United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 2021 *No. 44*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HONORING SARAH LUMPKIN ON HER RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an amazing public servant. The city clerk of Hinesville, Sarah Lumpkin, is retiring after over three decades of service in local government.

Sarah began her career with the city of Hinesville when she joined the city team as an accounts payable clerk and rose to the rank of assistant city clerk by 1991.

Throughout her career, she accumulated a long list of awards and accomplishments, including being named the first recipient of the Hinesville City Hall Employee of the Year Award in 1994, and being designated Certified Municipal Clerk by the International Institute of Municipal Clerks in 1996.

She took her leadership skills to new heights when she served as president of the Georgia Municipal Clerks and Finance Officers Association of the State of Georgia from 2006 to 2007.

Sarah's guidance and expertise throughout her career paved the way for tremendous growth and success for the city of Hinesville, and I am very grateful for all she accomplished.

I wish her the best of luck as she begins her retirement.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BRITNEE KINARD

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate SD Gunner Fund's Britnee Kinard for receiving the President's Lifetime Achievement Award because of her outstanding service to fellow Americans.

The AmeriCorps President's Lifetime Achievement Award is the highest honor of the President's Volunteer Service Award and it recognizes individuals, families, and groups who achieve a remarkable number of service hours.

In receiving the lifetime achievement award, Britnee is being recognized for her over 4,000 hours of service to ensure the continuation of America's unrivaled commitment to improving countless lives.

Britnee is the founder and president of SD Gunner Fund, which is an incredible organization that assists veterans, exceptional children, and first responders in receiving vital resources, such as service dogs, therapy dogs, emergency assistance, community advocacy and education, and much more.

She was inspired to start the successful SD Gunner Fund when she left her high-profile career in business to become a full-time caregiver to her husband after he suffered life-altering injuries while serving our country in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

I want to thank Britnee for her selfless commitment to service through SD Gunner Fund, and I wish her the best. I am extremely proud to have Britnee here in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

NATIONAL PHARMACIST DAY

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Pharmacist Day, which takes place in January annually to recognize and honor pharmacists across the Nation.

As a pharmacist myself, I thoroughly understand the role each pharmacist plays as an integrated member of the healthcare team. Every day, pharmacists are directly involved in patient care, and pharmacists are the most accessible healthcare professionals in the country. Ninety-five percent of Americans live within 5 miles of a pharmacy.

As we battle COVID–19, pharmacists should be recognized, as they are on the front lines dispensing the vaccine. Because of their work, lives will be saved. They have been vital resources throughout the COVID–19 pandemic, and they will continue to play an active role in combating the virus.

I ask that you join me in recognizing all pharmacists by thanking them for their work.

THANK YOU, JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DEMINGS). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this past Sunday was Bloody Sunday. For some who are not familiar with that terminology, the Congressional Black Caucus did a special tribute last evening. But I think it is also a recognition that elections count, determination counts, conscience counts.

So this morning I want to emphasize Bloody Sunday and what it really meant. It was, in fact, to restore or to initiate or to give Americans the free and equal right to vote. The late John Lewis, our friend, our brother, the conscience of the Congress, may not have known what historical steps he was walking in when he stared down the Alabama State Troopers standing with Hosea Williams and Albert Turner and other foot soldiers, staring them down because voting counts.

I rise to pay tribute to that kind of determination. As we proceed to debate the American rescue package, I want the Members, my friends on the other side of the aisle, to recognize that elections count, that people are looking for us to stare down the devastation of COVID–19, the devastation of poverty, and the devastation of lack of jobs.

They are looking for diversity in terms of vaccinations, reaching out to neighborhoods. They are looking for the child tax credit, the earned income tax credit, and that is because John Lewis stood tall for the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

In fact, after that Bloody Sunday, President Johnson rose to this podium and said: ''I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy. . . . At times, history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week in Selma, Alabama.''

So when we debate, I want us to be reminded that people died for the Voting Rights Act because elections count: people like Jimmie Lee Jackson, who was shot by a State trooper in Marion, Alabama, after a peaceful rally to vote; women like Viola Liuzzo, a Detroit housewife who was driving people back and forth between Montgomery and Selma. She, a mother of 5, was shot to death.

So today I rise to emphasize that Bloody Sunday is not just Bloody Sunday. It is a continuation of the fight for justice and the fight for voting rights. It is what we will do tomorrow. It is the PRO Act. It is the Violence Against Women Act. It is the vote for the American rescue package that does not disallow the fact that all Americans, those impoverished, those who have lost loved ones to COVID–19, those teachers who want to get in the classroom and teach. All of this will be part of the American rescue package.

Thank you, John Lewis, for beginning to tell us what America should be and what America can be. It is because of that kind of strength that we are here today. To John Lewis, we commit to you to pass H.R. 1 in the Senate, to pass the Voting Rights Act enhancement number four, after Shelby, Alabama, destroyed and undermined the very strength of the Voting Rights Act. Because we would not be here today; we would not have the opportunity to have the American rescue package; we would not have the opportunity to have the Violence Against Women Act; we would not have the opportunity to have the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, whose family was here last week when we debated it, if we did not have the right to vote.

So it is my belief today that, as we go into this debate, as we go into the rest of the week, as we vote for the universal background checks and the Charleston, South Carolina, closing the loophole, it is not a frivolous authority or power that we utilize. It is because people were willing to be beaten and to be almost killed, but certainly unbowed, as Shirley Chisholm said, for the precious right to vote.

Bloody Sunday may be one day, March 7, but all the years that I have gone and crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge, chosen to highlight a Confederate segregationist, but we turned that lemon into lemonade. When thousands and thousands and thousands every year marched across that Edmund Pettus Bridge, we weren't marching for segregation, we weren't marching for the violence that was perpetrated against the foot soldiers year after year. We were marching for freedom and the right to vote.

So this right to vote will be exercised on the floor of the House this week. I ask and beg my colleagues to join us in what is good. Join us in the American rescue package. Join us in the PRO Act. Join us in the universal background checks. Join us in closing the Charleston loophole. Join us next week in the Violence Against Women Act. Join us to make America the country of John Robert Lewis, standing for what is good.

Madam Speaker, I know we will do good and get into good trouble.

A QUESTION OF LIFE AND DEATH IN TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise, a proud, liberated Democrat unbought and unbossed.

I rise today to address the question of life and death, the question associated with the Governor of the State of Texas indicating that on tomorrow people may go out into the public and to public venues without a mask. He is leaving it to the public to make decisions associated with life and death. Life and death in Texas because the 7-day average for hospitalizations is 6,000. The number of people that died on last Sunday was 65. Life and death. And he leaves it in the hands of people who may somehow believe that he is risking his life. Not so. Not to the extent that the public will be, those who haven't been vaccinated because on December 22 of last year the Governor was vaccinated.

The Governor has resources. If by chance he should contract the virus, the Governor will have access to the finest medical care in the world. The Governor will get to the hospital expeditiously either by some car that will have some officer driving at a high rate of speed because the road will be cleared for him or he will pursue his needs by way of helicopter. The Governor has resources.

Better example. The former President, who called the virus a hoax, when he contracted the virus, he went to the finest medical center, received the finest medical care, and he survived.

His friend, who attended one of his rallies and 9 days later contracted the virus, died. This is a matter of life and death. The virus has not dissipated. It has not gone away.

So to the people of Texas, I love you, but I say this to you: If you don't have the resources that the Governor has, if you don't have a helicopter, if you don't have access to the best medical care in the world, if you don't have a doctor that will be waiting on you when you get to the hospital, if you have to go to the emergency room—the Governor won't go to the emergency room, he will bypass that.

So if you can bypass the emergency room and you can have the finest medical care in the world, maybe you should consider going into public venues without a mask. But if not, remember, it is a question of life and death, and the life you save may very well be your own.

□ 1015

PANDEMIC HELP AND TESTING FOR CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I am so proud of the wins in the American Rescue Plan, and in particular with what this means for America's children. As a pediatrician, my life's work has been the health and the wellbeing of children.

This pandemic has been particularly hard for children and families. The most important thing we can do to bring relief to our communities is to end the pandemic. This means getting shots into as many arms as possible as quickly as we can. It also means taking steps now to ensure that when children return to the classroom, our schools and our small businesses can stay safe and stay open.

Testing is key to keeping our schools and workplaces safe. And, frankly, we have not used testing in a way that significantly curbs the spread of this disease. Rapid home testing, in particular, is a critical public health tool that we have yet to really deploy. And there is funding in the American rescue package to support more strategic widespread testing.

Rapid tests can give results in about 15 minutes, and they can be done at home. Imagine testing in the morning before brushing your teeth. By the time you are done with breakfast you would have a result. If positive, you would stay home and avoid spreading coronavirus to others. This is how we break the chain of transmission and starve the virus. What we need now is to get these tests evaluated, approved, scaled up and priced such that everyone can use them two to three times a week. Frequent testing means you will catch infections early while people are

still asymptomatic and would otherwise unknowingly be spreading them to others.

The technology is inexpensive and is similar to that used in pregnancy tests. In fact, these tests can be produced in bulk for a dollar or two per test. But we need investment from the Federal Government in doing head-to-head comparisons to determine which tests are the best, and then production and procurement of those best tests on a massive scale.

This is a new virus. Variants have already emerged that make it more contagious. More are sure to come. It will be close to a year before all of our children are vaccinated. Now, frequent rapid testing is a way to identify infected children and staff before they get symptoms and keep them at home so they can't infect others. It can give staff and families confidence that our schools are safe. It can also give an early warning of outbreaks. Now, imagine what this sort of testing could mean for workplaces, for restaurants, and for theaters.

The American Rescue Plan does more than strengthen our vaccines and testing though. It provides critical relief that families need right now.

We are in one of the worst economic downturns this country has ever seen, and the American Rescue Plan provides help where it is most needed, prioritizing children and families.

This plan shores up the child tax credit and provides it up front as a monthly check for up to $300 per child. This is a very big deal. More than 93 percent of children and families will benefit, including the poorest 10 percent, who currently get no benefits because their parents' income is too low to qualify. These are the families who need the help the most. This provision alone will cut the number of children living in poverty in half.

It also shores up SNAP benefits and incorporates my bill to expand WIC, so that children can get good nutrition and enough of it to power their brains and their bodies. It provides cash benefits and enhanced unemployment benefits that will help the hardest-hit families the most, and it gets even more help to families with children.

It expands Medicaid in States that haven't already and makes it easier for people to afford and sign up for health insurance.

And finally, it provides resources to schools so that educators, staff, children, and their families feel confident that they are returning to classrooms safely. And it expands broadband access at home to narrow the digital divide.

The American Rescue Plan is a win for the country. It meets the moment, and it focuses relief on the people and businesses hardest hit by the economic and social fallout from this pandemic. Important to this pediatrician, it helps families and children with bold policy changes we have always needed but that have become even more urgent during this crisis.

UNIONS WILL HELP REBUILD THE MIDDLE CLASS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, later today we will debate the PRO Act, and we will pass the PRO Act to free up American workers to form unions and bargain collectively just because they darn well please without interference from their employer. And when we debate the PRO Act, Madam Speaker, we will get into all the details of the provisions of the PRO Act, which are really incredible, and I am very excited about that.

But right now, I want to talk about what a difference the PRO Act would make, why it would be a game changer for the working people of this country.

First of all, let's talk about productivity. American workers are incredibly productive. In the whole period during and after World War II when Americans were forming unions, thanks to the National Labor Relations Act, and up to a third of private-sector workers were in unions, wages and productivity rose in lockstep. You can't even separate them.

But then in the late seventies when we started deregulating airlines and deregulating trucking, and when Ronald Reagan became President and busted the air traffic controllers union, PATCO, and the union-busting business came up, and union membership started declining, productivity kept zooming up, but workers' compensation was totally flat. Since 1979, productivity has increased 70 percent, but compensation only 12 percent.

What about income inequality? We can go to the next one. For the last 100 years, income inequality has tracked union membership almost exactly. So if you take the share of income taken by the top 10 percent of the workforce, you can see that as union membership grew, income inequality fell.

Look at the difference the National Labor Relations Act itself made. In 1935, union membership shot up. The wages of the top 10 percent shot down as a share of everybody. We got more equal. We achieved the American Dream. And now with 1,000 cuts to union membership, when we are down to 6 percent of private-sector workers being in unions, there has been this incredible divergence, and the wealthy have taken all of the gains, and workers aren't in unions anymore.

And let's look at some specific stuff as we get the next slide up here. Let's start with benefits. Union members have more benefits and better benefits almost across the board. Here are just a couple of examples: 86 percent of union members have access to paid sick leave, as opposed to 72 percent of nonunion workers; and 94 percent of union members have access to healthcare benefits, compared to just two-thirds of nonunion workers.

And it is not on this slide, but more than half of union members have access to defined benefit pensions, real pensions, and only a small fraction of nonunion workers do.

Finally, let's look at wages in the next one. For all workers across the private sector, union members make about $1,150 a week more.

We are here debating, and finally we are passing, $1,400 for poor families one time. Union members earn $1,150 more every week through their own labor because they negotiated for it. That is $7,800 a year more.

And finally, if we look at the next slide—and Rick is doing an awesome job here; I appreciate you—it is especially important for women and workers of color. Look at this: This shows that across all categories of American workers, White, Black, and Latinx men and women workers make more. Women make $11,752 a year more if they are union members than if they are not. African-American workers make $10,088 a year more if they are union members. And Latinx workers make almost $14,000 a year more, $13,936.

Madam Speaker, any way you slice it, when we give workers the power to form unions at their workplace, they lift themselves up, they lift up their families, they lift up all the nonunion workers around them because the nonunion employers have to raise wages to keep up with the unionized workers, and they lift up our country.

Let's pass the PRO Act and rebuild the middle class of this country.

GUN CONTROL BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition of gun control bills.

I rise today in support of our Second Amendment, the greatest freedom that we have as Americans, and a right that people all over the world wish that they had.

The Second Amendment reads: ''A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.''

H.R. 8 and H.R. 1446, both gun control bills, infringe on the people's right to keep and bear arms. We must stand up and stop the constant flow of gun control bills that constantly come out of this House. The American people have these freedoms for a very good purpose.

You see, the right to defend oneself is something that should never require us to be on a list. It should never require us to pay a tax. It should never require us to wait to be able to purchase a firearm to defend ourselves. It should never require rules or shame or condemnation from another American.

Right now, we are in a time where people are being shamed just for being a gun owner. Our government is constantly pursuing legal gun owners and making them out to be the bad guy.

Take, for example, in Atlanta, Georgia, my home State, just this past weekend at the NBA All-Star game, there were 13 shootings. These were all illegal shootings. None of those criminals signed up for a background check for their guns. None of those criminals considered that they needed a waiting period before they used their firearm. And none of those criminals cared about any of the laws on the books when they shot people.

Criminals don't care about gun laws. Criminals just don't care. They're going to commit their crime. They are going to murder someone, whether they have a legal gun, an illegal gun, a knife, a hammer, you name it. They are criminals. They break the law.

H.R. 8 requires a background check on gun owners. Everyone knows that for a background check, you have to submit all your information to get that background check done. It is actually nothing but a national gun registry list. And everyone knows that a registry list leads to gun confiscation later on. This is what gun owners know. This is what gun owners fear of a government that may become too tyrannical, which I would like to remind you is the whole reason why we have the Second Amendment in the first place. It is because our brave men and women who founded our country fought against a tyrannical government that was coming to take away their guns.

This is not what we want in America. We never want a war on our land, but we also don't want a government that becomes too controlling and overbearing and takes away the rights of gun owners.

□ 1030

You see, gun rights are American rights, and gun rights are women's rights. Yesterday was International Women's Day. It is a wonderful thing to be an American woman. We are the freest women in the world. For us to be able to have the right to own a firearm and protect ourselves when someone is trying to hurt us is a great right.

Madam Speaker, there is a woman named Carol Bowne, who was stabbed to death outside of her New Jersey home by her ex-boyfriend. Carol knew her best chance of defending herself from a violent ex-boyfriend was a gun, not a piece of paper, not a 911 call. She knew her ex-boyfriend was violent and wanted to kill her, so she went to buy a gun.

But you know what? It was a background check, the rules of the State, the oppressive gun rules of that State, that led to her being stabbed to death because it delayed her ability to buy a gun and defend herself from an ex-boyfriend that was out of his mind.

Carol Bowne had a restraining order. She was following the law against her boyfriend, so she had a restraining order. She had reported him to the police, but he still came to her house and killed her in the driveway. She was waiting for her approval of her gun permit—literally, what we are talking about with H.R. 8, background checks, and H.R. 1446, a 20-day waiting period.

She was following the law, and she still got stabbed to death and murdered by her ex-boyfriend. You see, she had gone to the township police department 2 days before her death to check on the status of her languishing application.

