 271. Gerard John
 272. Ray Lee Jim
 273. Gregory Lee Turnure
 274. Donald L. Hunter
 275. Jeffrey McClure
 276. Michael Seltzer
 277. Richard L. Mason
 278. Phillip Dibenedetto
 279. Jerry M. Bethel
 280. Tiffany T. Bingham
 281. Brandeis Codde
 282. Name withheld by police
 283. David Guillen
 284. Jason James Kruzic
 285. Robert Wenman
 286. Matthew L. Fox
 287. Julie Colon
 288. Louis Lane
 289. Lance Bowman
 290. Kevin Lee Catlett
 291. Name withheld by police
 292. Doug Diamond
 293. Rodney Liveringhouse
 294. Name withheld by police
 295. Name withheld by police
 296. Taylor Christian Warner aka Tylor Warner
 297. Joey Hoffman
 298. Eduardo Martinez
 299. Kanavis Dujan Glass
 300. Daniel Matheson
 301. Michael Joseph Culbertson
 302. Marcos Reyes
 303. Rodney Morrison
 304. Arian Kaleb Schultz
 305. Glynn Farse Young
 306. Antwane Burrise
 307. Name withheld by police
 308. Malcolm Comeaux
 309. Grant King
 310. David Angulo
 311. Deborah White
 312. Name withheld by police
 313. Name withheld by police
 314. Dane Norris
 315. Samuel Solomon Cochran Jr.
 316. Jacob Wilbur Wright
 317. Jason Matthew Henke
 318. Winston Joseph Latour III
 319. Giovanni Cedano-Amaro
 320. Juan Rene Hummel Jr.
 321. Gary Hardy Jr.
 322. Colin E. Davis
 323. William Sears
 324. Ronald Pope
 325. Cryus D. Carpenter
 326. Name withheld by police
 327. Melissa Halda
 328. Christopher Lawings
 329. Andrew S. Gwynn
 330. Name withheld by police
 331. Name withheld by police
 332. Anthony Budduke
 333. Name withheld by police
 334. Donald Anderson
 335. Robert Land
 336. Lyana Gilmore
 337. Name withheld by police
 338. Name withheld by police
 339. Donald Timothy Miller
 340. Name withheld by police
 341. Fred John Henry Arcera
 342. Name withheld by police
 343. Trevor Edwards
 344. Ronald Stuart Chipman
 345. Name withheld by police
 346. Hasani Best
 347. Christopher Walker
 348. Mark Dawson Jr.
 349. Gearil Leonard Williams
 350. Corey Lee Cutler
 351. Name withheld by police
 352. Charles Garland
 353. Casper Brown
 354. Kurt Phelps
 355. Arthur Zalman Ferrel
 356. Fernando Napoles
 357. Shaon Jermy Ochea Walker
 358. Verlon Billy Stiles
 359. Refugio Reynaldo Olivo
 360. Matthew Patton
 361. Samuel Herrera Jr.
 362. Robert Samuel Craig Lusk

363. Joshua Clayton Brant
364. Name withheld by police
365. Derek Cooper
366. Julia Anne Moss
367. Randy Fedorchuk
368. Jessie A. Hudnall
369. Name withheld by police
370. James Lucachevitz
371. Kirby Joseph Michael Hengel
372. Name withheld by police
373. Mickel Erich Lewis Sr.
374. John Aycoth
375. Austin Manzano
376. Christopher Ulmer
377. Andrew A. Williams
378. Chester McDonald
379. Justin Caldwell
380. Ariel Esau Lujan
381. Shawn Campbell
382. Name withheld by police
383. Name withheld by police
384. Jason Edward Galliant
385. Name withheld by police
386. Name withheld by police
387. Name withheld by police
388. Ethan Freeman
389. Paul Sulkowski
390. Joey Hoffman
391. Name withheld by police
392. Name withheld by police
393. Steven Belville
394. Keith Beecroft
395. Name withheld by police
396. Michael Nichols
397. Name withheld by police
398. Name withheld by police
399. John Lipski
400. Name withheld by police
401. Bruce Allan Shumaker
402. Michael K. Nelson
403. Clifton Gorman Spencer
404. Brandon Keith Davis
405. Matthew Daniel Johnston
406. Jason S. Cline
407. Thomas Celona
408. Caleb Slay
409. Name withheld by police
410. Jason Neo Bourne
411. Name withheld by police
412. John Wesley Seymour
413. Name withheld by police
414. Name withheld by police
415. Name withheld by police
416. Javier Magana
417. David Viveros
418. Steven Campos
419. Rodriguez Duandre Pam
420. Terry David Fox
421. Name withheld by police
422. Ronny Dunning
423. Daniel David Reyes
424. Vusumuzi Kunene
425. Daron Jones
426. Chris Mellon
427. Eric Lyn Clark
428. Henry Frankowski
429. Name withheld by police
430. Name withheld by police
431. Name withheld by police
432. Christina Markwell
433. Name withheld by police
434. Terrell Smith
435. Duane Scott Murray
436. Peter Russell
437. Jordan D. Patterson
438. Name withheld by police
439. Douglas Hatfield
440. Name withheld by police
441. Nicholas Cory Kausshen
442. Name withheld by police
443. Lorenzo Aguilar
444. Name withheld by police
445. Alonzo Leroy Landy
446. Cory Donell Truxillo
447. Name withheld by police
448. Maurice Jackson
449. Larry Eugene Boyd
450. Nancy King
451. Randy Ward
452. Name withheld by police
453. Estavon Dominic Eliooff
454. Name withheld by police
455. Thomas Reeder III
456. Nathaniel Sironen
457. Brad Tyler Masters
458. Joseph R. Crawford
459. Whitney J. Crawley
460. Kurtis Kay Frevort
461. Earl Robert Caperton
462. Name withheld by police
463. Name withheld by police
464. Name withheld by police
465. Joseph Evans
466. Name withheld by police
467. Johnny Bolton
468. Tyquarn Graves
469. Nicholas Ellingson
470. Name withheld by police
471. Name withheld by police
472. Daniel Russell
473. Name withheld by police
474. Mark Clermont
475. Michael Brandon Joynier
476. Name withheld by police
477. Helen Jones
478. Name withheld by police
479. Name withheld by police
480. Alaina Burns
481. Shyheed Robert Boyd
482. Samuel Lorenzo
483. Jeffrey Marvin
484. Name withheld by police
485. Isaac Matheney
486. Name withheld by police
487. Micahel Romo
488. Name withheld by police
489. Jose Guzman
490. Alexander Gonzales
491. Benicio Vasquez
492. Jacob Ryan McDuff
493. Kwamena Ocran
494. Charles Edward Williams
495. Paul Bolden
496. Xzavier D. Hill
497. Mark Bivins
498. Allen Mirzayan
499. Joseph W. Howell
500. Name withheld by police
501. Antonio Carbajal
502. Gary Rodriguez Jr.
503. Name withheld by police
504. Reginald Johnson
505. Name withheld by police
506. Name withheld by police
507. Daniel Young
508. Daniel Canales Jr.
509. Robert Laudell Bull
510. Bradley Alexander Lewis
511. Name withheld by police
512. Name withheld by police
513. Harmony Wolfram
514. Name withheld by police
515. Javier Magdaleno
516. Kenneth Michael Dallas
517. Name withheld by police
518. Ezekiel Meza
519. Franklin Gray
520. Kevin Hayes
521. Andrew Scott Kislek
522. Name withheld by police
523. Joshua Crites
524. Name withheld by police
525. Anthony Andrew Reunart
526. Name withheld by police
527. Name withheld by police
528. Name withheld by police
529. Kevin Costlow
530. Dennis Denham
531. Anthony Greco
532. Keenan Sailer
533. Brooke Leann Blair
534. Brian Gregory Scott
535. Demarko Montez Henderson
536. Cortez Lee Bogan
537. Name withheld by police
538. Jacob Aaron Thomas
539. Jonathan Turner
540. Name withheld by police
541. Name withheld by police
542. Name withheld by police
543. Adam Bruce Connors
544. Phillip N. Davenport
545. Bruce Diehl
546. Name withheld by police
547. Name withheld by police
548. Name withheld by police
549. Richard Councilman
550. Tracy Drowne
551. John Allen Dunaway III
552. Jason Jesse Gallegos
553. Channing Lamar Spivey
554. Joshua Blessed aka Sergei Jourev
555. Steven Edward Ferguson
556. Sarah Grossman
557. Robert Anthony “Jordan” Whitehead
558. John Benedict Coleman
559. Name withheld by police
560. Caleb Rule
561. Israel Berry
562. Thomas Jeffery Sutherland
563. Ryan Emblem Moore
564. Robert James Lyon
565. Scott Hutton
566. Mary Lawrence
567. Gregory W. Hallback
568. Benjamin Ballard
569. Jarrid Hurst
570. Morgan James Davis
571. Marcus James Uribe
572. Mason James Lira
573. Gregorio Cruz Vanloo
574. William Slyter
575. Hannah R. Fizer
576. Nicholas Hirsch
577. Troy Willey
578. Keith William Brunelle
579. Jack Harry
580. David Lee Jacobs
581. Kellen Fortune
582. Buddy Edward Weeks
583. Cody W. Cook
584. Sabastian S. Noel
585. Benjamin Paul Brooks
586. Aaron Wesley Keller
587. Bonnie Jo Figueroa-Ortiz
588. Michael Pelley
589. James Tober Sr.
590. John Parks
591. Wade Russell Meisberger
592. Brittany S. Teichroeb
593. Jason Noble Snow
594. Wade Protus Phillips
595. Constantin Filan
596. Erick Gilmore
597. Paul Eugene Armstrong
598. Adam Lucas Carroll
599. Kevin Michael Norton
600. Terena Nicole Thurman
601. Sean Ernest Ruis
602. Tim O’Shea
603. Tyler Blevens
604. Name withheld by police
605. Chase Rountree
606. Name withheld by police
607. Kyle Elrod
608. Scott M. Kontowicz
609. John Karl Sieger
610. Christopher Poor
611. Andrew Jacob Preece
612. Howard Owens
613. James Justin Munro Jr.
614. Russell Van Liddell
615. Adrean Stephenson
616. Christopher Kimmons Craven
617. David Lee Rigg
618. David James Pruitte
619. Nicholas Kocolis
620. Jeffrey Scott Haarsrma
621. Johnathan Randell
622. Aaron Michael Griffin
623. Matthew Hilbelink
624. Earl Barton Jr.
625. Chris Minor
626. Joshua Squires

627. Kenneth Reiss
 628. Joshua Gay
 629. Rick Lee Miller
 630. Jeffrey Hubbard
 631. Thomas Moles
 632. Jimmy Ferrer
 633. Keith Allen Fileger
 634. Erik Jon Perez
 635. Jack Lamar Harris
 636. Jeffrey Wratten
 637. Shiloh D. Smith
 638. Nathan Harrington
 639. Scott Huffman
 640. Joey Middleton
 641. Damien Evans
 642. Nikolas Frazier
 643. Albert Wheeler
 644. Timothy Clevenger
 645. Michael Forest Reinoehl
 646. Joshua Beedie
 647. Andrew Blowers
 648. Seth Holliday
 649. Jeffrey Meyer
 650. Chad Busby
 651. Robert Ray Doss Jr.
 652. Glenn "G" Alvin Eldridge
 653. Clay A. Reynolds
 654. Name withheld by police
 655. Matthew Lyvon Paul
 656. Scott Heisler
 657. Rickey Wayne Riney
 658. Matthew C. Knowlton
 659. Joshua Sarrett
 660. Andrea Chuma
 661. Jeffery Ryan Blunk
 662. Christopher Michael Straub
 663. Matthew Nocerino
 664. Erik "Ace" Mahoney
 665. Jarred Kemp
 666. James Edward Baker
 667. Eric Marc-Matthew Allport
 668. Justin Lee Tofte
 669. Crystal Renee Starling McClinton
 670. John Hare
 671. Shayne Allen Sutherland
 672. William Sendelbach
 673. Kalun Purucker
 674. Anthony Michael Legato
 675. Sylvia Kirchner
 676. Julie Fandino
 677. Rodney Ross
 678. Jason Arpad Peters
 679. Steven Vest
 680. Christopher Allen Kanouff
 681. William Earl Lane
 682. Justin Dawley
 683. Bradley Pugh
 684. Darren W. Randolph
 685. Paul Bailey
 686. Gregory Putnik
 687. Christopher John Kitts
 688. Bryan Selmer
 689. James Collins
 690. Brandon Evans
 691. Richard "RJ" James Jones
 692. Paul Sarver
 693. Ryan Fallo
 694. Isaac Lemoine Christensen
 695. Bennie Biby
 696. Frank Murphy
 697. John Pacheaco Jr.
 698. Quincy Ivan Bishop
 699. John Mellone
 700. Guy Bradley Able
 701. Justin Hammack
 702. Michael Moza
 703. Jacob Rucker
 704. Wendy Jones
 705. Jesse James Kale Brown
 706. Douglas E. Rash
 707. Charles Craig Meeks
 708. Cody William Amman
 709. Jake Settle
 710. David Donovan
 711. Joshua D. Evans
 712. Dustin James Acosta
 713. James Horton
 714. Michael Dansby

715. Matthew Thomas
 716. Brittany Nicole Yoder
 717. Brian Allen Thurman
 718. Joshua Lee LaPlace
 719. Duane W. Rich
 720. Ethan Tyler Calton
 721. Craig Steven Wright
 722. Leonard Francis Kieren
 723. Dylan Ray Scott
 724. Kenneth Dale Miller
 725. Eric Drake Feenstra
 726. David John Donelli
 727. Name withheld by police
 728. Adam Robertson
 729. Benjamin Marley Manley aka Christopher Reeves
 730. Joshua Hoffpauir
 731. Jacob E. McClure
 732. William A. Riley-Jennings
 733. Joseph Tanner Casten
 734. Tara Rae Liubakka
 735. Cole Blevins
 736. Jordan Crawford
 737. Trevor Seever
 738. Jason Williams
 739. Henry Martinez Jr.
 740. James Reising
 741. Amanda Faulkner
 742. Michael Conlon
 743. Ashli Babbitt
 744. John R. Neitling
 745. Brian Andren
 746. Betty Francois
 747. Brian Williams
 748. Junius Thomas
 749. Daryl Dye
 750. Ty Walvatne-Donahy
 751. Joshua Van Machado
 752. Jeffrey D. Kite
 753. Justin Pegues
 754. Robert Stephen Calderon
 755. Kevin Darion Wells
 756. Christopher Austin Dockery
 757. Ryan Daniel Stallings
 758. Brian Richard Abbott
 759. Steven Verdone
 760. Caleb McCree
 761. John Eric Ostbye
 762. Edward Bittner
 763. Mark Meza
 764. Chase Coats
 765. Keith Scales
 766. Chad William Songer
 767. Richard Fenton Thomas
 768. Tracy Hope Walter-Hensley
 769. Nicholas Pingel
 770. Tilford "TJ" Barton
 771. Ariella Sage Eloise Crawford
 772. Clay Tatum
 773. Shae Estelle Jones
 774. Joseph Johnson
 775. Trey Bartholomew
 776. Clifford E. Wilbur Jr.
 777. Eric J. Porter
 778. Brian D. Ellis
 779. Gregory Chandler Metz
 780. Royce Robertston
 781. Lewis Ruffin Jr.
 782. Derrick Thompson
 783. Name withheld by police
 784. Name withheld by police
 785. Name withheld by police
 786. Name withheld by police
 787. Name withheld by police

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, the chairman of the committee has said several times that Democrats are not for defunding the police, but I would just point out the individual presiding over this session said that defunding the police is not a slogan, it is a policy demand.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Justice in Policing Act was crafted in response to George Floyd's murder. Almost no one believes that that was justifiable. Partisans have snatched this moment of unity to further divide our Nation.

How have they done that?

Look at this debate. Speaker after speaker has hurled insults falsely claiming that no Republican supports reform. Now, it is true that we don't support this reform, but the majority has refused to even consider amendments or alternatives to this partisan bill.

An essential component of any justice in policing bill would correct current injustices. I only have time to mention one: warrantless surveillance of American citizens is wrong.

Get a warrant.

Last year, conservatives and progressives united around this point, and the Speaker blocked debate or amendment to FISA reauthorization. Now the same tactics are being employed. Every single Member of Congress is here to represent American citizens, and denying us amendments denies all Americans a voice.

Don't politicize something that can heal and unite us. Vote "no" on this bill. Insist on regular order.

□ 1930

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, 8 minutes, 46 seconds on George Floyd's neck. "I can't breathe."

Say their names, Madam Speaker.

Breonna Taylor, Casey Goodson, Jr., Andre Hill, Eric Garner, Tamir Rice, and so many more.

While we can never bring them back and we cannot undo the pain their families, friends, and communities have felt, we can do everything in our power if we unite and pass this bill.

As the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to join us.

Our power, our message, is to pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

The right should read the bill. The right should quote from the bill. Show me those words in the bill to defund the police.

I will show you accountability. I will show you transparency. I will show you justice.

The American people are calling on Congress to act. Yes, Black Lives Matter.

Let's meet the moment and turn agony into action. Let's pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), a former sheriff.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill.

This bill should be a balefire, a warning to America that there are those

across the aisle who wish to attempt to federalize State and local law enforcement. I would like to focus specifically, though, on this move to eliminate qualified immunity. This is a betrayal of law enforcement. This alone is enough reason to vote against this bill.

There is a myth, a lie, perpetrated by those who want to do away with qualified immunity, that qualified immunity gives officers free rein on the job. This is not true. This is not sovereign immunity; it is qualified immunity.

The way that an officer qualifies for that immunity and for it to apply in an action that he has taken, he must follow the law, he must follow his agency's policies, and he has to act as he has been appropriately trained. If he violates any one of those three, he is on his own; qualified immunity does not apply.

Madam Speaker, law enforcement is a dangerous profession that deals in split-second decisions. Most people in this room have no idea what it is like to determine, in a high-stress, life-threatening—

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN).

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I was 11 years old when the police beat the crap out of me. Eleven years old, sixth grade; what threat did I pose, other than that of a child who was horseplaying in the street?