Another indication of her fear of her out-of-his-mind ex-boyfriend, she had installed surveillance cameras around her home. Guess what? Those cameras recorded——

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

HONORING RAMON ANIBAL RAMOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and work of a great New Yorker, a great Dominican-American, Ramon Anibal Ramos, who was born in San Pedro de Macoris in Ingenio Angelina.

Over 50 years in radio and TV, that is what he gave our community. He conducted Fiesta de Tele Antillas on channel 47. He would listen to rock and roll as a young man, at an early age.

He began La Voz del Tropico in 1958. He worked at Radio Radio, Onda Musical, Radio Reloj. In 1973, he went to work for Radio Clarin, ''Entre Carrera y Carrera,'' then Colorvision at a program called ''La Alegria del Pais y Fiebre del Sabado,'' and also Super KQ FM98.

He was an advocate for the community, and he worked right in the middle of the pandemic with SOMOS, a group of community-based physicians in the community of northern Manhattan.

Madam Speaker, as the newspaper reported flocks of vultures flying over Manhattan in those tough months of February, March, April, during the pandemic, Ramon Anibal Ramos was out there documenting everything that was going on in the city of New York and reporting on what community doctors at SOMOS were doing on behalf of my constituents. He was an advocate for the community. He worked with those doctors.

I want to extend my condolences to his wife and family, and to say that Ramon Anibal Ramos and his show, ''El Show de Ramon Anibal Ramos,'' was truly ''lo mejor del cable.''

Madam Speaker, I bring his name up because we are about to pass a $1.9 trillion rescue package, and I am amazed. I am taken aback. I am surprised how many in this Chamber and in the Senate don't see the importance of this rescue package.

Madam Speaker, as I said earlier, a flock of vultures flew over New York City. Imagine that, the number of dead people, families mourning, people fighting for their lives on ventilators in hospitals across the city, families quarantined, businesses shut down. Some of them will not be able to open again. Some of them are struggling to open right this very moment.

Imagine the heroes, nurses and doctors and police officers and firefighters, community-based physicians, who were out there supporting our community, putting their lives on the line—including Ramon Anibal Ramos, who put his life on the line to help New Yorkers.

Yet, many in this Chamber across the aisle and in the Senate don't see the importance of passing this $1.9 trillion package, which provides $75 billion for increased vaccination. As we see a new variant—by the way, it has been determined by researchers that only one out of the four antibodies available work against this new variant.

In fact, we are not over this pandemic, and we must bring additional dollars for vaccination. We must bring additional help for small businesses: the EIDL Forgiveness Act, additional PPP money, $25 billion for restaurants that have been hurt; $1,400 for families, for individuals, including those children and young people who are in school and college, and dependent parents who may be living with us.

Madam Speaker, the other side of the aisle and some of our Senators fought against the $400 unemployment benefits. They fought over a mere $100. What is $100 in today's cost of living? What can you buy with $100? Yet, they scrabbled and fought over $100 of unemployment benefits. Incredible.

Madam Speaker, this is an important package that will not only save America; it will put us on the right track to recuperate from this horrendous pandemic, which may be the crisis of our generation. We are here to support that package, to open up the schools safer. Let's bring health to the American family.

HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF WILLIAM QUARLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I stand here to honor the life and memory of William Edward Quarles, Jr.

Mr. Quarles was a pillar of the Goochland County, Virginia, community, and he constantly worked to make Goochland stronger. He encouraged his neighbors to get involved in local decisionmaking, and he cared about improving public safety and protecting the families that called Goochland home.

William was a dedicated leader with a heart for public service. He served on the Goochland County Board of Supervisors for 8 years, serving as chairman three times. He served for 6 years on the Goochland Planning Commission, including two times as chairman. He also served on the State EMS Advisory Board and as a representative for the

Virginia Association of Counties. In these roles, he was skilled at finding consensus and preventing divisiveness.

William was also a fierce champion of public education. Throughout his life, he fought to make sure that every child in the Goochland area could access quality education and new opportunities. He was a cofounder of the Goochland Education Foundation, and he was serving on the Goochland County School Board at the time of his death.

William took on each day's new challenges with an unforgettable vigor, a bright smile, and a contagious laugh and enthusiasm. He always remained positive. His enthusiasm was contagious.

People talked about how you couldn't talk to William without him pulling you into some sort of volunteerism, some level of civic engagement, some plan that he was working on. He helped people become their better selves, their more engaged selves, their more community-focused selves.

Madam Speaker, last month, William passed away at the age of 68. He left a community mourning. A bright spot, a bright man, and a man who would bring such kindness to every endeavor, William liked to use a simple acronym, one that his father-in-law had also used. The acronym is SMILE:

S—Seek to understand before being understood;

M—Make the other person feel important;

I—It is not about me;

L—Listen twice as much as you speak;

E—Enthusiastically and quickly admit it when you are wrong.

Madam Speaker, when I began running for Congress, William gave me these lessons, this acronym SMILE. He said: ''Remember this. This is how you best serve people.''

As our Commonwealth and our Nation face new challenges, we would do well to follow William's advice as we seek solutions and work to come together.

Madam Speaker, today, my thoughts are with his wife, Ruth; his sons, William and Christopher; his friends and family; and the greater Goochland community. William was a friend to everyone, and he considered everyone a friend.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RYAN) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Gracious God, we pray You draw near, and remind us once again how good it is to be close to You.

Come alongside our lawmakers today that their walk would fall in step with Your own purpose.

Provide them encouragement when their work and their desire for progress seems frustrated and hopeless.

Guide them with Your counsel when they find themselves inclined to lead on impulse.

And grant them confidence in Your grace plan when they are confounded with uncertainty and hesitation.

Show them the importance of patience when they face intransigence and narrow-mindedness among their colleagues.

And when, on this journey, our hearts become embittered, show us how to love as You have loved us.

Sovereign God, despite our best efforts, we may fail today. But You are the strength of our hearts and our reward forever. In this promise and in Your presence, sustain us in the living of these days.

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 South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

INEQUALITY IS AT HISTORIC HIGHS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the PRO Act. Union membership is at historic lows while inequality is at historic highs. The tremendous income inequality in our country is due, in large part, to antiunion policies that have stripped workers of the freedom to negotiate collectively for higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions.

Strong unions are essential to rebuilding the middle class and improving the lives of millions of Americans.

The PRO Act ensures workers have the freedom to decide for themselves, without retaliation, whether to form a union. It strengthens safeguards to ensure workers can hold free and fair union elections and it imposes penalties on companies and executives that violate workers' collective bargaining rights.

Passing the PRO Act will not only strengthen Rhode Island's workers' ability to join a union, it will help rebuild the middle class and create an economy where everyone can succeed.

I urge all my colleagues to support the PRO Act.

RECOGNIZING PARRY MCCLUER HIGH SCHOOL BOYS INDOOR TRACK AND FIELD TEAM

(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 recognize Parry McCluer High School boys indoor track and field team for once again winning the Virginia Class 1 State championship last week.

This victory marks back-to-back State titles for this incredibly talented squad led by Coach Poluikis.

After the Fighting Blues graduated a number of their starters last year, Poluikis wasn't sure if his team could go the distance.

With only five Blues competing at the State tournament he said: ''I knew we could win, but everything had to go perfect.'' And everything did go perfectly.

Trevor Tomlin swept the 1600 and 3200. Brenden Plogger won the 1000, and Zavery Wallace took the shot put.

Kedryn Chandler contributed points with a second-place finish in the 3200 and a third-place finish in the 1600, while Omar Massenberg added points in the shot put.

When all was said and done, Parry McCluer had come out with a two-point lead over runners-up Altavista.

This win was made all the more impressive by the fact that all of the team's 58 points were scored in just four events.

Congratulations to this Fighting Blues team on a remarkable season. You have earned it.

WHEN UNIONS ARE STRONG AMERICA IS STRONG

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

For more than a decade, I helped lead the Culinary Training Academy of Las Vegas, the largest job training program

in Nevada and one of the largest in the country.

Our work to train and place thousands of Nevadans in good union jobs taught me a lifelong lesson about the power of organized labor to uplift working people.

As a founding member and co-chair of the Congressional Labor Caucus, I am proud to support the PRO Act, which will return power to the hands of workers instead of Wall Street.

The PRO Act will ensure that workers have a seat at the table to advocate for higher wages, fair benefits, and security in employment and retirement.

Passing this legislation will protect the right to organize and provide basic labor protections to millions of workers who are not currently in a union.

Passing the PRO Act means undoing the damage of the Supreme Court's Janus decision, revitalizing the National Labor Relations Board, and rebalancing the scales between corporations and working people.

So I am proud to support the PRO Act because I know that when unions are strong, America is strong. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the PRO Act.

HAPPY 100TH BIRTHDAY TO GERALDINE AMSTUTZ

(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, today I rise to honor Geraldine Amstutz of Rochester, Minnesota, who will celebrate her 100th birthday on March 15.

Geraldine was born on March 15, 1921, in Grabill, Indiana, a small town founded and named after her grandfather.

After graduating high school at the top of her class, Geraldine went on to study music in college.

In 1943, Geraldine married Tillman Amstutz, with whom she would spend the next 63 years raising four children and eventually settling in Rochester.

Geraldine has always loved music, especially playing the piano, but her greatest passions involve people and art. For decades she has made personalized, homemade cards, sending thousands over the years to encourage, lift up, honor, and celebrate others. Approaching her centennial birthday, Geraldine continues making cards to bless others with her kindness and compassion.

Here is to 100 terrific years, Geraldine.

MILLIONS OF AMERICANS WILL BE LIFTED OUT OF POVERTY

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the American Rescue Plan Act, ambitious and urgently needed legislation to end the COVID–19 epidemic and to facilitate our economic recovery.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to provide support to millions of families struggling because of lost work or grieving because they lost a loved one.

And this American Rescue Plan fulfills this responsibility, providing $1,400 relief checks to Americans that are hurting financially.

For the Americans who have lost their job during the pandemic, the bill extends critical unemployment benefits so they can get back on their feet.

For children and families who are approaching 1 year of remote schooling, this bill provides $125 billion to safely reopen our schools and protect teachers and students.

For small businesses that have been hit hard, this legislation could increase funding for the Paycheck Protection Program and other support loans and grants.

For over 25 million Americans who are struggling to put food on the table, this bill increases SNAP benefits so families do not go hungry.

For nearly 10 million Americans who are behind on rent and utilities, this bill provides funds to keep a roof over their head and the lights on.

And I am very pleased that this bill includes funding modeled after my legislation to ramp up and fund the manufacturing and distribution of the COVID–19 vaccine.

STUDENTS MUST GET BACK TO THE CLASSROOM

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, as the father of three school-age boys, the health and well-being of children and school kids across America is one of my top priorities.

As we continue to navigate the COVID pandemic, I have heard repeatedly from parents across the 18th District of Illinois about getting our kids back in the classroom and back on the athletic field.

Throughout this pandemic, we have heard from experts and now President Joe Biden about the importance of trusting the science. When it comes to schools, the science is clear: Students and teachers can go back to in-person learning safely. The CDC is also clear on this. Risk of transmission of COVID–19 in the classroom is extremely low.

Getting back in the classroom won't just help our kids achieve their academic goals, it will also help with their mental and physical health, areas that many students have struggled with during this pandemic.

Hospitals across the country have seen increases in child suicide attempts and mental health admissions. Nothing is zero risk, but the consequences of keeping our children out of the classroom far outweigh the risk.

Our kids are suffering mentally and academically. The science is clear. Let's put our children first and get students back in the classroom as soon as possible.

HELP FOR SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Inland Empire of Southern California, the region that my family has called home for generations.

In my community and around this country people are hurting.

Businesses are struggling to keep their doors open. Families are wondering where their kids' next meal is going to come from, and our healthcare system is being pushed to the brink of failure.

Our communities are hurting, and they are wondering if people they sent to Washington to represent them are going to do anything about it. We need relief, and it can't come soon enough.

The American Rescue Plan represents real, tangible relief for our communities.

This bill will bring more than $600 million into my community of San Bernardino County to help protect first responders, teachers, and other essential workers.

It will give small businesses the access to funding they need to stay open and to put money in people's pockets to help them make ends meet.

It will help crush the virus by expanding vaccine distribution and access.

And it will give our schools the resources they need to safely reopen and put kids in the classroom.

This is a unique moment in American history, and this legislation provides bold solutions that this moment calls for.

AMERICAN DAIRY FARMERS NEED AN URGENT FIX

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

Mr. JACOBS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, the Dairy H–2A Eligibility Act.

As I have traveled around my district and met with dairy farmers, their number one need has consistently been a reliable workforce.

Currently, dairy farms do not have access to the H–2A visa program because their work is not considered seasonal. My very simple one-page piece of legislation would simply make dairy workers eligible for these temporary work visas.

Farming is the largest economic driver in my district, and dairy farming is a critical part of the American economy and food supply.

We need to ensure that farmers have the resources and workforce they need

while enforcing our immigration laws and preventing illegal immigration.

This change would put dairy farmers on equal footing with other H–2A employers and adhere to the same rules and regulations in force today.

As larger reforms to the agriculture workforce are debated, I ask for the consideration of this urgent fix to ensure American dairy farmers can continue to provide for the American families and thrive for generations to come.

LABOR IS THE BACKBONE OF THE AMERICAN MIDDLE CLASS

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021.

The pandemic has made clear that we need to strengthen worker rights and expand union participation.

Across this Nation, frontline and essential workers have had to work in unsafe conditions with insufficient pay because of their inability to negotiate with their employers.

The economic fallout from the pandemic has laid bare the costs of severe income inequality in America, where corporations and the wealthiest individuals are able to thrive at the expense of everybody else.

Labor is the backbone of middle America and the key to addressing income inequality.

Protecting the right to organize and to collectively bargain ensures access to better wages, more robust benefits, and safer working conditions for hardworking Americans.

When workers are able to stand together and demand their fair share, we will all be better off.

I strongly support passage of the PRO Act and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

(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, March is Women's History Month, and I am grateful to recognize inspirational women who have achieved success.

Inspirational women are the University of South Carolina's basketball team, who won a sixth SEC title in 7 years, the first time that has been done in SEC history. Congratulations to these talented women for remaining number one.

This game was also historic because it was the first time two Black head coaches met in a conference championship game with Coach Dawn Staley leading the Gamecocks and Coach Joni Taylor leading Georgia, an important milestone in American sports history.

Best wishes to the Gamecock women in the NCAA tournament.

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 Hatsy Young, widow of former Congressman Ed Young from Florence.

□ 1215

DELIVERING HELP THROUGH AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the American Rescue Plan.

Nearly 1 year ago, the first case of COVID–19 was confirmed in the district that I serve. Now, the virus has infected more than 100,000 people in my district. No family in our region, in our State, throughout our Nation has been left untouched. Our sense of urgency could not be stronger.

The American Rescue Plan is an opportunity to deliver help. My corner of Illinois has thousands of small businesses struggling to keep their doors open, 113,000 kids who have yet to return to the classroom, and 150 towns in the congressional district I serve that need help to keep essential services running.

Mr. Speaker, the bill would provide an estimated $27 million to Rock Island County, $55 million to Winnebago County, $35 million to Peoria County, and more than $85 million to the other 11 counties in between in the congressional district that I serve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support and vote for the American Rescue Plan.

ACT ON SOUTHERN BORDER CRISIS

(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our southern border is in crisis.

President Biden has been dodging the crisis they caused at our southern border, calling it a challenge, not a crisis. They have opened our borders but, at the same time, kept our schools closed.

The Democrat's approach of ''come on in'' has reversed sensible immigration control measures put in place by the previous administration and led to disastrous results.

Compared to pre-inauguration numbers, Customs and Border Protection is encountering five times the number of family units trying to cross the border. We are on pace to have over 100,000 unaccompanied minors cross the border illegally this year, up by 45 percent. Customs and Border Protection is projecting a 20,000-bed shortage for the children in their custody.

Under his rule, asylum seekers are now allowed to come into America to wait. And even if they are COVID-positive, they are released into the country—many of whom will never be seen again.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge President Biden to reverse these disastrous actions and return to sensible immigration policies that were present to stem the tide of illegal immigration.

PROTECTING RIGHTS TO ORGANIZE

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

Mr. KAHELE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

The PRO Act empowers workers to exercise their right to organize and holds employers accountable for violating workers' rights.

In my home State of Hawaii, unions successfully raised the standard of living for thousands of our residents. I am proud to say that Hawaii has the highest union membership rate in the Nation, at 23.7 percent.

We must pass the PRO Act to make sure all workers have a free and fair choice to join a union.

Mr. Speaker, organized labor has opened the doors of opportunity for millions of Americans, to help them buy homes, secure healthcare, educate their children, and enjoy leisure time with family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, as an 11-year card-carrying member of the Air Line Pilots Association, I know firsthand how unions can level the playing field. Unions give us a stronger voice to advocate for higher wages, better benefits, and improved workplace conditions. Unions put the power in the hands of the workers.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will lift up American workers and strengthen America's middle class. I urge my colleagues to support the PRO Act.

HONORING GHOST ARMY VETERANS

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you in support of awarding the Ghost Army veterans with the Congressional Gold Medal.

This is such a great story. In World War II, the Ghost Army had a mission unlike any other. They were recruited in one of the greatest counterintelligence operations of our time, fooling the Nazis with inflatable tanks, mannequins, and decoys.

It is estimated that they saved tens of thousands of American soldiers' lives. Their work was so groundbreaking that it remained classified for more than 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, the Ghost Army and their legacy have never been formally recognized. This bill is long overdue for the soldiers and their families. Of the

1,100 who served, only 11 of them are alive today. Among them, 103-year-old Staff Sergeant Stanley Nance, who lives in my home State of Utah. I have had a chance to get to know him.

He and his fellow soldiers, those few, those 11 who are still alive, and their families, deserve recognition of their service and sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to honor the Ghost Army and award them the Congressional Gold Medal.

BRINGING AMERICA BACK TO NORMAL WITH AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN

(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 to highlight the incredible achievements of the American Rescue Plan, which will put shots in arms, money in pockets, children in schools, and people in jobs.

President Biden's American Rescue Plan will power our efforts to defeat this virus and move America forward. Significantly, experts agree that the American Rescue Plan will cut child poverty in half by expanding the child tax credit and sending $300 per month per child to struggling families on top of the $1,400 check that the American Rescue Plan will put in the pockets of every American.

The American Rescue Plan will give schools the resources they need to safely reopen and stay open. It will enable our businesses to hang on and safely cater to their customers while retaining their employees and planning for a better future.

Job one for this new Congress and the new administration was always to beat back the virus and lift up our Nation. The American Rescue Plan takes direct aim at COVID–19 and charts the course to bring America back to normal.

HONORING REVEREND KEVIN COX

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of our dear friend, Reverend Kevin Cox, as a longtime servant in the ministry.

Reverend Cox started out his journey as a CPA, but the Lord brought him quickly into the blessings of pastoral ministry. From his very first pastorate at First Pentecostal Church in a small town in Florida in 1980, to now retiring after 16 years as Louisiana's district superintendent for the United Pentecostal Church International, Reverend Cox has diligently answered the call of God.

He and his late wife, Delisa, and their two sons, who now have beautiful families of their own, were never afraid to move where the Lord led.

Psalm 37:23 states that ''the steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord: and He delighteth in his way.''

Mr. Speaker, well done to Brother Cox. The Lord surely delights in his way. We are thankful for his years of service to the kingdom, and the blessings he has been to countless many people, including Louisiana's Fourth Congressional District. God bless him in his endeavors throughout retirement.

ACHIEVING HEALTH EQUITY FOR BLACK WOMEN AND GIRLS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the heels of Black History Month, at the beginning of Women's History Month, and 1 year into a pandemic, I rise today to bring attention to an urgent task: achieving health equity for Black women and girls.

Over the past year, we have watched firsthand as centuries-long systemic health and economic disparities have translated into higher rates of coronavirus and fewer resources to fight it in Black communities.

COVID–19 did not create these disparities. It has just made them plain for all to see.

Inequality comes in many forms, but health inequalities are among the most glaring. As it stands, Black women's life expectancy is nearly 3 years less than our White counterparts.

Recently, the Congressional Caucus on Black Women and Girls unveiled our first-ever report on this pressing issue and others facing Black women and girls in our country. More importantly, we have laid out solutions to these problems.

It is incumbent upon Congress to take on these initiatives because we cannot be satisfied until every American, including Black women and girls, can lead a long and healthy life.

Mr. Speaker, to help to accomplish these things, we must pass the American Rescue Plan.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MICHAEL MAGLI

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of my constituent, Deputy Michael Magli of the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office.

On February 17, Michael Magli kissed his wife and children good-bye for the last time as he embarked on what he likely believed to be a routine shift.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, we know now that he would not make it back home that particular night. He put his life on the line to take the hit from a drunk driver and save those down the road who might have been in the pathway of danger.

As Pinellas County Sheriff Paul Gualtieri so movingly put it at his funeral, Michael was at the right place at the right time.

Deputy Magli leaves behind a loving wife, two beautiful children, and the blue family as they struggle to make sense out of unimaginable grief. While Michael's earthly end-of-watch was February 17, 2021, his heavenly watch will endure forever.

STANDING WITH WORKERS BY PASSING PRO ACT

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, the PRO Act.

Just last weekend, I invited a number of our Democratic colleagues to come to my district and stand in solidarity with the Amazon workers in Bessemer, Alabama, who are voting this month on whether to join the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of unions that we have a 5-day workweek. It is because of unions that we have safer working conditions all across America. Congress must do more to protect the basic right to join a union.

If we pass the PRO Act, workers in Bessemer and workers across this country will have stronger collective bargaining rights and more streamlined union election processes. We would also have meaningful enforcement for companies that violate workers' rights.

The workers in my Alabama district deserve a fair election that is free of influence from management.

Mr. Speaker, the Amazon workers in Bessemer, Alabama, are following a rich tradition of ordinary Alabamians, standing up and fighting for civil rights and human rights. I am asking my colleagues to stand with the workers in Bessemer and around this country by passing the PRO Act.

RECOGNIZING IOWA'S STATE WRESTLING CHAMPIONSHIP WINNERS

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of nine young men in my district.

Because schools in Iowa are open for in-person learning, our young men and women are able to participate in sports, and I am able to rise today to honor their recent achievements for winning Iowa's State championship in wrestling.

Dustin Bohren, Bradley Hill, and Griffin Liddle of Bettendorf; Hunter Gavin of Iowa City West; Ben Kueter of City High in Iowa City; Matthew Lewis

of Centerville; Hayden Taylor of Solon; Kobe Simon of West Liberty; and Marcel Lopez of New London each won State championships last month in Des Moines.

Wrestling, we think, in Iowa, we are the center of the universe. When it comes to wrestling, we are, but we do give a nod to a certain Representative from Ohio. Wrestling and Dan Gable are as much a part of Iowa's unique history and culture as corn, first-in-the-Nation caucuses, Casey's Breakfast Pizza, and, of course, CHUCK GRASSLEY.

Before the pandemic, fans would cram into gyms across the State to watch our local teams compete. For the lucky few who made it to the State tournament, thousands would travel from all 99 counties to watch.

These young men and women have marked their place in Iowa history, and I could not be prouder to represent them in Congress.

PROVIDING IMMEDIATE RELIEF TO STRUGGLING AMERICANS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, a year into this pandemic and the world is still reeling. It has created a deep economic crisis for American families and small businesses, and economic disparity continues.

Now that vaccines are being administered, with millions inoculated so far, hope for gaining the upper hand over this disease is on the horizon.

Last weekend, I saw firsthand the smiles on teachers' faces as they lined up for their first dose of the vaccine. Desperate to see their students, they hold out hope that these shots can get them safely back into the classroom for the first time in a year.

Food workers, those who we deem essential to putting food on America's dinner table every night, need to be vaccinated as well. I talked to them about their desire to do their jobs without fear of getting sick, and getting back to a life of normalcy, but we must do more to help Americans.

Our communities are hurting. Families, businesses, cities, and States need economic relief now.

This week, we will pass the American Rescue Plan to get immediate relief to struggling Americans. It provides the resources needed to help people get by and return to work. This bill will help our economy move again, and I am proud to support it.

□ 1230

HONORING THE OUTSTANDING WORK OF KELLY BRITTON AND KATHY CARUSO

(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 outstanding work of Kelly Britton and Kathy Caruso, two residents of New York's 22nd Congressional District.

Kelly and Kathy founded and run Better Together, an advocacy group for children with special needs. As mothers with children with disabilities, Kelly and Kathy mobilized a grassroots group of parents and family members to advocate for children with differing abilities. Today, Better Together is bringing awareness to the many unmet needs that children with differing abilities experience.

I recently joined Better Together for their first advocacy event, an autism awareness and first responder forum. This wonderful collaborative event provided training and guidance to first responders on how to work effectively and compassionately to help patients with autism and other disabilities. It was a pleasure to join Kelly, Kathy, and the Better Together family to discuss their advocacy efforts and priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Kelly and Kathy for giving back to our community in such a meaningful way. They truly are making the world a better place.

A YEAR AGO THE PANDEMIC CHANGED OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, this pandemic changed our country; and during this year, more than 525,000 Americans have died from the virus, including 7,800 Marylanders. Too many jobs have been lost, too many families are struggling, and too many businesses have shuttered.

The American Rescue Plan provides a lifeline for our country. The average family of four in my district will receive approximately $10,000 of direct assistance. With another round of stimulus checks and the expansion of the child tax credit, we will get families back on their feet and cut child poverty in half.

The American Recuse Plan will also aid our communities during this crisis, funding that will expand vaccinations, especially in Black and Brown communities; money to help safely open schools; and assistance to keep teachers, transit workers, and other public servants on the job.

This unprecedented crisis calls on us to meet the moment with decisive action. Mr. Speaker, the American Rescue Plan is that decisive action.

HONORING MAYOR RAWLEY McCOY

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

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor a servant-hearted leader who cared deeply for the Victoria, Texas, community, Mayor Rawley McCoy, who passed away on March 5, 2021.

He will be greatly missed by his family, friends, and those he represented as mayor and those of us who had the honor to serve alongside him. A lifelong Victorian, he described our town as a wholesome community that provided an energetic and joyful childhood.

Long before being elected mayor, he lived and worked to make our community a better place. He was inspired to become mayor and to make Victoria, as he said, the kind of place where future generations can live their American dream. I will miss working with him, as I appreciated his heart to work with and to collaborate in order to serve people.

Mr. Speaker, Rawley once said, ''We can never become a great city until all of us can sit at and are welcome at the table.''

My prayers are with him, his wife, their three children, and all who had the great pleasure of knowing Mayor Rawley McCoy.

RECOGNIZING INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THEIR SAFETY, HEALTH, AND ENVIRONMENTAL APPLIED SCIENCES PROGRAM

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

The University's Safety, Health, and Environmental Applied Sciences program recently received a national recognition. Universities.com ranked the program third in the Nation, giving IUP's program top marks in career preparation, students and culture, facilities, activities, and groups. More than 8,000 colleges and universities were considered in this ranking process.

Believed to be one of the first programs of its kind in the Nation, IUP's Safety, Health, and Environmental Applied Sciences program trains safety professionals in industry, government, and institutional settings. According to the department's chairwoman, Tracy Cekada, the program prepares students for work in a wide range of areas, including manufacturing, oil and gas, insurance, healthcare, construction, distribution, government, transportation, and the service industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have such a stellar academic institution in my district like Indiana University of Pennsylvania, and this top-notch program comes as no surprise.

Congratulations, IUP, for this well-deserved recognition.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2021.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 9, 2021, at 9:49 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1319.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 188, I call up the bill (H.R. 842) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188, the amendment printed in part A of House Report 117–10 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 842

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 ''Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021''.

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

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

(a) JOINT EMPLOYER.—Section 2(2) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 152(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Two or more persons shall be employers with respect to an employee if each such person codetermines or shares control over the employee's essential terms and conditions of employment. In determining whether such control exists, the Board or a court of competent jurisdiction shall consider as relevant direct control and indirect control over such terms and conditions, reserved authority to control such terms and conditions, and control over such terms and conditions exercised by a person in fact: Provided, That nothing herein precludes a finding that indirect or reserved control standing alone can be sufficient given specific facts and circumstances.''.

(b) EMPLOYEE.—Section 2(3) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 152(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''An individual performing any service shall be considered an employee (except as provided in the previous sentence) and not an independent contractor, unless—

''(A) the individual is free from control and direction in connection with the performance of the service, both under the contract for the performance of service and in fact;

''(B) the service is performed outside the usual course of the business of the employer; and

''(C) the individual is customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, profession, or business of the same nature as that involved in the service performed.''.

(c) SUPERVISOR.—Section 2(11) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 152(11)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and for a majority of the individual's worktime'' after ''interest of the employer'';

(2) by striking ''assign,''; and

(3) by striking ''or responsibly to direct them,''.

SEC. 102. REPORTS.

Section 3(c) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Board'' and inserting ''(1) The Board''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Effective January 1, 2023, section 3003 of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (Public Law 166–44; 31 U.S.C. 1113 note) shall not apply with respect to reports required under this subsection.

''(3) Each report issued under this subsection shall—

''(A) include no less detail than reports issued by the Board prior to the termination of such reports under section 3003 of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (Public Law 166–44; 31 U.S.C. 1113 note);

''(B) list each case in which the Designated Agency Ethics Official provided advice regarding whether a Member should be recused from participating in a case or rulemaking; and

''(C) list each case in which the Designated Agency Ethics Official determined that a Member should be recused from participating in a case or rulemaking.''.

SEC. 103. APPOINTMENT.

Section 4(a) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 154(a)) is amended by striking '', or for economic analysis''.

SEC. 104. UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES.

Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting ''; ''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) to promise, threaten, or take any action—

''(A) to permanently replace an employee who participates in a strike as defined by section 501(2) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 142(2));

''(B) to discriminate against an employee who is working or has unconditionally offered to return to work for the employer because the employee supported or participated in such a strike; or

''(C) to lockout, suspend, or otherwise withhold employment from employees in order to influence the position of such employees or the representative of such employees in collective bargaining prior to a strike; and

''(7) to communicate or misrepresent to an employee under section 2(3) that such employee is excluded from the definition of employee under section 2(3).'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (4) and (7);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively;

(C) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking ''affected;'' and inserting ''affected; and''; and

(D) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated, by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '': Provided, That it shall be an unfair labor practice under subsection (a)(1) for any employer to require or coerce an employee to attend or participate in such employer's campaign activities unrelated to the employee's job duties, including activities that are subject to the requirements under section 203(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 433(b)).'';

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively;

(B) by striking ''For the purposes of this section'' and inserting ''(1) For purposes of this section'';

(C) by inserting ''and to maintain current wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment pending an agreement'' after ''arising thereunder'';

(D) by inserting '': Provided, That an employer's duty to collectively bargain shall continue absent decertification of the labor organization following an election conducted pursuant to section 9'' after ''making of a concession:'';

(E) by inserting ''further'' before '', That where there is in effect'';

(F) by striking ''The duties imposed'' and inserting ''(2) The duties imposed'';

(G) by striking ''by paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)'' and inserting ''by subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) of paragraph (1)'';

(H) by striking ''section 8(d)(1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A)'';

(I) by striking ''section 8(d)(3)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(C)'' in each place it appears;

(J) by striking ''section 8(d)(4)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(D)''; and

(K) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) Whenever collective bargaining is for the purpose of establishing an initial collective bargaining agreement following certification or recognition of a labor organization, the following shall apply:

''(A) Not later than 10 days after receiving a written request for collective bargaining from an individual or labor organization that has been newly recognized or certified as a representative as defined in section 9(a), or within such further period as the parties agree upon, the parties shall meet and commence to bargain collectively and shall make every reasonable effort to conclude and sign a collective bargaining agreement.

''(B) If after the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which bargaining is commenced, or such additional period as the parties may agree upon, the parties have failed to reach an agreement, either party may notify

the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service of the existence of a dispute and request mediation. Whenever such a request is received, it shall be the duty of the Service promptly to put itself in communication with the parties and to use its best efforts, by mediation and conciliation, to bring them to agreement.

''(C) If after the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the request for mediation is made under subparagraph (B), or such additional period as the parties may agree upon, the Service is not able to bring the parties to agreement by conciliation, the Service shall refer the dispute to a tripartite arbitration panel established in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Service, with one member selected by the labor organization, one member selected by the employer, and one neutral member mutually agreed to by the parties. The labor organization and employer must each select the members of the tripartite arbitration panel within 14 days of the Service's referral; if the labor organization or employer fail to do so, the Service shall designate any members not selected by the labor organization or the employer. A majority of the tripartite arbitration panel shall render a decision settling the dispute and such decision shall be binding upon the parties for a period of 2 years, unless amended during such period by written consent of the parties. Such decision shall be based on—

''(i) the employer's financial status and prospects;

''(ii) the size and type of the employer's operations and business;

''(iii) the employees' cost of living;

''(iv) the employees' ability to sustain themselves, their families, and their dependents on the wages and benefits they earn from the employer; and

''(v) the wages and benefits other employers in the same business provide their employees.'';

(5) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e) Notwithstanding chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Federal Arbitration Act'), or any other provision of law, it shall be an unfair labor practice under subsection (a)(1) for any employer—

''(1) to enter into or attempt to enforce any agreement, express or implied, whereby prior to a dispute to which the agreement applies, an employee undertakes or promises not to pursue, bring, join, litigate, or support any kind of joint, class, or collective claim arising from or relating to the employment of such employee in any forum that, but for such agreement, is of competent jurisdiction;

''(2) to coerce an employee into undertaking or promising not to pursue, bring, join, litigate, or support any kind of joint, class, or collective claim arising from or relating to the employment of such employee; or

''(3) to retaliate or threaten to retaliate against an employee for refusing to undertake or promise not to pursue, bring, join, litigate, or support any kind of joint, class, or collective claim arising from or relating to the employment of such employee: Provided, That any agreement that violates this subsection or results from a violation of this subsection shall be to such extent unenforceable and void: Provided further, That this subsection shall not apply to any agreement embodied in or expressly permitted by a contract between an employer and a labor organization.'';

(6) in subsection (g), by striking ''clause (B) of the last sentence of section 8(d) of this Act'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(2)(B)''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

''(h)(1) The Board shall promulgate regulations requiring each employer to post and maintain, in conspicuous places where notices to employees and applicants for employment are customarily posted both physically and electronically, a notice setting forth the rights and protections afforded employees under this Act. The Board shall make available to the public the form and text of such notice. The Board shall promulgate regulations requiring employers to notify each new employee of the information contained in the notice described in the preceding two sentences.