My mother and I did not feel empowered to take any recourse, because in our community, the police, unfortunately, operate as an occupying force.

I thank God that I am alive to tell this story. Unfortunately, George Floyd is not alive. Philando Castile is not alive. Tamir Rice is not alive. Aiyana Jones slept in her apartment on her couch. She was 7 years old. Police came in with a no-knock warrant and murdered her.

This is about transparency and accountability, and we should pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act in a bipartisan way.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill, and that is a shame, because this is an area that is ripe for bipartisan compromise.

But the House continues to spend its time forcing through another Democratic package that had zero Republican input. We considered this very same bill last Congress, but it only passed the House with three Republican votes in support.

Meanwhile, my colleagues, Representative PETE STAUBER and Senator

TIM SCOTT, have proposed the JUSTICE Act to positively reform police to serve all Americans equally.

However, their sincere efforts have not even been considered by those across the aisle. That bill would improve law enforcement transparency, require more detailed records on the use of force, provide funds for body cameras, ban choke holds, and improve training to intervene in situations and deescalate. These are all things we agree upon.

Yet, instead of equipping our law enforcement for success, we are considering this bill that would make it harder for our police officers to keep our communities safe.

Every community is different and dictating policy from Washington will only constrain our law enforcement heroes who put their lives on the line.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise.

My dear friends, you say you have a bill. Where was your bill when you had the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, and you could have passed it?

You say you have a bill. The same bill that you had to replace the Affordable Care Act that you never passed?

The same bill that you had to rebuild the infrastructure across the length and breadth of this country that you never passed?

Where is the invisible bill?

I rise to support this bill that will deal with elimination of deadly force racism that can take the lives of Black people with impunity.

I rise against your invisible bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded again to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to each other.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, Senator SCOTT had legislation, good legislation, but the Democrats wouldn't take it up; they filibustered.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, what happened to George Floyd is atrocious, it is criminal, and the policeman will be held accountable; he has got to be.

But that has nothing to do with eliminating immunity for countless policemen across the country. This bill does not properly address or prevent what happened in poor George Floyd's case.

Why would we have a bill that eliminates immunity for anybody charging the Capitol, breaking in illegally? They would be able to sue the police in the future, tie them up in court. Why would we do that? Because if we do this—follow the money—then the unions will be selling a lot of liability insurance; it will be the biggest fundraiser they have ever had.

Let's get together and come together on a bill that will not just raise money, not just hire more lawyers, but will solve the problem of the death, as criminal as it was, of George Floyd.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, this bill isn't about what we just heard. This bill is a moment of potential redemption for a country riven by racial division, riven by a history of racism going back to slavery, the Reconstruction era, post-Reconstruction, Jim Crow, the violent oppression of people because of the color of their skin.

We, in this body, have an opportunity to redeem our country and its history. Let us unite behind that cause and that opportunity at redemption.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021.

The peaceful protests for racial justice last summer compelled a long overdue reckoning for our country to take action to fulfill America's promise of equality no matter the color of your skin.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor this proposal to end police brutality and address the systemic racism that has marred American law enforcement for generations.

With this legislation, we finally say enough is enough: We've had enough of racial and religious profiling; Enough of no-knock warrants and chokeholds; and Enough of police using military-grade equipment on our American streets.

We are a country crying out for an end to the centuries-long scourge of racist brutality that has stolen so many black lives from our communities.

The Justice in Policing Act will help erode the culture of impunity within too many of our police forces by bringing much-needed accountability and transparency to our law enforcement institutions.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1280, a purely partisan bill, developed with zero Republican input, that would defund the police and hamstring the ability of our law enforcement agencies to keep our communities safe.

This bill would lower the legal threshold to criminally prosecute a police officer for deprivation of rights, which would, at best, lead to a torrent of frivolous cases against officers and, at worst, discourage them from doing their jobs.

Our officers are already forced to work in difficult environments. Countless officers have already simply quit or retired early, while morale has plummeted for those who stay. It will continue if this bill passes.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1280, a bill that defunds the police.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, Eric Garner, George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, all Black men and women who were killed by police.

It is in their memory that I rise today in support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, because we cannot live up to our ideals of justice for all while BIPOC Americans are disproportionately killed by police.

We need to pass this bill to save lives, to reform qualified immunity, to ban no-knock warrants like the one that contributed to the death of Breonna Taylor, to end the use of choke holds that killed Eric Garner and George Floyd.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting to pass this long overdue bill, to join me in this work to make this country a safer, more just place for all Americans. I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, death and destruction at this Capitol from recent Trump-instigated violence shows the result of insufficient policing. The deaths of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor, and in my area, Mike Ramos and Javier Ambler, and too many more, from misconduct, show the result of insufficient justice. As the name of this bill, "Justice in Policing," indicates this bill is not about removing the police; it is about removing the injustice. It seeks accountability.

It seeks equal justice under the law by our law enforcers, particularly for people of color, who have too often been victimized by systemic racism. Instead of working with us to make it better and secure our communities and more justice for all, many of today's Republican opponents are only spouting the poisonous slogans of Trumpism. Because Black and Brown lives do matter, let's approve this bill to achieve greater justice for all in an America that is safer for all.

□ 1945

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill, which represents the worst of Washington: defunding police in a surprise vote in the middle of the night.

This bill advances the far-left Democrat platform, and would defund the police through unfunded mandates that cost State and local departments millions of dollars.

If this weren't bad enough, the bill advances an antipolice agenda with

Washington-knows-best regulations, and puts a target on the backs of everyday officers by creating a national database of complaints that have not been adjudicated.

Madam Speaker, I oppose the bill. I stand with law enforcement, and I am grateful for those who serve on the thin blue line.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, as a person of color who has seen in my own life the dehumanizing effect of stop-and-frisk policing in New York City, I know firsthand that the Achilles' heel of American policing is the absence of accountability.

We, as a country, have a choice. We can either choose police accountability or choose qualified immunity, but we cannot choose both.

The purpose of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is not to second-guess officers who act in good faith. The objective is to hold liable officers who repeatedly abuse their power and who rarely, if ever, face consequences for their repeat abuses.

If you are a good officer, you have nothing to fear. But if you are a bad officer, you have accountability to fear, and fear accountability, you should.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. WILLIAMS).

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, what we saw happen to George Floyd was not an isolated incident. It was a modern-day lynching caught on camera, and it must stop.

Black men, women, and children are done dying. We are done dying at the hands of police.

Law enforcement should protect and serve. But in communities of color, we don't have the luxury of making that assumption. Many Black people get the talk, instructions on how to act when encountering police to increase the likelihood of returning home alive. These are survival tactics that my husband and I don't want to have to pass on to my young Black son, but we must.

For Black and Brown people everywhere, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. Let's affirm our commitment to root out police brutality and ensure accountability in policing.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in loving memory of Aiyana Jones, who was only 7 years old when she was killed by Detroit police.

The fact that the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act could have been named after countless other people murdered by police shows that this is

long overdue. It is important to note this bill is a start, not the end, of our movement to transform what it means to feel safe in our country.

We must demand true accountability, justice, and reparations for the generations of police brutality against our Black communities. We must invest in the social programs that we know will give our communities the opportunity to thrive.

This is the justice that Aiyana Jones and George Floyd and many other lives lost to police violence deserve.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Madam Speaker, there is an old African proverb that says: Until the lions tell their own story, the tales of the hunt will always glorify the hunter.

Who are the lions? They are the victims. They are Black and Brown and indigenous. They have suffered, endured, and survived 200 years of brutality, slavery, racism, Jim Crow, oppression, deprivation, degradation, denial, and disprivilege.

We have learned in this country one thing, that justice comes in small steps. And when we consider the enslavement of the Negro, the extermination of the Indian, the annexation of the Hispanic, our Nation that we love had an iniquitous conception.

So these small steps, no matter how painful they are, must be taken. This bill helps move us toward a more perfect Union. I urge passage of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, as a representative of more than a quarter of NYPD's 36,000 active officers, and thousands more retirees and first responders, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1280 and every piece of legislation that aims to cripple or degrade our law enforcement.

Instead of working with Republicans, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to push forth yet another partisan bill that will diminish public safety and prevent our law enforcement officers from serving and protecting our communities, all while trying to hold them personally liable. The brave men and women who put on the uniform every day deserve better.

We have offered real solutions to increase transparency, accountability, and performance so our Nation's law enforcement officers can better serve and protect all.

But make no mistake, this bill you are about to pass today defunds the police. The Congressional Budget Office

has confirmed that the unfunded mandates contained in this bill will drain the resources of State and local law enforcement to the tune of several hundred million dollars. This is negligence.

As a resident of New York City who has seen our police department's budget slashed by a billion dollars by politicians who think they know more than the officers doing the job on the street, I can tell you that there are serious ramifications.

Crime has skyrocketed. Last year, shootings increased by 97 percent, and murders increased by 44 percent. We have seen livelihoods and properties destroyed by rioters and looters in cities across America.

Government's number one responsibility to its citizenry is to keep them safe. Defunding law enforcement is an abdication of that responsibility.

Tonight, I call on every Member of this body to cosponsor my Right to Remain Safe Act, which holds local governments responsible should someone become a victim of a crime due to government's negligence.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt the motion to recommit today, we will instruct the Judiciary Committee to consider my amendment to H.R. 1280 to include a simple, straightforward sense of Congress strongly rejecting efforts to defund the police.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues say they don't support defunding the police. Well, here is their chance to show it.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to the millions of Americans who peacefully put this bill on the agenda.

It was nowhere last year until we saw 8 minutes and 46 seconds of a man being murdered, a Black man, George Floyd. People—White, Black, all different colors—took to the streets, and they said, "No more." I want to thank those activists and ordinary people who said we don't have to tolerate this.

The bill passed last year, and it is going to pass again because the American people are tired of this racism and the killing and killing and killing of Black people.

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

Madam Speaker, you said: Defunding the police is not a slogan; it is a policy demand.

Over 20 cities in this great country enacted that. They did that to the tune of \$1.7 billion taken from the brave

men and women who protect us all. That is our concern.

We would have loved to have worked with the other side. We had a bill. Senator SCOTT worked tirelessly on it. Representative STAUBER, former police officer STAUBER, on our side worked night and day on it. But Democrats wouldn't work with us, wouldn't take any of our amendments.

This is a partisan, political bill, unfortunately. That is why I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which bans police choke holds, creates a national police misconduct registry, and eliminates qualified immunity, among other needed provisions.

I grieved when first watching George Floyd's murder by a cop, and I grieve still over the continued loss of so many Blacks killed by cops. There have been 149 Black men killed at the hands of police since George Floyd's murder. I have been fighting against this police brutality since my first days as a member of the California State Assembly.

But here we are, mourning the victims of police choke holds, Blacks being shot in the back, fathers being killed in front of their children and their families. We Blacks are under siege by rogue cops, who we pay to protect and serve us, and White supremacists and domestic terrorists.

We have to resist this. We have to say to bad cops in blue that we are going to fight you. Or proud boys in yellow gear, we are going to fight you. We are going to resist you.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, a comprehensive bill to address systemic racism in law enforcement.

Today's legislation is named for George Floyd, whose senseless death at the hands of a police officer shocked the conscience of millions of Americans and sparked a long-overdue reckoning on race in America and a movement demanding racial justice. Congress has heard this call for justice, and in response, Congresswoman KAREN BASS and the Congressional Black Caucus have written this critical legislation to hold police accountable, change the culture of law enforcement, and build trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act takes these challenges head on by banning chokeholds, mandating racial bias training, ending qualified immunity, restricting the sale of military-grade weapons to local police departments, and establishing a National Police Misconduct Registry. While the inequities in our criminal justice system are immense, this legislation is a bold step to address systemic racism in law enforcement, and the time has come to make these reforms the law of the land.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to affirm my support as an original cosponsor for H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021.

This is not a new issue. But one that we continue to revisit over. And over. And over.

Madam Speaker, how many times will my Republican colleagues affirm that Black Lives Matter as the blood of Black Lives cry out from American cities and streets?

Despite what my Republican colleagues are purporting, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act will not defund the police.

But what it will do is bring us one step closer to justice by: banning chokeholds; prohibiting no-knock warrants; ending the qualified immunity doctrine that is a barrier to holding police officers accountable for wrongful conduct; Combatting racial profiling; Mandating there be data collection of these incidences for tracking, including body cameras and dashboard cameras; and; establishing new standards for policing.

George Floyd's death should not be in vain. And as a mother of a black son. Grandmother to three black grandsons, I do not want to have to worry about their safety when they encounter the police who are sworn to protect and serve. Not be the judge, jury, and onsite executioner.

Black lives matter, Madam Speaker, and it is past time that the laws of our nation reflect it. That is why I am urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. It goes without saying that I strongly encourage its immediate consideration and passage in the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Malliotakis moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1280 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Ms. MALLIOTAKIS is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents):

SEC. 503. SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the House—

(1) recognizes and appreciates the dedication and devotion demonstrated by the men and women of law enforcement who keep our communities and our nation safe; and

(2) condemns calls to "defund", "disband", "dismantle", or "abolish" the police.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 219, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]
YEAS—208

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brooks
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxo
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony

Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney

Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici

Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case

Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa

Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee

Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter

Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

□ 2043

Mr. CASTEN and Ms. TITUS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. SIMPSON, ROSE, and BUDD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on rollcall No. 59.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Kelly (PA))
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)
Buchanan (LaHood)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (NY)
Frankel, Lois (Clark MA)
Gaetz (McHenry)
Grijalva (García IL)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Huffman (McNerney)
Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Krishnamoorthi (Crown)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Lee CA)
Lee (NV) (Lee NV)
Leger Fernandez (Levin CA)
Levin (MI) (Lieu)
Lofgren (Lowenthal)
Luria (Lynch)
Lynch (Malinowski)
Maloney, Carolyn B. (Maloney, Sean)
Manning (Matsui)
McBath (Strickland)

Larson (CT) (Courtney)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark MA)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (McGovern)
Napolitano (Correa)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Speier (Scanlon)
Vargas (Correa)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON). The question is on passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 212, not voting 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]
YEAS—220

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans

Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kim (NJ)
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kush
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath

McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland

Suoizzi	Trahan	Watson Coleman
Swalwell	Trone	Welch
Takano	Underwood	Wexton
Thompson (CA)	Vargas	Wild
Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Williams (GA)
Titus	Vela	Wilson (FL)
Tlaib	Velázquez	Yarmuth
Tonko	Wasserman	
Torres (CA)	Schultz	
Torres (NY)	Waters	

NAYS—212

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

□ 2127

Mr. ARMSTRONG changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. KILMER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GOODEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was shown voting aye on rollcall No. 60. I intended to vote no.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Kelly (PA))	Kelly (IL) (Kuster)	Moulton (McGovern)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Napolitano (Correa)
Buchanan (LaHood)	Krishnamoorthi (Brown)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Langevin (Lynch)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Larson (CT) (Courtney)	Pingree (Kuster)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Lee (NV) (Kuster)	Ruiz (Aguiar)
Gaetz (McHenry)	Lieu (Beyer)	Rush (Underwood)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Speier (Scanlon)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Meng (Clark (MA))	Vargas (Correa)
Huffman (McNerney)	Moore (WI) (Beyer)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
		Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further 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, will now resume. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 219, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—210

Aderholt	Carl	Fitzpatrick
Allen	Carter (GA)	Fleischmann
Amodei	Carter (TX)	Fortenberry
Armstrong	Cawthorn	Fox
Arrington	Chabot	Franklin, C.
Babin	Cheney	Scott
Bacon	Cline	Fulcher
Baird	Cloud	Gaetz
Balderson	Clyde	Gallagher
Banks	Cole	Garbarino
Barr	Comer	Garcia (CA)
Bentz	Crawford	Gibbs
Bice (OK)	Crenshaw	Jimenez
Biggs	Curtis	Gohmert
Bilirakis	Davidson	Gonzales, Tony
Bishop (NC)	Davis, Rodney	Gonzalez (OH)
Boebert	DesJarlais	Good (VA)
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Gooden (TX)
Brady	Donalds	Gosar
Brooks	Duncan	Granger
Buchanan	Dunn	Graves (LA)
Buck	Emmer	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Estes	Green (TN)
Budd	Fallon	Greene (GA)
Burchett	Feenstra	Griffith
Burgess	Ferguson	Grothman
Calvert	Fischbach	Guest
Cammack	Fitzgerald	Guthrie

Hagedorn	Massie	Scalise
Harris	Mast	Schweikert
Harshbarger	McCarthy	Scott, Austin
Hartzler	McCaul	Sessions
Hern	McClain	Simpson
Herrell	McClintock	Smith (MO)
Herrera Beutler	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Hice (GA)	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Higgins (LA)	Meijer	Smucker
Hill	Meuser	Spartz
Hinson	Miller (IL)	Staubert
Hollingsworth	Miller (WV)	Steel
Hudson	Miller-Meeks	Stefanik
Huizenga	Moolenaar	Steil
Issa	Mooney	Steube
Jackson	Moore (AL)	Stewart
Jacobs (NY)	Moore (UT)	Stivers
Johnson (LA)	Mullin	Taylor
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (NC)	Tenney
Johnson (SD)	Nehls	Thompson (PA)
Jordan	Newhouse	Tiffany
Joyce (OH)	Norman	Timmons
Joyce (PA)	Nunes	Turner
Katko	Oberholte	Upton
Keller	Owens	Valadao
Kelly (MS)	Palazzo	Palmer
Kelly (PA)	Palmer	Pence
Kim (CA)	Pence	Perry
Perry	Pfleger	Pfleger
Kustoff	LaHood	Posey
LaMalfa	LaMalfa	Reed
Lamborn	Lamborn	Reschenthaler
Latta	Latta	Rice (SC)
LaTurner	LaTurner	Rodgers (WA)
Lesko	Lesko	Rogers (AL)
Long	Long	Rogers (KY)
Loudermilk	Loudermilk	Rose
Lucas	Lucas	Rosendale
Luetkemeyer	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer
Mace	Mace	Roy
Malliotakis	Malliotakis	Rutherford
Mann	Mann	Salazar