''(2) Whenever the Board directs an election under section 9(c) or approves an election agreement, the employer of employees in the bargaining unit shall, not later than 2 business days after the Board directs such election or approves such election agreement, provide a voter list to a labor organization that has petitioned to represent such employees. Such voter list shall include the names of all employees in the bargaining unit and such employees' home addresses, work locations, shifts, job classifications, and, if available to the employer, personal landline and mobile telephone numbers, and work and personal email addresses; the voter list must be provided in a searchable electronic format generally approved by the Board unless the employer certifies that the employer does not possess the capacity to produce the list in the required form. Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021, the Board shall promulgate regulations implementing the requirements of this paragraph.

''(i) The rights of an employee under section 7 include the right to use electronic communication devices and systems (including computers, laptops, tablets, internet access, email, cellular telephones, or other company equipment) of the employer of such employee to engage in activities protected under section 7 if such employer has given such employee access to such devices and systems in the course of the work of such employee, absent a compelling business rationale for denying or limiting such use.''.

SEC. 105. REPRESENTATIVES AND ELECTIONS.

Section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) Whenever a petition shall have been filed, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Board, by an employee or group of employees or any individual or labor organization acting in their behalf alleging that a substantial number of employees (i) wish to be represented for collective bargaining and that their employer declines to recognize their representative as the representative defined in section 9(a), or (ii) assert that the individual or labor organization, which has been certified or is being recognized by their employer as the bargaining representative, is no longer a representative as defined in section 9(a), the Board shall investigate such petition and if it has reasonable cause to believe that a question of representation affecting commerce exists shall provide for an appropriate hearing upon due notice. Such hearing may be conducted by an officer or employee of the regional office, who shall not make any recommendations with respect thereto. If the Board finds upon the record of such hearing that such a question of representation exists, it shall direct an election by secret ballot and shall certify the results thereof. The Board shall find the labor organization's proposed unit to be appropriate if the employees in the proposed unit share a community of interest, and if the employees outside the unit do not share an overwhelming community of interest with employees inside. At the request of the labor organization, the Board shall direct that the election be conducted through certified mail, electronically, at the work location, or at a location other than one owned or controlled by the employer. No employer shall have standing as a party or to intervene in any representation proceeding under this section.'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''an economic strike who are not entitled to reinstatement'' and inserting ''a strike'';

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) If the Board finds that, in an election under paragraph (1), a majority of the valid votes cast in a unit appropriate for purposes of collective bargaining have been cast in favor of representation by the labor organization, the Board shall certify the labor organization as the representative of the employees in such unit and shall issue an order requiring the employer of such employees to collectively bargain with the labor organization in accordance with section 8(d). This order shall be deemed an order under section 10(c) of this Act, without need for a determination of an unfair labor practice.

''(5)(A) If the Board finds that, in an election under paragraph (1), a majority of the valid votes cast in a unit appropriate for purposes of collective bargaining have not been cast in favor of representation by the labor organization, the Board shall certify the results of the election, subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C).

''(B) In any case in which a majority of the valid votes cast in a unit appropriate for purposes of collective bargaining have not been cast in favor of representation by the labor organization and the Board determines, following a post-election hearing, that the employer has committed a violation of this Act or otherwise interfered with a fair election, and the employer has not demonstrated that the violation or other interference is unlikely to have affected the outcome of the election, the Board shall, without ordering a new election, set aside the election and certify the labor organization as the representative of the employees in such unit and issue an order requiring the employer to bargain with the labor organization in accordance with section 8(d) if, at any time during the period beginning 1 year preceding the date of the commencement of the election and ending on the date upon which the Board makes the determination of a violation or other interference, a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit have signed authorizations designating the labor organization as their collective bargaining representative.

''(C) In any case where the Board determines that an election under this paragraph should be set aside, the Board shall direct a new election with appropriate additional safeguards necessary to ensure a fair election process, except in cases where the Board issues a bargaining order under subparagraph (B).''; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (7), as so redesignated, the following:

''(8) Except under extraordinary circumstances—

''(A) a pre-election hearing under this subsection shall begin not later than 8 days after a notice of such hearing is served on the labor organization and shall continue from day to day until completed;

''(B) a regional director shall transmit the notice of election at the same time as the direction of election, and shall transmit such notice and such direction electronically (including transmission by email or facsimile) or by overnight mail if electronic transmission is unavailable;

''(C) not later than 2 days after the service of the notice of hearing, the employer shall—

''(i) post the Notice of Petition for Election in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted;

''(ii) if the employer customarily communicates with employees electronically, distribute such Notice electronically; and

''(iii) maintain such posting until the petition is dismissed or withdrawn or the Notice of Petition for Election is replaced by the Notice of Election;

''(D) regional directors shall schedule elections for the earliest date practicable, but not later than the 20th business day after the direction of election; and

''(E) a post-election hearing under this subsection shall begin not later than 14 days after the filing of objections, if any.'';

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''(e) or'' and inserting ''(d) or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) The Board shall dismiss any petition for an election with respect to a bargaining unit or any subdivision if, during the 12-month period ending on the date on which the petition is filed—

''(1) the employer has recognized a labor organization without an election and in accordance with this Act;

''(2) the labor organization and employer engaged in their first bargaining session following the issuance of a bargaining order by the Board; or

''(3) the labor organization and successor employer engaged in their first bargaining session following a succession.

''(g) The Board shall dismiss any petition for an election with respect to a bargaining unit or any subdivision if there is in effect a lawful written collective bargaining agreement between the employer and an exclusive representative covering any employees in the unit specified in the petition, unless the petition is filed—

''(1) on or after the date that is 3 years after the date on which the collective bargaining agreement took effect; or

''(2) during the 30-day period beginning on the date that is 90 days before the date that is 3 years after the date on which the collective bargaining agreement took effect.

''(h) The Board shall suspend the processing of any petition for an election with respect to a bargaining unit or any subdivision if a labor organization files an unfair labor practice charge alleging a violation of section 8(a) and requesting the suspension of a pending petition until the unlawful conduct, if any, is remedied or the charge is dismissed unless the Board determines that employees can, under the circumstances, exercise free choice in an election despite the unlawful conduct alleged in the charge.''.

SEC. 106. DAMAGES FOR UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES.

Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 160(c)) is amended by striking ''suffered by him'' and inserting ''suffered by such employee: Provided further, That if the Board finds that an employer has discriminated against an employee in violation of paragraph (3) or (4) of section 8(a) or has committed a violation of section 8(a) that results in the discharge of an employee or other serious economic harm to an employee, the Board shall award the employee back pay without any reduction (including any reduction based on the employee's interim earnings or failure to earn interim earnings), front pay (when appropriate), consequential damages, and an additional amount as liquidated damages equal to two times the amount of damages awarded: Provided further, no relief under this subsection shall be denied on the basis that the employee is, or was during the time of relevant employment or during the back pay period, an unauthorized alien as defined in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)) or any other provision of Federal law relating to the unlawful employment of aliens''.

SEC. 107. ENFORCING COMPLIANCE WITH ORDERS OF THE BOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 160) is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e);

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d)(1) Each order of the Board shall take effect upon issuance of such order, unless otherwise directed by the Board, and shall remain in effect unless modified by the Board or unless a court of competent jurisdiction issues a superseding order.

''(2) Any person who fails or neglects to obey an order of the Board shall forfeit and pay to the Board a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 for each violation, which shall accrue to the United States and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the Board to the district court of the United States in which the unfair labor practice or other subject of the order occurred, or in which such person or entity resides or transacts business. No action by the Board under this paragraph may be made until 30 days following the issuance of an order. Each separate violation of such an order shall be a separate offense, except that, in the case of a violation in which a person fails to obey or neglects to obey a final order of the Board, each day such failure or neglect continues shall be deemed a separate offense.

''(3) If, after having provided a person or entity with notice and an opportunity to be heard regarding a civil action under subparagraph (2) for the enforcement of an order, the court determines that the order was regularly made and duly served, and that the person or entity is in disobedience of the same, the court shall enforce obedience to such order by an injunction or other proper process, mandatory or otherwise, to—

''(A) restrain such person or entity or the officers, agents, or representatives of such person or entity, from further disobedience to such order; or

''(B) enjoin such person or entity, officers, agents, or representatives to obedience to the same.'';

(4) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking ''proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Board under subsection (e) of this section,'' and inserting ''proceed as provided under paragraph (2) of this subsection'';

(B) by striking ''Any'' and inserting the following: ''

''(1) Within 30 days of the issuance of an order, any''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) No objection that has not been urged before the Board, its member, agent, or agency shall be considered by a court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, and to be made a part of the record. The Board may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and shall file its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order. Upon the filing of the record with it the jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals if application was made to the district court, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.''; and

(5) in subsection (g), by striking ''subsection (e) or (f) of this section'' and inserting ''subsection (d) or (f)''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 18 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 168) is amended by striking '' section 10(e) or (f)'' and inserting ''subsection (d) or (f) of section 10''.

SEC. 108. INJUNCTIONS AGAINST UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES INVOLVING DISCHARGE OR OTHER SERIOUS ECONOMIC HARM.

Section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 160) is amended—

(1) in subsection (j)—

(A) by striking ''The Board'' and inserting ''(1) The Board''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) Notwithstanding subsection (m), whenever it is charged that an employer has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph (1), (3) or (4) of section 8(a) that significantly interferes with, restrains, or coerces employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed under section 7, or involves discharge or other serious economic harm to an employee, the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred. If, after such investigation, the officer or regional attorney to whom the matter may be referred has reasonable cause to believe such charge is true and that a complaint should issue, such officer or attorney shall bring a petition for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order as set forth in paragraph (1). The district court shall grant the relief requested unless the court concludes that there is no reasonable likelihood that the Board will succeed on the merits of the Board's claim.''; and

(2) by repealing subsections (k) and (l).

SEC. 109. PENALTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 12 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 162) is amended—

(1) by striking ''SEC. 12. Any person'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 12. PENALTIES.

''(a) VIOLATIONS FOR INTERFERENCE WITH BOARD.—Any person''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) VIOLATIONS FOR POSTING REQUIREMENTS AND VOTER LIST.—If the Board, or any agent or agency designated by the Board for such purposes, determines that an employer has violated section 8(h) or regulations issued thereunder, the Board shall—

''(1) state the findings of fact supporting such determination;

''(2) issue and cause to be served on such employer an order requiring that such employer comply with section 8(h) or regulations issued thereunder; and

''(3) impose a civil penalty in an amount determined appropriate by the Board, except that in no case shall the amount of such penalty exceed $500 for each such violation.

''(c) CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any employer who commits an unfair labor practice within the meaning of section 8(a) shall, in addition to any remedy ordered by the Board, be subject to a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed $50,000 for each violation, except that, with respect to an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph (3) or (4) of section 8(a) or a violation of section 8(a) that results in the discharge of an employee or other serious economic harm to an employee, the Board shall double the amount of such penalty, to an amount not to exceed $100,000, in any case where the employer has within the preceding 5 years committed another such violation.

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining the amount of any civil penalty under this subsection, the Board shall consider—

''(A) the gravity of the unfair labor practice;

''(B) the impact of the unfair labor practice on the charging party, on other persons seeking to exercise rights guaranteed by this Act, and on the public interest; and

''(C) the gross income of the employer.

''(3) DIRECTOR AND OFFICER LIABILITY.—If the Board determines, based on the particular facts

and circumstances presented, that a director or officer's personal liability is warranted, a civil penalty for a violation described in this subsection may also be assessed against any director or officer of the employer who directed or committed the violation, had established a policy that led to such a violation, or had actual or constructive knowledge of and the authority to prevent the violation and failed to prevent the violation.

''(d) RIGHT TO CIVIL ACTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person who is injured by reason of a violation of paragraph (1), (3), or (4) of section 8(a) may, after 60 days following the filing of a charge with the Board alleging an unfair labor practice, bring a civil action in the appropriate district court of the United States against the employer within 90 days after the expiration of the 60-day period or the date the Board notifies the person that no complaint shall issue, whichever occurs earlier, provided that the Board has not filed a petition under section 10(j) of this Act prior to the expiration of the 60-day period. No relief under this subsection shall be denied on the basis that the employee is, or was during the time of relevant employment or during the back pay period, an unauthorized alien as defined in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)) or any other provision of Federal law relating to the unlawful employment of aliens.

''(2) AVAILABLE RELIEF.—Relief granted in an action under paragraph (1) may include—

''(A) back pay without any reduction, including any reduction based on the employee's interim earnings or failure to earn interim earnings;

''(B) front pay (when appropriate);

''(C) consequential damages;

''(D) an additional amount as liquidated damages equal to two times the cumulative amount of damages awarded under subparagraphs (A) through (C);

''(E) in appropriate cases, punitive damages in accordance with paragraph (4); and

''(F) any other relief authorized by section 706(g) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–5(g)) or by section 1977A(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a(b)).

''(3) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—In any civil action under this subsection, the court may allow the prevailing party a reasonable attorney's fee (including expert fees) and other reasonable costs associated with maintaining the action.

''(4) PUNITIVE DAMAGES.—In awarding punitive damages under paragraph (2)(E), the court shall consider—

''(A) the gravity of the unfair labor practice;

''(B) the impact of the unfair labor practice on the charging party, on other persons seeking to exercise rights guaranteed by this Act, and on the public interest; and

''(C) the gross income of the employer.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 10(b) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 160(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''six months'' and inserting ''180 days''; and

(2) by striking ''the six-month period'' and inserting ''the 180-day period''.

SEC. 110. LIMITATIONS ON THE RIGHT TO STRIKE.

Section 13 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 163) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '': Provided, That the duration, scope, frequency, or intermittence of any strike or strikes shall not render such strike or strikes unprotected or prohibited.''.

SEC. 111. FAIR SHARE AGREEMENTS PERMITTED.

Section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 164(b)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: '': Provided, That collective bargaining agreements providing that all employees in a bargaining unit shall contribute fees to a labor organization for the cost of representation, collective bargaining, contract enforcement, and related expenditures as a condition of employment shall be valid and enforceable notwithstanding any State or Territorial law.''.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947 AND THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959

SEC. 201. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO THE LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947.

The Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 is amended—

(1) in section 213(a) (29 U.S.C. 183(a)), by striking ''clause (A) of the last sentence of section 8(d) (which is required by clause (3) of such section 8(d)), or within 10 days after the notice under clause (B)'' and inserting ''section 8(d)(2)(A) of the National Labor Relations Act (which is required by section 8(d)(1)(C) of such Act), or within 10 days after the notice under section 8(d)(2)(B) of such Act''; and

(2) by repealing section 303 (29 U.S.C. 187).

SEC. 202. AMENDMENTS TO THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959.

Section 203(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 433(c)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following '': Provided, That this subsection shall not exempt from the requirements of this section any arrangement or part of an arrangement in which a party agrees, for an object described in subsection (b)(1), to plan or conduct employee meetings; train supervisors or employer representatives to conduct meetings; coordinate or direct activities of supervisors or employer representatives; establish or facilitate employee committees; identify employees for disciplinary action, reward, or other targeting; or draft or revise employer personnel policies, speeches, presentations, or other written, recorded, or electronic communications to be delivered or disseminated to employees.''.

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 301. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of that provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, is not affected thereby.

SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 303. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

The amendments made under this Act shall not be construed to amend section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021, or the PRO Act.

The American economy needs a strong middle class. Labor unions play an essential role in rebuilding our middle class and improving the lives of workers and their families. There is clear evidence that workers who organize a union have higher wages, better benefits, and safer workplaces.

Regrettably, union membership has dropped over the last 50 years from nearly one-third of all workers in the mid-20th century to just over 10 percent of workers today. The decline of unions and workers' bargaining power are major reasons why income inequality has soared and wages have stagnated for hardworking people.