NAYS—219

Adams	Demings	Kuster
Aguiar	DeSaulnier	Lamb
Allred	Deutch	Langevin
Auchincloss	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Axne	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Barragán	Doyle, Michael F.	Lawrence
Bass	Escobar	Lawson (FL)
Beatty	Eshoo	Lee (CA)
Bera	Espallat	Lee (NV)
Beyer	Evans	Leger Fernandez
Bishop (GA)	Fletcher	Levin (CA)
Blumenauer	Foster	Levin (MI)
Blunt Rochester	Frankel, Lois	Lieu
Bonamici	Fudge	Lofgren
Bourdeaux	Gallego	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan F.	Garamendi	Luria
Brown	Garcia (IL)	Lynch
Brownley	Garcia (TX)	Malinowski
Bush	Golden	Maloney,
Bustos	Gomez	Carolyn B.
Butterfield	Gonzalez,	Maloney, Sean
Carbajal	Vicente	Manning
Cárdenas	Gottheimer	Matsui
Carson	Green, Al (TX)	McBath
Cartwright	Grijalva	McCollum
Case	Haaland	McEachin
Casten	Harder (CA)	McGovern
Castor (FL)	Hastings	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Hayes	Meeks
Chu	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Cicilline	Himes	Mfume
Clark (MA)	Horsford	Moore (WI)
Clarke (NY)	Houlahan	Morelle
Cleaver	Hoyer	Moulton
Clyburn	Huffman	Mrvan
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)
Cannolly	Jacobs (CA)	Nadler
Cooper	Jayapal	Napolitano
Correa	Jeffries	Neal
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Neguse
Courtney	Johnson (TX)	Newman
Craig	Jones	Norcross
Crist	Kahele	O’Halleran
Crow	Kaptur	Ocasio-Cortez
Cuellar	Keating	Omar
Davids (KS)	Kelly (IL)	Pallone
Davis, Danny K.	Khanna	Panetta
Dean	Kildee	Pappas
DeFazio	Kilmer	Pascrell
DeGette	Kim (NJ)	Payne
DeLauro	Kind	Perlmutter
DelBene	Kirkpatrick	Peters
Delgado	Krishnamoorthi	Phillips
		Pingree

Pocan	Scott (VA)	Tonko	Clyburn	Kaptur	Phillips	Johnson (OH)	Moolenaar	Smith (NJ)
Porter	Scott, David	Torres (CA)	Cohen	Keating	Pingree	Johnson (SD)	Mooney	Smucker
Pressley	Sewell	Torres (NY)	Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Jordan	Jordan	Moore (AL)	Spartz
Price (NC)	Sherman	Trahan	Cooper	Khanna	Joyce (OH)	Joyce (OH)	Moore (UT)	Stauber
Quigley	Sherrill	Trone	Kildeer	Kildee	Joyce (PA)	Mullin	Mullin	Steel
Raskin	Sires	Underwood	Costa	Kilmer	Price (NC)	Katko	Murphy (NC)	Stefanik
Rice (NY)	Slotkin	Vargas	Courtney	Kim (NJ)	Quigley	Keller	Nehls	Steil
Ross	Smith (WA)	Veasey	Craig	Kind	Raskin	Kelly (MS)	Newhouse	Steube
Roybal-Allard	Soto	Vela	Crist	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Norman	Stewart
Ruiz	Spanberger	Velázquez	Crow	Krishnamoorthi	Ross	Kim (CA)	Nunes	Stivers
Ruppersberger	Speier	Wasserman	Cuellar	Kuster	Roybal-Allard	Kinzinger	Obenrolte	Taylor
Rush	Stanton	Schultz	Dauids (KS)	Lamb	Ruiz	Kustoff	Owens	Tenney
Ryan	Stevens	Waters	Davis, Danny K.	Langevin	Ruppersberger	LaHood	Palazzo	Thompson (MS)
Sánchez	Strickland	Watson Coleman	Dean	Larsen (WA)	Rush	LaMalfa	Palmer	Thompson (PA)
Sarbanes	Suozzi	Welch	DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ryan	Lamborn	Pence	Tiffany
Scanlon	Swalwell	Wexton	DeGette	Lawrence	Sánchez	Latta	Perry	Timmons
Schakowsky	Takano	Wild	DeLauro	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes	LaTurner	Pfluger	Turner
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Williams (GA)	DelBene	Lee (CA)	Scanlon	Lesko	Posey	Upton
Schneider	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)	Delgado	Lee (NV)	Schakowsky	Long	Reed	Valadao
Schrader	Titus	Yarmuth	Demings	Leger Fernandez	Schiff	Loudermilk	Reschenthaler	Van Drew
Schrier	Tlaib		DeSaulnier	Levin (CA)	Schneider	Lucas	Rice (SC)	Van Dуйne
			Deutch	Levin (MI)	Schrader	Luetkemeyer	Rodgers (WA)	Wagner
			Dingell	Lieu	Schrier	Mace	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
			Doggett	Lofgren	Scott (VA)	Malliotakis	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
			Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Scott, David	Mann	Rose	Waltz
			F.	Luria	Sewell	Massie	Rosendale	Weber (TX)
			Escobar	Lynch	Sherman	Mast	Rouzer	Webster (FL)
			Eshoo	Malinowski	Sherrill	McCarthy	Roy	Westerman
			Españalat	Maloney,	Sires	McCauley	Rutherford	Westerman
			Evans	Carolyn B.	Maloney, Sean	McClain	Salazar	Westerman
			Fletcher	Maloney, Sean	Manning	McClintock	Calise	Williams (TX)
			Foster	Matsui	Frankel, Lois	McHenry	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
			Frankel, Lois	McBath	Fudge	McKinley	Scott, Austin	Wittman
			Fudge	McCollum	Gallego	Speier	Sessions	Womack
			Gallego	McEachin	Garamendi	Stanton	Simpson	Young
			Garamendi	McGovern	García (IL)	Stevens	Miller (WV)	Young
			García (IL)	McNerney	García (TX)	Strickland	Miller-Meeks	Zeldin
			García (TX)	Golden	Gomez	Suozzi		
			Gomez	Meng	Gonzalez,	Swalwell		
			Gonzalez,	Mfume	Vicente	Takano		
			Vicente	Moore (WI)	Gottheimer	Thompson (CA)		
			Gottheimer	Morelle	Green, Al (TX)	Titus		
			Green, Al (TX)	Moulton	Grijalva	Tlaib		
			Grijalva	Mrvan	Haaland	Tonko		
			Haaland	Murphy (FL)	Harder (CA)	Torres (CA)		
			Harder (CA)	Nadler	Hastings	Torres (NY)		
			Hastings	Napolitano	Hayes	Trahan		
			Hayes	Neal	Higgins (NY)	Trone		
			Higgins (NY)	Neguse	Himes	Underwood		
			Himes	Newman	Horsford	Vargas		
			Horsford	Norcross	Houlihan	Veasey		
			Houlihan	O'Halleran	Hoyer	Vela		
			Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez	Huffman	Velázquez		
			Huffman	Omar	Jackson Lee	Wasserman		
			Jackson Lee	Pallone	Jacobs (CA)	Schultz		
			Jacobs (CA)	Panetta	Jayapal	Waters		
			Jayapal	Pappas	Jeffries	Watson Coleman		
			Jeffries	Pascrell	Johnson (GA)	Welch		
			Johnson (GA)	Payne	Johnson (TX)	Wexton		
			Johnson (TX)	Pelosi	Jones	Wild		
			Jones	Perlmutter	Kahele	Williams (GA)		
			Kahele	Peters		Wilson (FL)		
						Yarmuth		

NOT VOTING—2

Bergman Bowman

□ 2218

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mrs. TRAHAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FORTENBERRY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Kelly (PA))	Kelly (IL)	Moulton (McGovern)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Napolitano (Correa)
Buchanan (LaHood)	Krishnamoorthi (Brown)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Langevin (Lynch)	Payne (Wasserman)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Larson (CT)	Schultz (Courtney)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard (Evans)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Lee (NV)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Gaetz (McHenry)	(Kuster)	Rush (Underwood)
Grijalva (García (IL))	Lieu (Beyer)	Speier (Scanlon)
Hastings (Wasserman)	Meng (Clark)	Vargas (Correa)
Schultz (Schultz)	(MA)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Huffman (McNerney)	Moore (WI)	Wilson (FL)
	(Beyer)	(Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 210, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—220

Adams	Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas
Aguilar	Bonamici	Carson
Allred	Bourdeaux	Cartwright
Auchincloss	Bowman	Case
Axne	Boyle, Brendan	Casten
Barragán	F.	Castor (FL)
Bass	Brown	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brownley	Chu
Bera	Bush	Cicilline
Beyer	Bustos	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Carbajal	Cleaver

Doyle, Michael	F.	Escobar
F.	Eshoo	Españalat
Evans	Carolyn B.	Fletcher
Fletcher	Maloney, Sean	Foster
Foster	Manning	Frankel, Lois
Frankel, Lois	Matsui	Fudge
Fudge	McBath	Gallego
Gallego	McCollum	Garamendi
Garamendi	McEachin	García (IL)
García (IL)	McGovern	García (TX)
García (TX)	McNerney	Golden
Golden	Meeks	Gomez
Gomez	Meng	Gonzalez,
Gonzalez,	Mfume	Vicente
Vicente	Moore (WI)	Gottheimer
Gottheimer	Morelle	Green, Al (TX)
Green, Al (TX)	Moulton	Grijalva
Grijalva	Mrvan	Haaland
Haaland	Murphy (FL)	Harder (CA)
Harder (CA)	Nadler	Hastings
Hastings	Napolitano	Hayes
Hayes	Neal	Higgins (NY)
Higgins (NY)	Neguse	Himes
Himes	Newman	Horsford
Horsford	Norcross	Houlihan
Houlihan	O'Halleran	Hoyer
Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez	Huffman
Huffman	Omar	Jackson Lee
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (CA)	Panetta	Jayapal
Jayapal	Pappas	Jeffries
Jeffries	Pascrell	Johnson (GA)
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Johnson (TX)
Johnson (TX)	Pelosi	Jones
Jones	Perlmutter	Kahele
Kahele	Peters	

NAYS—210

Aderholt	Cline	Gimenez
Allen	Cloud	Gohmert
Amodei	Clyde	Gonzales, Tony
Armstrong	Cole	Gonzalez (OH)
Arrington	Comer	Good (VA)
Babin	Crawford	Gooden (TX)
Bacon	Crenshaw	Gosar
Baird	Curtis	Granger
Balderson	Davidson	Graves (LA)
Banks	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Barr	DesJarlais	Green (TN)
Bentz	Diaz-Balart	Greene (GA)
Bice (OK)	Donalds	Griffith
Biggs	Duncan	Grothman
Bilirakis	Dunn	Guest
Bishop (NC)	Emmer	Guthrie
Boebert	Estes	Hagedorn
Bost	Fallon	Harris
Brady	Feenstra	Harshbarger
Brooks	Ferguson	Hartzler
Buchanan	Fischbach	Hern
Buck	Fitzgerald	Herrrell
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Herrera Beutler
Budd	Fleischmann	Hice (GA)
Burchett	Fortenberry	Higgins (LA)
Burgess	Fox	Hill
Calvert	Franklin, C.	Hinson
Cammack	Scott	Hollingsworth
Carl	Fulcher	Hudson
Carter (GA)	Gaetz	Huizenga
Carter (TX)	Gallagher	Issa
Cawthorn	Garbarino	Jackson
Chabot	García (CA)	Jacobs (NY)
Cheney	Gibbs	Johnson (LA)

NOT VOTING—2

Bergman Miller (IL)

□ 2302

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Kelly (PA))	Kelly (IL)	Moulton (McGovern)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Napolitano (Correa)
Buchanan (LaHood)	Krishnamoorthi (Brown)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Langevin (Lynch)	Payne (Wasserman)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Larson (CT)	Schultz (Courtney)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard (Evans)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Lee (NV)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Gaetz (McHenry)	(Kuster)	Rush (Underwood)
Grijalva (García (IL))	Lieu (Beyer)	Speier (Scanlon)
Hastings (Wasserman)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Vargas (Correa)
Schultz (Schultz)	Meng (Clark)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Huffman (McNerney)	Moore (WI)	Wilson (FL)
	(Beyer)	(Hayes)

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1, FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 1, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

CONTRACT FOR USPS FLEET VEHICLES

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise with great concern regarding the recently announced contract between the United States Post Office and Oshkosh Defense for the construction of 165,000 postal vehicles over the next decade, all new.

There is no doubt our postal fleet is aging. The Grumman LLV, in service since 1994, is gas powered and lacks basic safety equipment like airbags or air conditioning.

Unfortunately, this contract lacks any commitment to make these vehicles new age, either electric, hybrid, or advanced biofuels.

While new vehicles are said to be capable of incorporating an electric drivetrain, Postmaster General Louis DeJoy, who has been a disaster for the Postal Service, recently indicated only 10 percent of the new fleet will be electric. Ten percent? That makes no sense and flies in the face of the Biden administration's recent order to electrify the Federal fleet.

DeJoy's failed tenure calls into question the awarding of this contract.

As such, the administration and the Postal Service must delay the contract until a review is conducted to determine that there was not inappropriate political influence in the process and that the proposed contract is consistent with Biden's Executive Order on tackling the climate crisis.

This contract is a multi-billion-dollar opportunity to reimagine the Federal fleet and develop this critical domestic supply chain. We can't fumble this opportunity.

□ 2310

HONORING CENTENNIAL OF THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

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

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of the centennial of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

The following is the resolution this body passed 100 years ago tomorrow, H.J. Res. 426.

“Providing for the bringing to the United States of the body of an unknown American, who was a member of the American Expeditionary Forces, who served in Europe and lost his life during the World War, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies.

“Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, under regulations to be prescribed by him, to cause to be brought to the United States the body of an American, who

was a member of the American Expeditionary Forces who served in Europe, who lost his life during the World War and whose identity has not been established, for burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Virginia.

“Such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of War.”

Madam Speaker, they will not be forgotten.

DELIVERING RELIEF TO COMMUNITIES AND ESSENTIAL WORKERS

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

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, I am honored to have been able to vote “yes” last week for the American Rescue Plan Act and join my House colleagues in sending this critically important legislation to the Senate.

It is past time that we enact bold relief that delivers critical resources to individuals, families, and communities throughout our Nation so that we can get back to work and past this health crisis.

I am pleased that this legislation includes vital health care provisions to support community vaccination sites, scale up testing and tracing, and address care disparities.

Further, this legislation includes significant resources to assist schools in reopening. We must continue to do all we can to support our intrepid teachers and the critical work that they are doing in this challenging time to engage students and prepare them with the life skills they need for their career endeavors.

Madam Speaker, the momentum is on our side to defeat this virus. I encourage my Senate colleagues to take the next step in approving this legislation as soon as possible so that we can provide all of our communities and our valiant essential workers with the resources they need.

CELEBRATING HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK CENTENNIAL

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Hot Springs National Park.

Nearly 5,500 acres of forested hills settle just above historic downtown Hot Springs, Arkansas, protecting 47 thermal water springs. Hot Springs National Park attracts millions of tourists each year with its rich multigenerational legacy of preserving history and conserving natural resources for public health, wellness, and enjoyment.

First named Hot Springs Reservation in 1832, the land was one of the first federally protected parcels of land in

the country. Its official National Park designation on March 4, 1921, led to the park quickly becoming a source of national intrigue. Bathhouse Row drew millions of people seeking health remedies in the thermal spring waters. Many of these bathhouses still stand today, offering visitors a glimpse into local history, art, and culture.

I take this time to honor the National Park Service's century of caretaking of one of Arkansas' most valuable natural treasures. I look forward to the next 100 years, and I invite the world to come to experience my home, beautiful Hot Springs National Park, Arkansas.

FIXING AN ALREADY SECURE ELECTION

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, my Democrat colleagues say that the 2020 election was the least corrupt and most secure in our Nation's history. But if that is true, Madam Speaker, then why are they pushing an 800-page bill to fix it?

ONE DOSE OF THE PFIZER VACCINE

(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, thanks to Operation Warp Speed, we now have a pathway out of the pandemic using anti-COVID vaccines, but I want to share some more good news.

A new study published in the New England Journal of Medicine shows that just one dose of the Pfizer vaccine has an efficacy of close to 93 percent. The clinical difference between 92 percent and 95 percent of the two-dose regimen is minuscule.

If we gave everyone, except possibly the most vulnerable, just the first dose, we could possibly double our supply immediately and thus inoculate our citizens much faster. Using this strategy, we could possibly prevent the spread of new variants and mutants and effect a quicker end to this tragic pandemic, which has already cost hundreds of thousands of lives in this country.

Yesterday, I joined some of my fellow physician colleagues, asking the Health and Human Services Department to consider adopting this strategy.

Acting now could prevent the spread of new variants and the further spread of this tragedy, the kind of tragedy already felt and continuing to be felt by thousands across this country.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge the Health Secretary to follow the science.

RECOGNIZING VENANGO MUSEUM OF ART, SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY

(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 the Venango Museum of Art, Science and Industry in Oil City, Pennsylvania.

The museum plays a big role in maintaining the culture and history of the region with educational programming and rotating exhibits.

Recently, the executive director of the museum, Betsy Kellner, reached out to my office to let us know of an exciting project the museum was able to complete thanks to funding provided by the Pennsylvania Humanities Council and the National Endowment for the Humanities through the CARES Act.

The museum is the proud owner of a 1928 Wurlitzer pipe organ, which was previously held in the historic Latonia Theater in Oil City. The museum was able to refurbish the organ, a feat that took thousands of volunteer hours and more than 600 different pipes.

After the organ was successfully refurbished, the Venango Museum of Art, Science and Industry hosted a virtual concert for residents to enjoy. The concert can also be viewed online at venangomuseum.org.

I would like to thank Betsy and the museum team for providing this enriching cultural experience for the residents of Venango County during the pandemic.

RESPECT DR. SEUSS BY FORGETTING CANCEL CULTURE

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

Mr. MOONEY. Madam Speaker, let's not attempt to steal knowledge of our Nation's history from our children, like the Grinch attempted to steal Christmas.