But this decline in union membership is not a product of workers' choices. A recent survey by MIT found that nearly half of nonunion workers say that they would vote to join a union if given the opportunity.

The gap between worker preferences and union membership is the result of an 85-year-old labor law that lacks the teeth to enforce workers' rights when employers unlawfully retaliate against them for organizing. The National Labor Relations Act, the NLRA, is far too weak to defend workers against intensifying antiunion attacks from special interests.

That is why we must pass the PRO Act. The legislation strengthens workers' rights by making significant upgrades in the NLRA since it was enacted 85 years ago.

First, the PRO Act provides new tools to protect workers from antiunion intimidation and retaliation. It then introduces meaningful penalties for companies that violate workers' rights and closes loopholes they use to exploit workers.

Finally, the PRO Act strengthens safeguards to ensure that workers can hold free, fair, and safe union elections.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to stand up for workers and ensure that they can exercise their right to join together and negotiate for higher wages, better benefits, and a safe workplace. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the radical, partisan, and utterly shameful PRO Act.

This unnecessary bill is an assault on American workers, employers, and the economy. Democrats are pushing this sweeping legislation without holding a single committee hearing or markup.

Is this the new standard for the people's House?

It silences the minority and their constituents by denying a thorough examination of yet another extreme and

damaging Democrat legislative scheme. It is disgraceful.

The pro-union bosses' act that Democrats have disingenuously titled the PRO Act is a left-wing wish list of union boss priorities, which undermines the rights of workers by forcing them to pay into a union system, whether or not they want to be represented by a union.

Many workers would not choose to funnel billions of their hard-earned dollars to left-wing groups like Planned Parenthood, the Clinton Foundation, the Progressive Democrats of America.

This misguided bill also stunts economic recovery by hitting employers over the head with an estimated $47 billion in new annual costs. But it is not just employers who will pay the price. This bill will reclassify gig economy workers as employees, costing tens of thousands of workers their jobs and eliminating the flexibility so many rely on to care for their family members; a priority even more critical during the COVID–19 pandemic.

The appalling list of bad policy provisions in this bill goes on, and we will hear more about them during this debate. The bottom line is this, the PRO Act is a sorry excuse for legislation, and the partisan process under which it is being considered is equally embarrassing. I urge all Members to reject the PRO Act.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the chair of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

The COVID–19 pandemic has highlighted the urgent need for workers to have the right to negotiate for better wages, stronger benefits, and safer working conditions.

To keep our communities going, nurses, grocery store workers, firefighters, childcare workers, educators, healthcare workers, and more have been showing up to work every day, despite the risks. We have the opportunity to honor their work and to help restore fairness to our economy by making it easier for workers to form unions and collectively bargain.

The PRO Act will establish substantive and enforceable penalties for unlawful tactics employers take to interfere with workers' organizing a union. The legislation closes loopholes in labor laws that allow workers to be misclassified, provides them with protections of the National Labor Relations Act, bans captive audience meetings, and prohibits employers from interfering in union elections. It is the most significant workers' rights legislation in years and an important step in restoring the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the BlueGreen Alliance in support of the PRO Act.

MARCH 8, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As a coalition of some of the nation's largest labor unions and environmental organizations, collectively representing millions of members and supporters, the BlueGreen Alliance and its partners write to express our support for the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act of 2021, H.R. 842.

In the United States, we face a critical juncture for the rights of employees to organize. Workers have faced wage stagnation, difficult working conditions, and a wholesale effort to decimate their ability to organize for the past several decades. Exploitation by employers of labor laws that have been made toothless has caused union membership to fall dramatically from 33 percent in 1956 to ten percent in 2018. As it stands, no meaningful penalties exist for corporations using illegal tactics to eliminate the option to organize. Workers, already facing record income inequality, now face job losses due to the impacts of the COVID–19 pandemic. And we know the reality is that we went into this pandemic with three ongoing interconnected crises: economic inequality, racial inequality, and climate change.

Based on the National Bureau of Economic Research's statistics, we know that unions consistently provide working Americans with ten to twenty percent higher wages than non-unionized workers. Workers who are union members fare better in crises—whether the crisis is COVID–19 or climate change. During crises, unionized workers have better access to enhanced safety measures, unemployment insurance, additional pay, paid sick time, and input in the terms of furloughs or other job-saving arrangements. Empowering workers, whether they are in the private sector or in the public sector, to band together to negotiate better wages and safer working conditions is the best path forward to protecting our workers and rebuilding America's middle class.

Organizing does not just affect job quality, though: unionized workers are better equipped to handle potentially hazardous workplace situations, and have more freedom to blow the whistle in dangerous situations. This can avert industrial accidents and result in safer communities, as well as cleaner air and water. Many unions also take firm positions on environmental issues because they understand the impact that clean air and water have on workers. Unions have supported the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and other actions designed to both reduce the carbon pollution driving climate change and grow good-paying jobs in the clean economy. This bill can also help us close the gap in union density and job quality in our growing clean energy sectors.

The PRO Act empowers employees by strengthening workers' rights to bargain and to organize. It does so by ending prohibitions on collective and class-action litigation, prohibiting employers from permanently replacing striking employees, amending how employees are defined so that no one is misclassified as an independent contractor, strengthening remedies and enforcement for employees who are exercising their rights, creating a mediation and arbitration process for new unions, protecting against coercive captive audience meetings, and streamlining the National Labor Relations Board's procedures.

The PRO Act would take tangible steps to stem the tide of continued violations of the rights of working people to organize and would provide real consequences for those who violate the rights of workers. We must restore fairness to our economy so that workers no longer get a raw deal, and strengthen the right of workers all over the country to unionize and bargain for better working conditions. For these reasons, we urge you to vote yes on the PRO Act. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

BlueGreen Alliance, American Federation of Teachers, International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers, International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, League of Conservation Voters, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Service Employees International Union, Sierra Club, United Steelworkers Union, Utility Workers Union of American.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with workers and support this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, my Democrat colleagues have, apparently, decided committee work doesn't matter for the 117th Congress because they, once again, brought legislation to the House floor without first holding a single committee hearing or markup.

□ 1245

As the Republican leader of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee, I would have welcomed the opportunity to debate and amend this flawed legislation in committee.

H.R. 842, also known as the PRO Act, is a radical proposal aimed at appeasing big union bosses who fund the far left's political agenda. From 2010 to 2018, unions sent more than $1.6 billion in member dues to hundreds of left-wing groups like Planned Parenthood, the Clinton Foundation, and the Progressive Democrats of America, instead of spending that money on worker representation.

That is right. Union leaders are lining their pockets and their friends' pockets with the dues workers are forced to pay. No worker should be forced to participate in union activity or pay for representation they do not agree with. That is un-American. But the pro-union bosses act would overturn right-to-work laws in 27 States, including my home State of Georgia.

That would be devastating for Georgia's post-COVID economy. That is why I will offer an amendment protecting the right-to-work laws. In fact, I introduced a total of five amendments to this bill that would put workers first; but, unfortunately, Democrats only allowed one to be considered on the House floor for debate even though last Congress they allowed more than one to be voted on this House floor.

But the American people deserve to know the other amendments that the Democrats blocked.

First is protecting employees' right to secret-ballot elections. An amendment requiring all unions to win a secret-ballot election in order to be certified because no worker should face retribution because of how they cast their ballot.

Codifying a sensible joint-employer standard. An amendment that strikes

the section of the bill which defines joint employment using the indirect control and replaces this provision with the direct and immediate control to protect franchisees and treat them as any other small business owner.

Employee privacy protection. An amendment requiring employers to receive express consent from employees before sharing their personal information with a union because the bill currently does not require that consent.

And worker retirement protection. This amends the bill to state that mandatory arbitration agreements cannot force the members of a bargaining unit into a multiemployer pension plan.

All of my amendments would bring much-needed accountability and transparency, and I am disappointed a majority of them were not even allowed to be offered on the House floor. Furthermore, the PRO Act would further disrupt our economy, which is in desperate need of full reopening.

Mr. Speaker, today, I stand with small business owners and our workforce, and I oppose this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress we held three hearings and considered 35 amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), who is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and the co-chair of the new Labor Caucus.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

As a small business owner and union member of the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades for 30 years, I know how important it is that every worker has a union.

Giving workers a voice in their workplace, negotiating for good, family supporting wages and benefits and worker safety are crucial to a family's ability to thrive.

Democrats will deliver on this important legislation today, but it is interesting Republicans lately have been trying to falsely rebrand themselves as the party of working people while opposing the strongest bill in Congress to give power to workers. The same Republicans who fought tooth and nail to reduce stimulus checks and unemployment insurance, championed union busting and prevented an increase in the minimum wage from being included in COVID relief.

They claim they are the party of the working people. Their idea of helping working people is voting for a $2 trillion tax cut for corporate donors and billionaire friends but refusing to vote for a $1.9 trillion investment in the American people.

Their tax breaks for the top 1 percent, by the way, even included a provision that might make it easier to send jobs overseas. Yes. That is fighting for the average worker—in China.

Please, if you are the party of working people, then I am a stunt double, doppelganger for Brad Pitt. I hope you enjoyed me in ''Fight Club.''

Today, on this side of the aisle we proudly stand up to protect the right to organize for every worker.

We will stand up for better worker protections in a pandemic.

We will stand up for negotiating for better pay and benefits to support your family.

We will stand up against antiworker so-called right-to-work laws that inevitably mean right to work for less.

We will stand up for gig workers, for nurses, for grocery workers, for meatpackers, for fast-food workers, for public service workers, and, yes, for Amazon workers in Bessemer, Alabama.

That is what the party of working people would do, and that is why we are going to pass the Protecting the Right to Organize Act this week.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two pieces of correspondence from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Transport Workers Union of America.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS,
Washington, DC, March 5, 2021.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, I am writing to state our strong support for H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act (PRO Act). I urge you to support this critical legislation and to oppose any weakening amendments and any motion to recommit when H.R. 842 comes to the House floor this week. The Teamsters Union believes that this legislation is critically important to rebuilding the middle class and to begin reversing decades of income inequality and the erosion of worker rights.

Today, the economy is not working for working people and their families. Wages have stagnated for workers across the economy, while income has skyrocketed for CEO's and the wealthiest one percent. In large measure, this inequality is the result of a loss of bargaining power and the erosion of workers' ability to exercise their rights on the job.

Today, when workers make the decision to stand together and bargain with their employer for improved working conditions, the deck is stacked against them from day one. Under current law, unscrupulous employers, armed with limitless funds, routinely violate the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and block workers' ability to exercise their right to bargain for better wages and better working conditions with impunity. The Protecting the Right to Organize Act is an important step forward for workers' rights, rebuilding the middle class, and addressing inequality. It would restore and strengthen worker protections which have been eroded over the years.

The Protecting the Right to Organize Act addresses several major weaknesses in current law. The legislation enacts meaningful, enforceable penalties on employers who break the law and gives workers a private right of action if they've been terminated for union activity. The bill would make elections fairer by prohibiting employers from using coercive activities like ''captive audience'' meetings and by preventing employers from hiring permanent replacements of workers who exercise their right to strike. It would establish a process for mediation and arbitration to stop stalling tactics at the bargaining table and help parties achieve a first contract. Importantly, the bill also addresses rampant intentional misclassification and ensures that misclassified workers are not deprived of their right to form a union under the NLRA.

Research shows that workers want unions. However, there is a huge gap between the share of workers with union representation and the share of workers that would like to have a union and a voice on the job. The PRO Act would take a major step forward in closing that gap, addressing income inequality, and ultimately growing a strong middle class.

I urge you to demonstrate to the American people that workers and their rights are a priority for this Congress. I hope I can tell our members that you stood with them and other workers in their efforts to achieve meaningful worker rights and protections and better wages and working conditions. The Teamsters Union urges you to vote yes on H.R. 842 and to oppose all efforts to weaken this bill by amendment.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

TRANSPORT WORKERS OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of more than 150,000 members of the Transport Workers Union (TWU), I am writing to urge you to support the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act when it comes to the floor this week. This bill directly addresses the needs of the middle-class in the 21st century and will help ensure that our next generation economy is one that puts working families first.

Our labor laws are designed to provide access to the time-tested process of collective bargaining. Under the National Labor Relations Act, certain workers, through their elected representatives, negotiate with their employer over the terms of their labor. How often will they work? How much will they be paid? What benefits will they receive beyond their salary? Through collective bargaining, these questions are answered in a unique way for each work group and at each company. This is an incredibly flexible process that has allowed TWU to successfully negotiate contracts for everyone from airline mechanics to bikeshare workers.

Bikeshare workers at Motivate (a company owned by Lyft) are often considered part of the ''gig economy''. They are also proud TWU members with a national contract. For many of these union members, the majority of their interaction with their employer is through an app—very similar to the way rideshare drivers interact with their employers. These workers move around a large geographic area collecting and repositioning bikes in the same way a rideshare driver would pick up and move passengers. Unlike rideshare drivers, however, bikeshare workers' rights are not seen as incompatible with their company's business model.

These workers and many others are proof that collective bargaining is powerful enough to live on into our future. None of the more than 200 current contracts that TWU has negotiated and implemented is identical—in fact many of them would work at no other company or among any other work group. While the process mandated under our labor laws may be the same, the outcomes vary wildly, allowing for growth and change as circumstances shift and technologies evolve. All workers deserve access to that process in order to better their standard of living.

Unfortunately, the proportion of unionized workers in the U.S. is near a 90-year low because of structural hurdles which make joining a new union very difficult.

The PRO Act would directly address these issues and give workers across the entire economy equal access to the collective bargaining process. In order ensure workers' rights keep pace with the new economy, the Transport Workers Union strongly urges you to vote yes on the PRO Act and to oppose any weakening amendments.

Sincerely,

JOHN SAMUELSEN,
International President.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for me to voice my opposition to the PRO Act, shortsighted legislation that is a bad deal for America's workers and America's employers.

The greatest thing that I learned working in a factory is that workers care about employers and employers care about and value the hardworking people who come to work and get the job done every day.

The PRO Act needlessly inserts government—what I call the middleman—into the workplace, driving a wedge between the employee-employer relationship. This bill would infringe on workers' rights and handcuff employers, making it harder for people to make decisions that positively impact their workforce.

Our team has met with employers and workers across central and northeastern Pennsylvania, and the message is crystal clear: Say no to the PRO Act.

Let's not pretend the government knows or cares about workers more than the businesses that employ them, and let's not add more mandates where they don't belong. Instead, it is time for the government to step back and for businesses to continue what they do best: innovate, produce, and provide opportunities for the American people.

If my colleagues supporting the PRO Act really care about America's employers, workers, and boosting our economic recovery, then I urge them to oppose this special interest giveaway.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor and is the chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the PRO Act. I am very proud to be a lead sponsor of this transformative bill and to represent one of the most unionized States in the country, where I have spent two decades organizing alongside unions for decent wages, benefits, and workers' rights.

Unions helped build America's middle class. But over the years large corporations have deployed union-busting tactics to rob workers of their fundamental workplace rights. That changes today.

The PRO Act will undo decades of Republican antiworker policies. It puts power back into the hands of workers and secures the right to organize and bargain for good wages, fair benefits, and an equal voice on the job. The PRO Act is about democracy in the workplace. It is about standing with the heroic workers carrying America through the pandemic.

It is past time to pass the PRO Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters of support from the Service Employees International Union and the Communications Workers of America.

SEIU,
February 4, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 2 million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), we write to endorse the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act of 2021. This important bill would strengthen working Americans' rights to join together in unions and bargain for higher wages and better working conditions to help create balanced, inclusive growth, and build our economy back better than it was before.

We are nearly one year into the worst public health and economic crisis we have faced in a generation, with underpaid frontline workers literally risking their lives for poverty wages. While many have rightly called these essential workers heroes, our country has failed to truly respect them with a promise to protect them and adequately pay them throughout the crisis. Too many essential workers continue to lack basic work protections like proper PPE, paid sick and family leave, or health care, and far too few have a voice in the workplace and access to a union. This is most true for the Black and brown workers who have kept us safe and fed throughout this crisis.

Unions are the best solution to leveling the playing field and safeguarding the health and safety of working people. In fact, during this crisis, where workers that have been able to act collectively and through their union, they have been able to secure enhanced safety measures, additional hazard pay, paid sick time, and other protections. But because of a concerted effort to undermine unions in America over the past forty years, just 10% of working people have a say in the decisions that affect them at work, in their communities and in our economy. Too many unscrupulous employers—even amidst a pandemic—take advantage of America's outdated labor laws to stifle the ability of working people to join together in unions to stay safe on the job and build a better future for their families.

The PRO Act would reinvigorate labor law to help build an economy that works better for the millions of people who work for a living—not just those at the top. We applaud the bill's joint employer provision, which would ensure that workers can meaningfully bargain with all companies that actually control their employment. We also endorse the bill's new standard to stop employers from misclassifying their workers as independent contractors or supervisors to escape their responsibilities. These changes would make it harder for companies to circumvent basic worker protections through subcontracting arrangements or other evasions.