I rise to honor the legendary Dr. Seuss for Read Across America Day. Yesterday would also have been his 117th birthday.

Before he became a world-famous writer, Seuss attended Dartmouth College, my alma mater. He was also a member of the New Hampshire Alpha Chapter of the fraternity Sigma Phi Epsilon, of which I was also a member. We used to love showing Theodore Geisel's class photo on the wall to visitors.

But in the spirit of cancel culture, publishers have discontinued six of his books. Dr. Seuss was known as a progressive for his time. His famous story "The Lorax" was about protecting the environment.

My favorite, "Marvin K. Mooney Will You Please Go Now!" my 6-year-old daughter thinks was written just for

her. Children grow up dreaming about "Oh, the Places You'll Go!" a Dr. Seuss book with the lessons we find throughout our life's journey.

Madam Speaker, we should all respect and honor Dr. Seuss and forget this cancel culture nonsense.

□ 2320

TRANSFORMING SCHEDULE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, there needs to be comment about the way the schedule was totally transformed, once again.

What drove this change?

We were supposed to be debating the George Floyd bill tomorrow. George Floyd deserves a better bill than he got, a bipartisan bill that we would certainly be willing to work with the Democrats on, but they didn't want our help. We rushed through and did it tonight.

We asked: What was the reason for the dramatic change? Is somebody ashamed of what we are bringing and they want to do it late at night?

We were told: No. There is concern from somebody that the QAnon-announced inauguration will be tomorrow, so we need to get out of town.

Apparently, there is somebody that believes it. I don't know anybody on our side, but perhaps the Speaker and the majority leader are the believers in QAnon. Nobody else here that I know of.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MANNING) at 12 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a)(1)(B) of House Resolution 8, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 8, 2021, at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-515. A letter from the Deputy Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments received February 2, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-516. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Certain Subordinate Organizations of State Savings Associations (RIN: 3064-AF37) 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 Financial Services.

EC-517. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Application Processing Procedures of State Savings Associations and Conforming Amendments to Other Regulations (RIN: 3064-AF36) 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 Financial Services.

EC-518. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Removal of Transferred Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS) Regulations Regarding Nondiscrimination Requirements (RIN: 3064-AF35) 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 Financial Services.

EC-519. A letter from the Associate Legal Counsel, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures (RIN: 3046-AB19) received February 17, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-520. A letter from the Legal Counsel, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's significant subregulatory guidance — Compliance Manual on Religious Discrimination (RIN: 3046-ZA01) received February 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-521. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Schedule of Application Fees Set Forth in Sections 1.1102 through 1.1109 of the Commission's Rules [MD Docket No.: 20-270] received February 4, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-522. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rules Governing the Use of Distributed Transmission System Technologies [MB Docket No.: 20-74]; Authorizing Permissive Use of the "Next Generation" Broadcast Television Standard [GN Docket No.: 16-142] received February 4, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-523. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory

Commission, transmitting the Commission's final evaluation of vendor submittal — Endorsement of Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) Technical Report (TR) 3002019436 "Remote Source Verification During a Pandemic or Similar State of Emergency: Screening Criteria and Process Guidance" received February 22, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-524. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0584; Product Identifier 2020-NM-069-AD; Amendment 39-21349; AD 2020-25-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-525. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2016-3343; Product Identifier 2015-SW-078-AD; Amendment 39-21353; AD 2020-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-526. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Yaborá Indústria Aeronáutica S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Embraer S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1122; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-00972-T; Amendment 39-21357; AD 2020-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-527. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Cessna Aircraft Company) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1108; Project Identifier AD-2020-01397-T; Amendment 39-21360; AD 2020-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-528. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Régional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1133; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01515-T; Amendment 39-21372; AD 2020-26-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-529. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1032; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-00856-E; Amendment 39-21338; AD 2020-24-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-530. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1121; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01546-T; Amendment 39-21356; AD 2020-26-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-531. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0572; Project Identifier 2017-SW-056-AD; Amendment 39-21358; AD 2020-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-532. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aerostar Aircraft Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0574; Project Identifier 2019-CE-015-AD; Amendment 39-21340; AD 2020-24-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-533. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0689; Project Identifier 2020-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-21359; AD 2020-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-534. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0592; Project Identifier AD-2020-00251-E; Amendment 39-21352; AD 2020-25-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-535. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0425; Project Identifier 2016-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-21346; AD 2020-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-536. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1031; Project Identifier AD-2020-00846-T; Amendment 39-21334; AD 2020-24-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-537. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket

No.: FAA-2020-0778; Product Identifier 2020-NM-097-AD; Amendment 39-21362; AD 2020-26-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-538. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0729; Project Identifier AD-2020-00620-E; Amendment 39-21355; AD 2020-25-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-539. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mineola and Kenedy, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0877; Airspace Docket No.: 20-ASW-8] (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.

EC-540. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Marquette, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0880; Airspace Docket No.: 20-AGL-37] (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.

EC-541. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Warroad, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0878; Airspace Docket No.: 20-AGL-35] (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.

EC-542. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31345; Amdt. No.: 556] 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.

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 Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TORRES of

New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAHELE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MANNING, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 6. A bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 1532. A bill to require a review of the effects of FHA mortgage insurance policies, practices, and products on small-dollar mortgage lending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 1533. A bill to extend the deferment of EIDL loans made in response to COVID-19 from 1 year to 2 years; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GUEST, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. HERRELL, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. CLINE, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CLYDE, and Mr. HAGEDORN):

H.R. 1534. A bill to prohibit the President and the Secretary of Health and Human Services from declaring certain emergencies or disasters for the purpose of imposing gun

control; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. GUEST, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MAST, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DUNN, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H.R. 1535. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to limit the exemption from the registration requirements of such Act for persons engaging in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts to activities which do not promote the political agenda of a foreign government, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the disclosures of foreign gifts by institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER (for himself, Mr. RYAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 1536. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include all members of the Armed Forces in the definition of "independent student" for purposes of determining the eligibility of such members for Federal financial assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 1537. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for terms and conditions for nonimmigrant workers performing agricultural labor or services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESCOBAR (for herself, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VELA, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 1538. A bill to amend the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission Act, with respect to preparedness for COVID-19 and other infectious diseases in the border region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AGUILAR (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. LIEU, Mr. PANETTA,

Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. KAHELE, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 1539. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to develop and make available guidance relating to domestic preparedness for and collective response to terrorism regarding active shooter and mass casualty incident response assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. AGUILAR (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. LIEU, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. KAHELE, Ms. MENG, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. SCANLON):

H.R. 1540. 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.

By Mr. AGUILAR (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. LIEU, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. KAHELE, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 1541. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide support to State and local governments in their efforts to counter violent extremist threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. POCAN, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. BOST, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EMMER, Mr. BACON, Mrs. HINSON, and Mrs. FISCHBACH):

H.R. 1542. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to provide grants for deployment of renewable fuel infrastructure, to finalize proposed rules relating to requirements for E15 fuel dispenser labeling and underground storage tank compatibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KELLER, Mr. CARL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. TIF-FANY, Mrs. McCLAIN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. STELL, Mr. BOST, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DUNN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. MANN, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. ROY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1543. A bill to provide authorities to prohibit the provision of services by social media platforms to certain individuals and entities on the Specially Designated Nationals List and senior officials of governments of a state sponsor of terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1544. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Center for Mental Health Services of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, to award grants to facilitate the funding of community-based mental health and substance use disorder services and peer support programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 1545. A bill to ensure that after a declaration of a major disaster affected States, local governments, and Indian tribal governments receive immediate approval for services and assistance provided under section 416 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1546. A bill to amend the Eliminate, Neutralize, and Disrupt Wildlife Trafficking Act of 2016 to direct the Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking to develop recommendations to address wildlife trafficking on the internet and on social media, and to direct the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to develop a strategy to address wildlife trafficking on the internet and on social media, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RYAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1547. A bill to improve the financial literacy of secondary school students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HILL, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. CASE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1548. A bill to establish a pilot program for native plant species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1549. A bill to establish the Advisory Committee on Climate Risk on the Financial Stability Oversight Council; to the Committee on Financial Services.