We also strongly support the PRO Act's reforms banning anti-worker state laws that supersede collective bargaining agreements. These so-called Right-to Work laws weaken workers' voice at the workplace, drive down wages, and threaten the economic security of all workers—union and nonunion alike. Furthermore, working people subject to these laws earn $1,558 less per year than those who are not. The PRO Act permits companies and workers to decide for themselves whether to negotiate fair share agreements in collective bargaining. In addition, we are pleased to see PRO Act provisions that would deter employer misconduct by making remedies meaningful, penalizing the most egregious violations, limiting interference in union elections, and facilitating first contracts with newly formed unions. The bill rightfully removes restraints on workers' solidarity actions across different workplaces.

In this time of crisis, working people around the country urgently need the PRO Act's much needed reforms to make it easier for people to join unions and hold companies accountable. A voice on the job has never been more important for safeguarding the health, safety, and economic security of the working people we have relied on to get us through this pandemic.

SEIU members are proud to support the PRO Act. We will add any future votes on this legislation to our legislative scorecard.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA,
AFL-CIO, CLC,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members and officers of the Communications Workers of America (CWA), I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, when it comes to a vote on the House floor this week.

The ability of working people to join together to collectively bargain for fair pay and working conditions is a fundamental right. But it is extremely difficult for private sector workers covered by the NLRA to organize if their employer opposes them doing so. Companies can intimidate workers relentlessly, misclassify workers, gerrymander election units, dodge accountability for violating worker rights by hiding behind subcontractors, and more—all completely legally. And even if they do violate the law and illegally terminate or punish workers for union activity, the existing NLRA is toothless and its penalties barely amount to a slap on the wrist. Companies who illegally fire workers are only required to pay them back pay, minus any income they've had elsewhere in the interim.

Once workers do come together and organize, the existing NLRA is also inadequate to protect worker rights. Companies can easily stall indefinitely to prevent workers from getting a first contract for years after they organize. If and when workers are forced to go on strike to protect their livelihoods, employers can permanently replace strikers without consequence.

The huge surge in economic inequality over the past quarter-century is related directly to many workers' lack of a strong voice on the job. Over that time, wages have stagnated for workers across the economy, while income has skyrocketed for CEOs and the wealthiest 1%. By 2012, the wealthiest 1% made 22.5% of national income, while the bottom 90% of families made less than half of national income—just 49.6%.

Workers who form unions have stronger protections against discrimination and retaliation, enhanced job security, better retirement benefits, and more effective ways of combating practices that jeopardize their health and safety on the job. These problems have all been magnified by the ongoing COVID–19 pandemic.

New research confirms that workers without union representation are less likely to have paid leave, to have access to proper PPE at work, or to have protections against

unnecessary layoffs. The PRO Act would fix these problems and re-establish workers' right to organize in this country, In doing so, it helps combat skyrocketing economic inequality and strengthens the middle class. Therefore, I strongly urge you to vote in favor of the PRO Act and oppose any amendments that would weaken the bill. CWA will include votes on this bill in our Congressional Scorecard.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER M. SHELTON,
President, Communications Workers of America (CWA).

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the PRO Act.

The efforts by House Democrats to kill flexible work options in America do not consider the harmful effects this bill will have on mothers. This bill would force workers out of their individual labor agreements and into one-size-fits-all union contracts.

I have seven children, and balancing work and family is an issue that I truly care about. For many mothers, flexible work opportunities are their lifeline. Federal law should not discourage mothers from working in positions that fit their unique schedules and needs. When given flexible opportunities, mothers are able to advance their careers while balancing competing priorities of childcare, education, caring for sick or aging family members, and so much more.

The only thing that this bill is pro on is big labor. The PRO Act is a massive expansion of union bosses' power at the expense of workers and employers' freedom.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I got here just a little before I was going to speak, and I heard the gentlewoman from Illinois speak. She talked about flexible work hours. I thought to myself: Who decides what is flexible?

Historically, of course, working men and women were told: You will do this for that much at this time under these conditions.

That was the reality—sweatshops, health-endangering shops, and long hours with little pay. Then the labor unions came along. They got some strength, they got some support, and lo and behold, the middle class started to grow and started to make good wages, have safe working conditions, and, yes, flexible hours.

Mr. Speaker, as we work to create jobs and build our economy back better, we need to make sure that the jobs that are available to Americans help them get by and get ahead. That is what the minimum wage battle is about. That is what this is about—average working people wanting to get by, wanting to have a decent salary, and wanting to have decent working conditions.

Very frankly, that just didn't happen, Mr. Speaker. Some died to make that a reality. Others were beaten and battered in order to have that be a reality. Child labor, abuse of gender, women abused in the workplace working in terrible, odious conditions—that is why Democrats passed the PRO Act last year, and that is why we will do so again today.

One of the most important tools for workers to secure better pay and benefits is the right to organize and bargain collectively. Those of you who have been employers know that you want to maximize profits and you want to try and manage and see whether you can hire people for X amount of dollars rather than X plus Y. That right was secured over the course of generations by workers who fought to have that right recognized and secured. Collective bargaining made possible the prosperity and upward mobility that was a hallmark of America in the 20th century.

Strong unions lead to better pay, higher quality and more affordable healthcare, more secure retirement benefits, and workplaces that are safer, not just for union members but for all workers.

Unfortunately, in the 21st century, Mr. Speaker, the right to organize has been eroded and weakened. As a result, many workers are stuck with no recourse to demand the better pay and benefits they deserve, and they need, and their families need, and we need as a middle class society that knows that we are a consumer economy. Henry Ford knew if you didn't pay them, then they couldn't buy your cars—a pretty simple equation.

The PRO Act would change that, empowering workers, once again, through their right to organize. It prevents management from misclassifying workers.

I urge Members to think whether or not that happens.

Mr. Speaker, this gig economy sounds great until you get to be 65 or 67 and you look around and there is nobody behind you. There is nobody to lift you up. There is nobody to say: Thank you for that 30 years, 40 years, or 50 years of service to our company or to our economy. It prevents management from misclassifying workers in order to avoid negotiating the fair pay and safe working conditions they deserve.

□ 1300

No, they are just contract employees. They don't have any real attachment or relationship with our company. They are just contract, and we can use them one day and throw them away the next.

Moreover, the PRO Act levels the playing field for labor unions in contract negotiations. Maybe you don't believe in that, Mr. Speaker, not you personally, but maybe there are people who don't believe that they ought to be equal. After all, I started the business, and I invested money.

I agree with that; I want to see them make money. I am a procapitalist Democrat, a procapitalist American. I have been around the world, and I have seen noncapitalist societies. They don't work very well. But the capitalist society works better if everybody is lifted, not just some.

I thank Chairman SCOTT of the Education and Labor Committee for his hard work on this bill, as well as the members of his committee.

I am proud that we Democrats strongly support this bill, which is so central to our effort to make opportunities more accessible and more broadly available to American workers as we look to rebuild our economy stronger after COVID–19.

The leader of the party on the other side of the aisle said in his speech that he gave at the beginning of the session: We are the workers' party.

We will see, Mr. Speaker, when we vote on this bill, whether that statement was accurate.

The workers are not against this bill. As I said last year, when we passed this bill, the PRO Act is the workers' rights legislation that working people in our country need and for which they have been waiting for far too long. That is why we need to pass this bill today and send it to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote for our workers, for our families, for our children, and for our effort to build back better and stronger from the challenges we now face.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats continue to look backward, 100 years backward. Just before COVID hit, we had the greatest economy in our country ever, the lowest unemployment for women, minorities, everyone, without the PRO Act.

No procapitalist can support this bill. This is part of a socialist agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 842, the prounion bosses act.

Here we are once again. This is becoming all too familiar here in Congress, an exercise for Democrats to steamroll these massive bills through the House without proper debate or transparency. Our committee didn't even have a hearing or a markup on this.

Frankly, the bill is disastrous. Bills like this only further suppress workers' rights, create a one-size-fits-all type of union contract, and create incentives for disruptive and dangerous union strikes, especially in healthcare.

One particularly bothersome practice is this legislation would require employers to hand over workers' private personal information to union organizers—home addresses, cell phone numbers, email addresses—without

their employees' consent. These are privacy violations not to be tolerated in this country.

I know leadership doesn't want you guys to do this, but we want to work with you. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support for the bill from the AFL–CIO.

Legislative Alert

AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On January 26, we wrote in support of the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act (H.R. 842), which would restore the original intent of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to give working people a voice on the job so they can negotiate for higher wages, better benefits, a more secure retirement and a safer workplace. We write today to redouble our request and to express our views on amendments to H.R. 842 that the Rules Committee has made in order.

Now is the time to pass the PRO Act. For too long, employers have been allowed to violate workers' rights with impunity because the law includes no penalties for doing so. As a result, workers' ability to negotiate for better pay and benefits has eroded and income inequality has reached levels we have not seen since the Great Depression. In the midst of a global pandemic, which has killed tens of thousands of front line workers, it is more important than ever that working people have the right to rely on the protection of a union contract.

The PRO Act will level the playing field to give workers a fair shot when fighting for improvements on the job. The bill modernizes the NLRA by bringing its remedies in line with other workplace laws. In addition to imposing financial penalties on companies and individual corporate officers who violate the law, the bill would give workers the option of bringing their case to federal court. The bill would also make union elections fairer by prohibiting employers from requiring their employees to attend ''captive audience'' meetings, a common tactic whereby employers present anti-union propaganda to pressure workers to vote against the union.

Under the bill, once workers vote to form a union, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) would be authorized to order that the employer commence bargaining a first contract. These orders would be enforced in district courts to ensure swift justice, avoiding the complex and drawn out process in the courts of appeals. In addition, the bill would ensure that employees are not deprived of our right to a union because an employer deliberately misclassifies them as supervisors or independent contractors.

Too often, when workers choose to form a union, employers stall the bargaining process to avoid reaching an agreement. The PRO Act would establish a process for mediation and arbitration to help the parties achieve a first contract. This important change would make the freedom to negotiate a reality for countless workers who form unions but never get to enjoy the benefits of a collective bargaining agreement due to employers' intentional delays.

The PRO Act recognizes that employees need the freedom to picket or withhold our labor in order to push for the workplace changes we need. The bill protects employees' right to strike by preventing employers from hiring permanent replacement workers.

It also allows unrepresented employees to engage in collective action or class action lawsuits to enforce basic workplace rights, rather than being forced to arbitrate such claims alone.

Finally, the bill would eliminate ''right to work'' laws. These laws, steeped in a history of racism, are promoted by billionaires and special interest groups to give more power to corporations at the expense of workers, and have the effect of lowering wages and eroding pensions and health care coverage in states where they have been adopted.

The PRO Act is the first step towards restoring our middle class by strengthening the collective power of workers to negotiate for better pay and working conditions. After the PRO Act's passage, we urge Congress to further empower workers through passage of the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act, so our nation's public sector workers may enjoy the protections of a union contract.

We urge you to support and vote for the PRO Act.

AMENDMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Tlaib (#8) This amendment establishes a 120–day timeline for the tripartite arbitration process between the employees/labor organization and employer to ensure that the arbitration process is not indefinitely drawn out. Vote yes.

Hern (#6) Prohibits the PRO Act from taking effect until the Secretary of Labor certifies that the PRO Act will not negatively affect employment rates. There is nothing to support the notion that strong labor protections have adverse impacts on job numbers. This serves no purpose other than to further delay worker access to the protections of the PRO Act. Vote no.

Keller (#16) This amendment deletes the provisions of the bill prohibiting employers from permanently replacing workers on strike and protecting the rights of workers to engage in brief or intermittent strikes. Vote no.

Good (#18) Amends section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act to prohibit employers from remaining neutral during an organizing effort or election. Vote no.

Comer (#21) This amendment strikes the provision of the bill which requires employers to disclose how much they are spending on union-busting or ''union avoidance'' consultants. Vote no.

Torres (#22) This amendment revises the Labor-Management and Disclosure Act of 1959 to require the Department of Labor to make disclosures under the persuader rule publicly available in an accessible and searchable electronic form, and through a secure software application for use on an electronic device. Vote yes.

Walberg (#24) This amendment seeks to extend the time between a petition for a union election and a pre-election hearing. Vote no.

Levin (#34) This amendment directs the NLRB to develop a system and procedures to conduct union representation elections electronically, as allowed by the PRO Act itself. Vote yes.

Fulcher (#37) Codifies a vote-and-impound process through which the NLRB will conduct union elections even where employer coercion or other unfair labor practices have occurred, tainting the election. This policy is harmful to workers who are subject to employer unfair labor practices during or prior to a union election. Vote no.

Fitzgerald (#39) Requires an unnecessary administrative process for unions to collect consent before using dues for activities other than collective bargaining or contract administration. Serves only to create administrative hurdles as employees are already entitled to limit payments to union to those for representational purposes. Vote no.

Allen (#47) This amendment strikes the provision requiring states to allow ''fair share agreements.'' So-called ''Right to Work'' laws, which prohibit fair share agreements, depress wages and benefits. Vote no.

McBath (#54) This amendment simply clarifies that the definition of employer and employee in the PRO Act does not affect state laws governing wages, hours, workers' compensation or unemployment insurance. Vote yes.

Wilson (#59) This amendment strikes the provision requiring states to allow ''fair share agreements.'' So-called ''Right to Work'' laws, which prohibit fair share agreements, depress wages and benefits. Vote no.

Newman (#67) This amendment ensures that the NLRB's notices that inform workers of their rights be in the languages spoken by the employees. Vote yes.

The AFL-CIO offers no recommendation on the following amendments: Jackson Lee (#12), Bordeaux (#25), Stevens (#65), Murphy (#68), Davids (#71).

Restoring our middle class depends on strengthening the collective power of workers to negotiate for better pay and working conditions. This is why public support for unions is the highest it has been in decades. We urge you to support the PRO Act, oppose all weakening amendments for the reasons explained above, and help us build an economy that works for all working families. We also urge you to oppose any Motion to Recommit, which would have the effect of killing the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had time to rebut many arguments, like the one we just heard. The requirement that the employer share lists of the employees during a union election is decades and decades old. It hasn't changed.

In any event, I am here to support the PRO Act with all of my heart. For decades, we have witnessed the loss of workers' rights, the decline of private-sector union membership, and the erosion of the American middle class. For 86 years, Congress has failed to pass any meaningful private-sector labor law reform to reverse these devastating trends.

The decline of union membership has resulted in an unequal economy where workers no longer receive a fair share of the profits they produce. But we can change that starting today.

The PRO Act protects workers' rights to unite and negotiate for higher pay, better benefits, and safer working conditions. By passing the PRO Act, we empower workers to fight for the fruits of their labor and build an economy that works for all Americans.

I urge all of my colleagues to stand up for the working people of this Nation and vote for the PRO Act.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 842.

This bill would be the most drastic change to labor law this country has seen in the past 80 years. It would severely upend labor laws and change

long-established precedents at the behest of Democrats and their Big Labor donors and at the expense of hardworking Americans.

This bill would take away the flexibility of workers to choose their own work hours, place onerous burdens on small business, restrict the ability of employers to seek labor relations advice, and violate workers' privacy by giving labor organizations access to their contact information without consent.

This bill would also undermine the ability of States to choose their own labor laws by striking down the right-to-work laws of 27 States.

As a member of the Wisconsin Senate, I authored the right-to-work bill that became law. I can attest firsthand to what the consequences would be if these laws were struck down.

Striking down State right-to-work laws would force millions of workers to pay dues to labor unions without any say about how their money was spent.

I offered an amendment to this bill that would prevent union dues from being used for political purposes. It is yet to be seen whether Democrats will support union bosses or hardworking Americans.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you advise how much time is available on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CICILLINE). The gentleman from Virginia has 21½ minutes. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 20½ minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for this time and opportunity to speak in support of H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

Unions are the backbone of northwest Indiana's economy, and we must do all we can to strengthen the ability for all workers to form unions. For far too long, State and Federal policies have targeted union workers and their ability to position themselves and leverage.

Today, we change that. Today, we have the backs of working families. When workers can stand together and form a union, they have the ability to use their collective voice for fair wages, safe working conditions, improved health benefits, and a more secure retirement.

Organized labor is essential to creating opportunities for all individuals to have a good-paying career where they can take care of themselves and their families.

I believe that the divide in our Nation is by workers believing they will be left behind. The PRO Act will lift up workers and unite workers.

I thank Chairman SCOTT for this time, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the PRO Act so that we can move forward in creating an economy that works for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF BRICKLAYERS AND ALLIED CRAFTWORKERS,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

DEAR HOUSE MEMBERS: On behalf of the International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers (BAC), I am writing to express our strong support for the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, H.R. 842. The PRO Act is historic legislation that will help level the playing field and provide workers the opportunity to freely exercise their right to organize a union. President Biden captured this fundamental principle clearly and succinctly when he told America's workers and companies that ''The choice to join a union is up to the workers—full stop.''

BAC is proud of the relationship that we share with our signatory employers across the United States to provide vital building and construction services to the communities we live in. However, our members, and just as importantly the contractors that hire them, are under assault by unscrupulous corporations and employers that abuse and deny their workers from having a meaningful voice in the workplace. The PRO Act would help address these abuses and provide workers a fair shot at forming a union of their choice to bargain for better wages, benefits, and conditions in the workplace.

Too often, employers intentionally violate the law during organizing campaigns because some of the penalties are so weak that low road employers just view them as a small cost of doing the business of union busting. The PRO act strengthens penalties for such behavior in order to deter employers from interfering with worker's rights.

The PRO Act also clarifies the definition of independent contractor and supervisor to help prevent the misclassification of workers. Misclassification is far too common in construction and other industries and it prevents workers from exercising their rights, getting the pay and benefits they deserve, and deprives communities of much-needed revenue through tax evasion.

Our economy is out of balance and it is time for Congress to step up to protect working class families and restore economic stability. We urge you to support the PRO Act and oppose any weakening amendments when the House of Representatives considers the bill.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY J. DRISCOLL,
President.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN).

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the PRO Act.

You see, when I came to Washington, D.C., I believed that I had one duty, one purpose, that I was elected to serve my district, my people, and to answer to nobody else except my constituents.

But since arriving in Congress, I have learned that not everyone shares the same philosophy. You see, I have come to realize that this body is oftentimes more interested in self-service than in public service, that corporate donors come before constituents, and that a union boss is more important than an American worker.

The right to work is as intrinsically American as the right to vote. No man or woman should be denied the fruits of his labor simply because they refuse to toe a partisan line. Each man and woman ought to be granted the dignity and respect to decide his own destiny.

This bill strips the right of self-determination away from the people and places it directly into the hands of the powerful. It is a shameful display of the very type of self-service that disgusts nearly every American outside of Washington, D.C.

This vote will reveal much about who we are elected to serve. Are we, as representatives of the people, elected to serve union management or our constituents?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with labor unions that, throughout history, have fought the greed of their bosses and corporations in order to have a better life.

I rise in solidarity with workers in the Marathon Petroleum plant in Minnesota who are striking for safer working conditions and with the workers at the Minneapolis Institute of Art, Walker Art Center, and many more workplaces that have recently unionized in my district.

I rise in solidarity with the 5,800 mostly Black workers in Alabama who are currently fighting one of the most predatory corporations in the world, Amazon, to form a union.

Labor unions have been the driving force for all positive change for workers in modern history. As a former union member myself, I can attest to the power that workers wield when they exercise their right to organize. That is why we need the PRO Act and why we must pass it this week and pressure the Senate to do the same.

The PRO Act puts power back where it belongs, in the hands of workers.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from National Nurses United.

NATIONAL NURSES UNITED,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, The House of Representatives is scheduled to vote on H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act this week. On behalf of the 170,000 nurses represented by National Nurses United, the largest union of registered nurses in the United States, we strongly urge you to vote YES on the PRO Act, which would implement critical improvements to current labor law in order to protect the right for workers to organize collectively and form a union.

A union gives workers the ability to act together to advocate for safe working conditions, to improve their wages and benefits, and to protect their workplace rights through collective bargaining and concerted activity. For registered nurses, union advocacy and representation allow us to focus on what we do best: caring for our patients. Across the country, nurses have been subject to intimidation and retaliation from their employers because of their efforts to unionize. The PRO Act would provide critical protections for nurses who want to organize collectively.

The dire need for this legislation has been made all the more clear during this pandemic as nurses have been forced to struggle

together for the most basic safety protections at their hospitals and clinics. The formation of a union in the hospital not only offers protections to nurses and other health care workers, but just as importantly, it leads to health and safety protections that improve patient care. For example, union organizing has led to improvements in infectious disease protocols, staffing levels, workplace violence prevention programs, and safe patient handling programs, all of which directly improve patient care.

Attacks on unions and the right to unionize have hurt efforts to protect patient care in the hospital, and to improve the lives of working families outside the hospital. While the latest Gallup poll shows support for unions at its highest point since 2003, with 65% of Americans approving of labor unions, these attacks on unions and the right to organize have continued unabated. The PRO Act would provide the legislative reform needed to protect American workers.

The PRO Act would have a direct impact on registered nurses and all other workers by making the following improvements to current labor law:

Prevent employers from interfering in union elections, including prohibiting employers from holding captive audience meetings;

Facilitate first contracts by requiring mediation and arbitration to settle disputes;

Strengthen support for workers who suffer retaliation and require the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to immediately seek an injunction to reinstate employees while their cases are pending;

Prevent employers from forcing employees to waive their right to collective or class-action litigation;

Close loopholes in the federal labor law that allows employers to deny pay, benefits, or workers' rights to employees;

Put an end to the misclassification of employees as supervisors or independent contractors;

Enhance the right to support boycotts, strikes, and other acts of solidarity.

This legislation is of high priority for registered nurses across the country, and we hope you will join with us in supporting it by voting yes. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our Lead Legislative Advocate.

Sincerely,

BONNIE CASTILLO, RN,
Executive Director, National Nurses United.
DEBORAH BURGER, RN,
President, National Nurses United.
ZENEI CORTEZ, RN,
President, National Nurses United.
JEAN ROSS, RN,
President, National Nurses United.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. FOXX for yielding time for me to speak today.

Even though I have family members who are members of unions, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 842, the PRO Act.

The PRO Act is an unnecessary challenge to the rights of business owners and workers alike. The legislation would eliminate right-to-work laws across our country, and Iowa has one of those. It is yet another attempt to attack States' rights.

Abolishing these laws would force workers to participate in and pay dues to unions, even if they don't wish to be represented or support a union's political philosophy.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle cared about workers' rights, why did this administration cancel the Keystone Pipeline and open our borders to a crisis?

Additionally, this bill would strike down other worker protections, including their ability to hold secret ballot elections and to be heard by the National Labor Relations Board, and would create burdensome guidelines for determining joint employment and independent contractor status.

We need to do more to support our workers and businesses and do it in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose the prounion boss act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and chair of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Over the years, Republicans and wealthy corporate interests have chipped away at labor rights, stripping workers of their power and worsening economic inequality in the process.

Since March 2020, as the pandemic has ravaged our communities, billionaires' wealth has grown by $1.3 trillion. Meanwhile, millions of Americans are still unemployed, and working families are struggling to pay for food, rent, medical bills, and other basic necessities.

It is time to put an end to antiunion activities. They are illegal power grabs by antilabor special interests that put profits over the needs of working people.

On our path to economic recovery, unions will offer us a way to build back our middle class stronger than ever before. Let's pass this bill to give more power to American workers, reduce economic inequality, and support working families.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights in support of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

Vote Yes on H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 220 national organizations to promote and protect the civil and human rights of all person in the United States, we urge you to vote YES on H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act of 2021. Protecting the right to collectively bargain is a top priority for the civil and human rights community, and The Leadership Conference will include your vote on H.R. 842 in our Voting Record for the 117th Congress.

Economic security is inextricably linked to civil and human rights, and enabling working people to exercise the right to form unions and engage in meaningful collective bargaining is one of the most effective, efficient, and comprehensive ways to promote economic security for individuals and their families. Unions allow working people to have a stronger voice to advocate for fair wages, safer working conditions, and better workplace standards. A working person covered by a union contract earns, on average, 11.2 percent more in wages than a nonunionized worker in the same sector with similar education and experience, and the gains are even more pronounced for workers of color. Black workers, for example, earn 14 percent more than their non-union counterparts, and Latino workers earn 20 percent more. Unions also help close race and gender wage gaps, and unionized workers enjoy safer workplaces, stronger health care benefits, more predictable work schedules, greater access to paid sick days, and better retirement benefits.

The benefits of unions have become even more pronounced during the COVID crisis. Too many essential workers during this pandemic have lacked basic protections on the job, leading to thousands of working people becoming infected with the coronavirus, some dying as a result. Many sites of coronavirus outbreaks during the pandemic were at workplaces that offered low-pay and limited, if any, benefits to workforces with large concentrations of people of color, women, and immigrants—communities, who because of decades of systemic discrimination, have fewer resources to withstand a health emergency. Working people with a union, however, were better able to negotiate enhanced health and safety measures, premium pay, and paid sick leave during this crisis. Research also shows that unionized workers have felt less fearful speaking out about health and safety hazards on the job.

Despite the right to form unions and collectively bargain, attacks on unions have led to a decline in the share of working people covered by collective bargaining agreements over the past 40 years, a trend that has mirrored the rise in income inequality in America. It is clear, however, that working people want to join unions. There is a 400 percent gap between the percentage of working people who say they want a union—48 percent—and the percentage of unionized workers, around 12 percent. Workers want unions because they have seen how having a collective voice allows them to win better pay and benefits, stronger health and safety protections, and more fairness on the job. The PRO Act would streamline the process for forming a union, ensure that new unions are able to negotiate a first collective bargaining agreement, and hold employers accountable when they violate workers' rights.

Though the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) was meant to encourage collective bargaining, in the 80 years since its passage, nearly every amendment to the law has made it harder for working people to form unions. This allows employers to take advantage of weaknesses in the law to undermine the rights of working people, including firing pro-union workers, holding mandatory meetings to bash unions, and refusing to bargain a first contract after a union is formed. These hostile behaviors, which occur at the expense of the employee, are often without consequence for the employer. The PRO Act seeks to remedy this imbalance by bolstering workers' rights and creating accountability for employers that engage in anti-union behavior.

The PRO Act would reform existing labor laws and protect the right to join a union by:

Imposing stronger remedies when employers interfere with workers' rights. The PRO

Act would institute civil penalties for violations of the NLRA and would also require the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to go to court for an injunction to immediately reinstate terminated workers if the NLRB believes an employer has illegally retaliated against workers for union activity. The PRO Act would also give workers the right to go to court on their own to seek relief, bringing labor law in line with other workplace laws that allow for a private right of action.

Strengthening workers' right to join a union and collectively bargain over working conditions. The PRO Act would prohibit employers from holding mandatory anti-union meetings and engaging in other coercive anti-union tactics. The law would establish a process for reaching a first agreement when workers organize, employing mediation, and then, if necessary, binding arbitration. The PRO Act would also allow employers and unions to agree upon a ''fair share'' clause requiring all workers who are covered by the collective bargaining agreement to contribute a fair share fee towards the cost of bargaining and administering the agreement, even in so-called ''right-to-work'' states. The PRO Act will also help level the playing field for workers by repealing the prohibition on secondary boycotts and prohibiting employers from firing workers during lawful strikes.

Unrigging the rules that are tilted against workers. The PRO Act tightens the definitions of independent contractor and supervisor to help prevent misclassification and make sure that all eligible workers can unionize if they choose to do so. The PRO Act also makes clear that workers can have more than one employer, and that both employers need to engage in collective bargaining over the terms and conditions of employment that they control or influence. To create transparency in labor-management relations, the PRO Act would require employers to post notices that inform workers of their NRLA rights and to disclose contracts with consultants hired to persuade workers on how to exercise their rights.

Through organizing, bargaining, litigation, legislative, and political advocacy, unions and the labor movement have played a significant role in advancing the rights and interests of people of color and women in the workplace and in our society overall. Unions can best play this role when the right of workers to organize and bargain is fully protected and can be freely exercised.

Working people in America need—and have a right to enjoy—the benefits that result from collective bargaining and union membership. We urge you to vote yes on H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021, to help ensure that working people are paid fairly, treated with dignity, and have a voice on the job.

Sincerely,

WADE HENDERSON,
Interim President and CEO.
LASHAWN WARREN,
Executive Vice President for Government Affairs.

□ 1315

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER.)

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the PRO Act.

The bill is nothing more than a payoff to union bosses at the expense of the American workers and our businesses.

This bill would abolish States' right-to-work laws, like ours in Tennessee. This would force workers to give money to unions from their hard-earned paychecks, even if they don't want union representation.

Where do these union contributions end up?

Well, let me tell you: with left-wing political activist groups. $1.6 billion—and that is billion, with a B—in union member dues went to these groups between 2010 and 2018 alone.

Last week, the Democrats passed a bill to direct tax dollars to political campaigns. And if that wasn't enough, now they are trying to force more workers to pay union dues so union bosses have more cash to funnel as political donations to left-wing groups.

So let me ask you, America: Should Members of Congress be able to tell others how to do their jobs and who can employ you? I think not.

This bill is just another progressive power grab, and American workers and businesses deserve better.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the most important pro-labor legislation in several generations, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, otherwise known as the PRO Act.

For far too long, the deck has been stacked against the right to freely organize and collectively bargain. We have seen the result. Despite massive gains in productivity and economic growth, working- and middle-class American workers' purchasing power and real wages have barely moved from where they were 40 years ago. Meanwhile, the gains that were created by those workers have flowed overwhelmingly to the super wealthy at the very top.

Let's level the playing field and give America's workers a seat at the table. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the PRO Act, and I urge the Senate to pass it and get it to the President's desk for signature.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will make four points on this bill.

First of all, under this bill, you can have a vote on unionization within under 15—I am told even 11—days of finding out the vote is coming. You look at our elections. I know in the State of Wisconsin, probably similar, you get over 2½ months between filing and knowing you are going to have an election and actually the election. It is hard to believe anybody who really cares about the worker would do that.

Secondly, your privacy concerns. You are even giving the addresses of all of the employees to the unions. This is supposedly the party of women. Do you really want to come home at night and have people in your driveway wanting to talk to you about an election?

Third, we are getting rid of the secret ballot. I don't know how anybody who cares about anybody would get rid of the secret ballot.

And, fourth, you have a situation here, when it is unclear whether something right or wrong happened, automatically you go to a union. So you can have a situation here in which the majority of people did not vote for a union, and the government bureaucrat says, automatically, you are unionized.

And one final comment: For people talking about purchasing power, the most recent COVID bill is a strange bill. Your purchasing power is going down.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees.

INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE OF
THEATRICAL STAGE EMPLOYEES,
New York, NY, March 8, 2021.

Re H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to you on behalf of the over 127,000 American members of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE) to urge you to support H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, and to oppose any weakening amendments or motion to recommit when the U.S. House of Representatives considers the bill this week.

The IATSE proudly represents behind-the-scenes workers in all forms of live theater, motion picture and television production, trade shows and exhibitions, television broadcasting, and concerts, as well as the equipment and construction shops that support these areas of the entertainment industry. The ongoing COVID–19 pandemic has put millions out of work and threatens the safety of countless others. Over the course of the last year, we have seen that belonging to a union can, quite literally, be the difference between life and death on the job. The time to act is now.

Labor unions are under assault, with policies across the country undermining workers' collective bargaining rights and stripping union workers of the wages, benefits, and retirement security they deserve. The PRO Act would help level the playing field in an economy pillaged by inequality and anti-worker legislation and would make the freedom to negotiate collectively a reality for millions of American workers.

The PRO Act, which passed the House with bipartisan support last year, will restore the original intent of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), which was to give working people a voice on the job so they can negotiate for higher wages, better benefits, a safe workplace and protection against discrimination.

Among its key provisions, the PRO Act gives the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) authority to ensure employers not only negotiate in good faith but incur financial and legal penalties for union-busting. The status quo gives employers perverse incentives to lie, threaten, and coerce workers out of joining a union. They routinely fire union supporters and force workers to attend mandatory ''captive audience meetings'' where they slander union membership.

Too often, when workers choose to form a union, employers stall the bargaining process to avoid reaching an agreement. The

PRO Act would establish a process for mediation and arbitration to help the parties achieve a first contract. Employers would also be prohibited from hiding behind subcontractors, or deliberately misclassifying employees as independent contractors, to evade their responsibilities of providing a livable wage, health benefits, or safe work environment.

The bill protects the right to strike and makes it illegal for bosses to fire and replace workers who walk off the job in protest of better conditions. Workers must be allowed to picket and withhold their labor in order to have the power necessary to improve their workplaces.

Finally, this crucial piece of legislation eliminates the ''right-to-work'' laws of the Jim Crow era that enable union ''free riders'' and ultimately put lives at risk. Each year, dubious special interest groups and their billionaire funders push these laws to give corporations even greater power at the expense of American workers. The last seven decades have shown that people in states with right-to-work laws receive lower wages and reduced access to quality health care and retirement security.

The passage of the PRO Act is an important step to rebuilding America's working class, not just from the policy failures of the last few decades, but also the ongoing COVID–19 pandemic. This crisis has shown the importance of having a voice in the workplace and support for labor unions is at a historic high. Recent studies have found that nearly half of all nonunion workers, more than 60 million people, would join a union today if given the chance. This is that chance. That is why I urge you to support the PRO Act when it comes before you for a vote on the House floor.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW D. LOEB,
International President.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, the PRO Act puts workers first.