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

H.R. 1550. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a public awareness campaign with respect to human papillomavirus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER,

Ms. MENG, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of medical nutrition therapy services for individuals with eating disorders under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1552. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 42 Main Street in Slatersville, Rhode Island, as the "Specialist Matthew R. Turcotte Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1553. A bill to provide for further comprehensive research at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke on unruptured intracranial aneurysms; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GALLEGU, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 1554. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for the research and development, production, or deployment of the nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missile and its associated nuclear warhead; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 1555. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue final rules to promote and incentivize the widespread adoption of broadband consumer labels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 1556. A bill to require State and local governments to establish reopening plans as a condition of receiving funding under title VI of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 1557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain credits related to solar energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BASS, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 1558. A bill to reduce child poverty in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 1559. A bill to direct the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to submit a report on

facilitating efficient, timely environmental reviews of nuclear reactors through expanded use of categorical exclusions, environmental assessments, and generic environmental impact statements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DEAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHARKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 1560. A bill to establish a Federal Advisory Council to Support Victims of Gun Violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 1561. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require the Coast Guard to conduct icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes to minimize commercial disruption in the winter months, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 1562. A bill to prohibit the trading of the securities of certain Communist Chinese military companies on a national securities exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Armed Services, Education and Labor, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

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

H.R. 1563. A bill to extend the authorities under the Water Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2016 providing operational flexibility, drought relief, and other benefits to the State of California; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOMEZ (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 1564. 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 Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1565. A bill to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1566. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to require that equitable distribution of assistance include equitable distribution to Indian tribes and tribal organizations and to increase amounts reserved for allotment to Indian tribes and tribal organizations under certain circumstances, and to provide for a Government Accountability Office report on child abuse and neglect in American Indian tribal communities; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1567. A bill to allow certain qualified law enforcement officers and retired law enforcement officers to carry a concealed firearm to protect children in a school zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1568. A bill to amend the Special Drawing Rights Act in order to strengthen congressional oversight with respect to allocations of Special Drawing Rights by the International Monetary Fund, and to prohibit such allocations for perpetrators of genocide and state sponsors of terrorism without congressional authorization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1569. A bill to assist in the conservation of critically endangered species in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. CROW, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MFUME, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. NORTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SOTO, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PA-

NETTA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. PHILLIPS):

H.R. 1570. A bill to encourage greater community accountability of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS of New York:

H.R. 1571. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide non-immigrant status for dairy workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1572. A bill to direct the Federal Election Commission to carry out a voucher pilot program under which individuals may use vouchers to make small dollar contributions to qualified candidates for election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1573. A bill to clarify the rights of all persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any detention facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICCI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1574. A bill to suspend United States security assistance with Honduras until such time as human rights violations by Honduran security forces cease and their perpetrators are brought to justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 1575. A bill to repeal restrictions on the export and import of natural gas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1576. A bill to provide for a coordinated national research program to examine the nature, causes, consequences, and prevention of violence and unintended injury and death relating to gun ownership, use, and trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 1577. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined

by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 1578. A bill to streamline nuclear technology regulatory permitting and licensing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CLOUD, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 1579. A bill to prohibit Members of Congress from purchasing or selling certain investments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1580. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit the use of certain psychological evaluation via telehealth for Medicare coverage of neurostimulation services for the treatment of chronic pain; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COOPER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. DEAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. MENG, Ms. CHU, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JONES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 1581. A bill to support library infrastructure; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1582. A bill to clarify and increase the restrictions on political activities that are applicable to the members of the Postal Service Board of Governors, including the Postmaster General and the Deputy Postmaster General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1583. A bill to fully fund the Prevention and Public Health Fund and reaffirm the importance of prevention in the United States health care system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 1584. A bill to impose a limitation on taxation and fees on transactions by certain securities industry participants, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. LIEU, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SHERRILL, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. CHU, Mr. BEYER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CASE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SABLON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. KUSTER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARSON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LAMB, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1585. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 1586. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a program under which an institution of higher education may elect to cosign Federal student loans made to students attending the institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. WILD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 1587. A bill to provide certain coverage of audiologist services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in

addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 1588. A bill to modernize the hydropower licensing process and to promote next generation hydropower projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSENDALE (for himself and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 1589. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify the exemption for re-hires for loan forgiveness under the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 1590. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to add access to telecommunications and information services in Indian country and areas with high populations of Indian people to the universal service principle relating to access to such services in rural, insular, and high cost areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 1591. A bill to establish the United States Chief Manufacturing Officer in the Executive Office of the President with the responsibility of developing a National Manufacturing Strategy to revitalize the manufacturing sector, spur economic growth, and expand United States competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 1592. A bill to combat forced organ harvesting and trafficking in persons for purposes of the removal of organs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 1593. A bill to provide for automatic acquisition of United States citizenship for certain internationally adopted individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 1594. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to exclude certain evictions and information relating to such evictions from consumer reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. JACKSON):

H.R. 1595. A bill to require the continuation in effect of export controls with respect to Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

H.R. 1596. A bill to establish the Commission to Study the Stigmatization, Criminalization, and Ongoing Exclusion and Inequity for LGBTQ Servicemembers and Veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. TITUS (for herself, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 1597. A bill to provide for conservation and economic development in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to condition eligibility for grants under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1599. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to secure the supply of critical energy resources, including critical minerals and other materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1600. A bill to reduce methane emissions from flaring and venting natural gas during oil and natural gas production activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 1601. A bill to increase the exempt amount applicable for the retirement earnings test for months in 2020 and 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOEBERT (for herself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. PERRY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CARL, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. LOUDERMILK):

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that retired Lieutenant General Russel Honoré, United States Army, should immediately be relieved of his interim investigative role into the events of January 6, 2021; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H. Res. 185. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 3, 2021, as National Triple-Negative Breast Cancer Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FALLON, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. ROY, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H. Res. 186. A resolution calling for the immediate release of Trevor Reed, a United

States citizen who was unjustly found guilty and sentenced to nine years in a Russian prison; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H. Res. 187. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of "World Hearing Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 6.

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

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 1532.

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

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 1533.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this constitution"

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 1534.

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

The Second Amendment to the Constitution

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 1535.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RESCIENTHALER:

H.R. 1536.

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

Article One Section Eight

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1537.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. ESCOBAR:

H.R. 1538.

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

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18) THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS, CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 1539.

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

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 1540.

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

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 1541.

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

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 1542.

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

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

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1543.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 1544.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 1545.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1546.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1547.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1548.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 1549.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 1550.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 1551.

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

Clause 1 Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 1552.

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

Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 1553.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1554.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 1555.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 1556.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: which gives Congress the authority, " . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: " . . . to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers . . ."

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 1557.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1558.

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

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 1559.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 1560.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of U.S. Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 1561.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 1562.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GARCIA of California:

H.R. 1563.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GOMEZ:

H.R. 1564.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 1565.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 & Clause 18

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1566.

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

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1567.

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

Clauses 3 and 18 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution. Article I, Section 8, clause 3, the Interstate Commerce Clause, gives Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes. Article I, Section 8, clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause, gives Congress the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 1568.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1569.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 1570.

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

Amendment 4 and Amendment 14, Section 5 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JACOBS of New York:

H.R. 1571.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4: "The Congress shall have the power . . . To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;"

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1572.

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

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

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1573.

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

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1574.

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

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 1575.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1576.

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

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

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1577.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 1578.

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

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3 (Commerce Clause); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause).

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 1579.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1580.

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

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

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 1581.

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

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1582.

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

Article I, Section I, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1583.

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

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

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1584.

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

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

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

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 1585.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1586.

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

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 1587.

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

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:

H.R. 1588.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 1589.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 1590.

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

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1591.

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

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1592.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 1593.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 1594.

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

U.S.C. Article I, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1595.

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

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads; To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

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

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1596.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1597.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 1598.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

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

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1599.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1600.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 1601.

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

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 8: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CORREA, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ALLRED, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 18: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 38: Mr. LATURNER.

H.R. 55: Mr. MFUME, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 160: Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 164: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 174: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 255: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 256: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BUSH, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 288: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 305: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 347: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 403: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 410: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 457: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 463: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 471: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 475: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 485: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 492: Mr. DELGADO and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 498: Mr. FEENSTRA and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 508: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 525: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 554: Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 564: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 586: Ms. WILD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 622: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 677: Mr. BENTZ, Mr. FALLON, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. COMER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 682: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. ROSE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BAIRD, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 695: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 707: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 708: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 729: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 746: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 812: Ms. HERRELL and Ms. VAN DUYN.

H.R. 814: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 824: Mr. JACOBS of New York.

H.R. 835: Ms. JACOBS of California.

H.R. 852: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 869: Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 890: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 909: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 959: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 995: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1013: Mr. KUSTOFF and Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 1017: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1022: Mr. DELGADO and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 1026: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1035: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 1068: Ms. CHU and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1113: Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. BOST, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 1115: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1140: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CRIST, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1145: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1159: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1179: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1193: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. MOONEY, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1195: Mr. CARSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. JONES, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1210: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. BRADY, and Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 1219: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1226: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1272: Mr. TRONE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1275: Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1276: Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. PANETTA,

Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1283: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 1307: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1308: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 1344: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1346: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1347: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 1355: Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1361: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1362: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1378: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. CHU, and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 1379: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1381: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 1384: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROSS, Ms. CHU, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1393: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 1397: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 1406: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1446: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. JONES, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERILL, and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1453: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1454: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1457: Mr. WELCH, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1459: Ms. TLAIB, Ms. WILD, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1467: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1470: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1475: Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 1479: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 1483: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1486: Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 1498: Mr. OWENS and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 1503: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1506: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1511: Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 1520: Mr. GIBBS.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.J. Res. 17: Mr. COHEN.

H.J. Res. 28: Ms. PINGREE.

H. Res. 108: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 116: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H. Res. 118: Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. TIFFANY, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H. Res. 130: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. MEIJER.

H. Res. 137: Mr. SUOZZI.

H. Res. 151: Mr. SOTO, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H. Res. 153: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H. Res. 157: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H. Res. 161: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 162: Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H. Res. 173: Mr. ROSENDALE.

H. Res. 183: Mr. RYAN.