During the COVID–19 pandemic, almost all of the critical sectors of our economy that have remained open and functioning have relied on union labor and union workers. They are our frontline workers.

We depend on frontline workers in our hospitals, in our transit systems, in our classrooms, our schools, in our essential businesses, like supermarkets and corner stores. Frontline workers are, indeed, essential workers.

Every time you go to any of my neighborhoods in Harlem, East Harlem, Hamilton Heights, Washington Heights, Inwood, and the northwest Bronx, you find these essential workers, 24/7, working to support their families and our communities.

The PRO Act puts workers first with the respect and protections and security that they deserve. I urge my colleagues to support the PRO Act. No more lip service. No more empty promises. Let's vote for the PRO Act today.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ).

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 842.

Like many other bills in this Congress, the majority has rushed this bill to the floor with no deliberation in committee.

To be clear, I have never opposed union rights to organize. In fact, I have worked with them on some valid issues. However, this bill, among its many concerning provisions, denies States' rights.

As a former State senator, I believe it is unconstitutional to deny my State of Indiana and our constituents the ability to decide for themselves whether to join a union.

In short, the PRO Act is an antibusiness, antiworker, and antifree enterprise socialist agenda. I urge my colleagues to vote against this radical bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as we gather here today to pass the PRO Act, we are engaged in a great act of patriotism for our country.

The middle class is the backbone of our democracy. The middle class in America has a union label on it. So as we move to strengthen collective bargaining and the rest, we are strengthening our middle class and our democracy. For that reason, I rise with great pride as the House takes this historic patriotic step forward for our workers and for justice and fairness in America.

I thank Chairman BOBBY SCOTT, the chair of the Education and Labor Committee, for his leadership in the PRO Act, among other things, and his lifelong dedication to fighting for working families.

That is what unifies us as Democrats. With all of our differences, our unity springs from our commitment to making progress for America's working families.

This progress is possible, because just over 4 months ago, Americans went to the polls and elected President Biden, a champion of workers, whose commitment to families' health and financial security is in his DNA.

The elected Democratic majorities in Congress know that unions are the backbone of our Nation. And as I have said for many years, the middle class has a union label on it. It bears repeating.

Now, House Democrats are honoring that truth by, tomorrow, passing the American Rescue Plan, which honors our heroes, healthcare workers, first responders, transportation, sanitation, food workers, and our teachers, many of them members of unions.

Today, we are passing the crown jewel of our pro-worker agenda, the PRO Act.

Again, under the American Rescue Plan, we have a very significant provision for pensions.

The PRO Act restores and strengthens the powers of unions to fight for better wages and working conditions, which is both a moral and economic imperative for building back better—building back our economy better.

Unions pave the way for bigger paychecks for all, over the last 80 years, consistently providing workers with 10 to 20 percent higher wages, benefits so strong that even nonunion workers receive better wages.

Unions deliver greater access to affordable healthcare and a secure retirement. Workers represented by a union are significantly more likely to have access to health insurance through work and five times as likely to have a defined benefit pension—and that, with Mr. SCOTT's leadership, is a significant part of the American Rescue Plan, which we will pass either later today, depending on how long it takes in the Rules Committee, or tomorrow at the latest.

Vitally, unions are a force for justice. Union members of color have almost five times the median wealth of their nonunion counterparts, and unions are one of the most effective tools for closing the gender pay gap. That is something I am so proud of and so grateful to organized labor for, because they have done more to close the gender pay gap than any organization you can name, except possibly, pretty soon, this Congress may vote to have equal pay for equal work. That is something we have passed in the House; hopefully, we can pass it in the Senate.

Yet today, unions face a brutal and existential assault waged from courthouses, State houses, and even this House: from the disastrous Supreme Court ruling in Janus, which trampled over the freedoms of more than 17 million public workers; to so-called right-to-work laws, which give employers the right to gut unions; to the GOP tax scam, giving 83 percent of the benefits to corporations and the wealthy and raising taxes on 86 million middle-class families.

Let me just say that that GOP tax scam, which cost about $1.9 trillion—I will talk about this later, but I want to mention it here every chance I get. Their tax scam cost about $1.9 trillion, exactly what this bill invests in, and this bill takes half the kids in America who are poor, out of poverty, a third of the people in poverty out of poverty, invests in working-class families, puts vaccines in people's arms, children back in school safely, money in people's pockets, and, again, people back to work. It is something that will grow the economy, as opposed to their tax scam, which just heaped mountains of debt onto future generations.

They didn't complain when it cost $1.9 trillion to give a tax break to the rich. They are just complaining when we are trying to lift the American people up in the time of a pandemic, as well as the economic crisis that accompanies it.

At the same time of all this, workers seeking to organize a union face a surge of intimidation and retaliation from the employers and special interests. In fact, employers are charged with violating Federal law in the majority of all union election campaigns involving more than 60 employees. In

one out of five union election campaigns, employers are charged with illegally firing a worker participating in a union activity. Year in and year out, big corporate employers get away with their crimes. No accountability, no consequence; just full impunity.

We must strengthen the power of unions to negotiate for what they need and deserve, which is why, today, we are passing the PRO Act, because what they need and deserve is what America's workers need and deserve.

The most comprehensive, consequential pro-worker legislation in over 80 years, the PRO Act empowers workers to exercise their basic right to organize, including by giving workers the power to override right-to-work laws and streamlining access to justice for workers who are retaliated against.

It holds employers accountable, reversing an unacceptable status quo in which there are no monetary penalties for companies that violate workers' rights, no matter how repeated or egregious the violation.

□ 1330

And it strengthens workers' access to fair and free union elections, fixing a process that is fundamentally rigged against workers so that they, not employers, can decide for themselves whether to join a union.

This legislation will make a tremendous difference in workers' lives, helping combat the acceleration of economic inequality that undermines the middle class, which has only grown worse over the past year.

In this past year, the rich have gotten so much richer. Let me tell you how much. During the first 4 months of the pandemic, while workers suffered record high unemployment, Mr. Speaker, American billionaires' wealth grew by $931 billion. Extraction of money to the top.

The PRO Act is part of the Democrats' mission not only to recover from this time of crisis, but to Build Back Better, advancing an economy that works for every American in every ZIP Code.

As the AFL–CIO, representing over 12 million workers, writes, ''In the midst of a global pandemic, which has killed tens of thousands of frontline workers, it is more important than ever that working people have the right to rely on the protection of a union contract. The PRO Act will level the playing field to give workers a fair shot when fighting for improvements on the job . . . The PRO Act is the first step to restoring our middle class.''

As we pass the PRO Act, Democrats will continue our work to pass a $15 minimum wage, secure paycheck fairness for women—that is coming up in a couple of weeks—protect pensions—tomorrow—and lower healthcare costs and increase paychecks for all.

I have a sweater that one of my friends gave me, and it says ''We don't agonize, we organize.'' So I want to also embroider on there, ''We don't agonize, we organize, we unionize,'' because that is the way that we are going to level the playing field for America's workers.

For America's workers and middle class and for the financial security of all Americans, I urge a strong bipartisan vote on the PRO Act.

I thank the gentleman again, our distinguished chair, Mr. SCOTT, for his leadership.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we know that hyperbole is the strong suit of Democrats, but how anyone can say that giving freedom to workers to join or not join a union is trampling the rights of workers takes hyperbole to new heights.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong opposition to this bill, which would cripple American entrepreneurs and workers, just the opposite of what we should be doing to stimulate an economy.

Workers already have the right to organize under Federal law, as they should, but the PRO Act takes the extreme step of forcing unionization onto workers who do not wish to be a part of a union.

And just like the recent $2 trillion spending spree, Democrats are ramming this partisan bill through with no Republican input. We didn't even have a committee hearing to examine its harmful effects, including an estimated $47 billion on job creators.

Unfortunately, one of my commonsense amendments—to preserve a longstanding ban on secondary boycotts—was blocked by the Democrat majority.

Democrats would be wise to heed President Biden's message of unity and work with Republicans to help our economy. Instead, they are back this week with more partisan bills designed to appease left-wing special interest groups. American workers deserve better.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN), the vice chair of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, we live in a country where CEOs can make as much as 320 times what their workers make. We live in a country where 1 percent—the top 1 percent economically controls more wealth than the bottom 90 percent of our country. We live in a country where three individuals own more wealth than the bottom 50 percent of our Nation. In a democracy with a Constitution such as ours, this economic inequality cannot stand.

The PRO Act seeks to empower workers, workers who built this country with their blood, sweat, and tears, who work overtime and extra time and weekends and do not take a vacation so that our economy can thrive. The PRO Act gives workers the opportunity to unionize and organize without being oppressed within the plantation capitalist system. I rise to ask bipartisan support of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support for this legislation from the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union.

UFCW,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

Re UFCW Action: Vote YES on H.R. 8421|Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act.

DEAR SENATOR AND/OR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.3 million members of the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW), I urge you to vote ''yes'' on the Protecting the Right to Organize Act when it comes to the House floor and oppose any motions to reconsider or weaking amendments. UFCW members are essential frontline workers risking their lives to keep food on our tables, grocery shelves stocked, and our prescriptions filled during this pandemic. By strengthening the right to organize, collectively bargain, and keep our workplaces safe, the PRO Act will provide a better life for our current and future members. We will be scoring this vote.

Workers face many difficulties on the job including hazardous working conditions, diminishing value of benefits, and stagnating wages. The best way for workers to increase workplace safety, wages, and benefits is to form a union—however, the right to organize has been eroded. The PRO Act would modernize the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to strengthen the rights of workers to organize, place meaningful penalties on employers who violate workers' rights, and return power to workers to bargaining for fairer wages, benefits, and working conditions.

The UFCW believes that restoring our middle class is dependent on strengthening the collective strength of workers to negotiate for better pay and benefits. Please vote ''yes'' on the PRO Act and help us build an economy that works for all working families.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. PERRONE,
International President.
SHAUN BARCLAY,
International Secretary-Treasurer.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 14½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 842, the so-called PRO Act. This bill undermines worker privacy, forces independent contractors to become employees, and overturns right-to-work laws in 27 States, including my home State of Idaho.

The bill obstructs workers from getting rid of corrupt unions by blocking or delaying elections from taking place due to frivolous lawsuits.

Now, I have an amendment. It is unlikely to see the light of day. So I will mention it here. It protects the worker's right to vote. Under my amendment, if an unfair labor practice charge

is made, the election still takes place, with ballots secured by the National Labor Relations Board until the charge is resolved.

Now, make no mistake, H.R. 842 would still be a bad bill, but at least my amendment would ensure union elections take place as scheduled, prioritizing worker rights over the unionization process.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's amendment was made in order, so we will be considering it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), the chair of the Workforce Protections Subcommittee.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

Workers, especially people of color, built this country, and they have kept it afloat. Never has that truth been more evident than now, as we grapple with the COVID–19 pandemic.

Despite their essential roles in our society, though, we have seen workers' rights systematically suppressed for decades, including the fundamental right to ban together to organize and to advocate for fair treatment, for fair pay, and benefits for safe and healthy work environments, and for the respect and dignity they are due as working people, let alone the backbone of our economy.

But, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, let's be clear. This is not just about fairness. It is about justice, economic justice. Workers, especially women and people of color, have driven economic growth in this country, but have seen the fruit of their labor concentrating and accumulating in the hands of the wealthiest. In other words, their work, their sacrifice has not trickled down.

Enough is enough. Workers deserve their share. They deserve justice. I strongly support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Laborers' International Union of North America.

LIUNA!,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 500,000 members of the Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA), I write to ask you to support H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, when it comes to the House floor for a vote. The right to join a union is critical to ensure that workers receive fair pay and benefits and safe jobsites. The PRO Act will expand the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to ensure that workers and unions have real, enforceable protections under the law.

One of the most significant problems with the NLRA is the absence of effective remedies for workers against employers who break the law. Often, employers fire union supporters to defeat union organizing efforts, knowing that the penalty is low, only lost wages, and even that is reduced by the amount the worker earns on any other work that he or she finds after getting fired. H.R. 842 will address this serious problem by authorizing the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to impose penalties of up to $50,000 for unfair labor practices.

The PRO Act strengthens enforcement of the NLRA in other important ways. For example, the PRO Act allows workers to exercise First Amendment rights to free speech against so-called secondary employers. It strengthens workers' and unions' representational rights and protects immigrants' labor rights. Significantly, it adopts the so-called ABC test for distinguishing employees from independent contractors. Under the Bill, a person is an independent contractor only if the individual is free from the employer's control and direction, the service is outside the normal course of the employer's business, and the individual is customarily engaged in an independently established trade or business. H.R. 842 will also prevent employers from misclassifying workers as supervisors and will establish that employers with control over employees are held responsible for their actions in the workplace, including users of temp agencies. This addresses an important circumstance, since three million people are employed daily by temp agencies. The PRO Act would also ban captive audience meetings, giving workers the power and freedom to decide for themselves if union representation is right for them. Importantly, the PRO Act would push back on the recent so-called right to work laws, which harm unions and our members, by allowing unions to recover fair share fees covering the costs of collective bargaining and representation.

For these reasons, and for the many other improvements to labor law in the Bill, LIUNA supports the PRO Act and asks you to vote yes when it comes to the House floor.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

TERRY O'SULLIVAN,
General President.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. STEEL).

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today against the PRO Act.

The PRO Act strips people of their right to work and comes at a time when our economy has been transformed by the COVID–19 pandemic. Now more than ever, people need more flexibility and independence to work in the capacity they see fit, not less.

Independent contractors, entrepreneurs, and small businesses in my home State of California already understand the devastating effects AB–5 had on their ability to provide for their families. Even in California, they realized there needed to be exceptions for certain industries. The PRO Act makes no such exceptions.

The blanket approach that proved to be a disaster in California is certainly guaranteed to cause more harm to workers at the national level.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this misguided legislation and to preserve our constituents' rights to work.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the PRO Act, which protects a worker's right to join a union.

This is not just an issue of economic justice, as we seek to restore power to the people, as we experience an era of entrenched corporate power, and as members of this very body dare to debate the need for a $15 minimum wage.

This is also an issue of racial justice. History shows that unions help to reduce the racial wage gap by empowering Black and Brown workers to fight for better pay and better working conditions; but, due to Republican policies, much of that progress has been lost.

Today, we are seeing the increasing exploitation of workers of color. Antiunion policies have hurt Black and Brown workers the most. Today, people of color are the most likely to be exploited by greedy corporations.

We cannot achieve racial justice without economic justice, and we can't achieve economic justice without protecting all of our workers and their right to organize.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this proworker bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 842, the prounion bosses' act.

First off, Americans have the right to organize and join a union if they choose to do so, and United States law has protected this freedom for over 80 years.

My father was a machinist and a union organizer for part of his career, and I worked for a time at U.S. Steel South Works on the south side of Chicago, a union steelworker.

Unions have and can still play a valuable role in our Nation's workforce. However, any reforms we make to our labor laws should put workers first. Unfortunately, the radical, partisan legislation we are considering today grants unprecedented power to union leaders at the expense of workers.

We have seen what can happen when union leaders abuse the trust of their rank-and-file members. Most recently, a Federal investigation into the United Autoworkers revealed an extensive and long-lasting effort by two former UAW presidents and their subordinates to embezzle over $1.5 million in UAW money for their personal benefit.

Sadly, the sweeping proposals of this bill will only increase the likelihood of abuse similar.

Mr. Speaker, the hardworking families we represent deserve better than the legislation before us. Let's elevate and protect the rights of workers with a union that serves them instead of tipping the scales against them in favor of special interests and union leaders who serve themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to H.R. 842.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reference was made to union officials at the UAW. They were caught and prosecuted under present law. The Trump administration that prosecuted them did not make any recommendations for changes in the law.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I stand in favor of the PRO Act. And what a perfect acronym it is, because this bill is, indeed, proworker, procapitalism, proeconomic recovery, profamily, prowomen, just pro-American.

I am proud to represent a State with a large union presence, a large organized labor presence that has over 161,000 union members, just as I am proud to vote for this bill.

We have seen firsthand how unions enable workers to have better pay, better benefits, better working conditions. Unions also help address the gender wage gap and promote diversity. Indeed, they are the tide that lifts all ships; yet, across the country, the right to unionize has come under assault.

In the face of these attacks, the PRO Act is the strongest upgrade to workers' collective bargaining rights in nearly a century.

□ 1345

It will empower workers to exercise their rights and hold employers accountable when they try to stand in the way.

I include in the RECORD a letter from UNITE HERE also in support of the PRO Act.

UNITEHERE!,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Las Vegas, NV, March 9, 2021.

Re Support the PRO Act (H.R. 842).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I urge you to support the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, H.R. 842. Like President Biden, the workers we organize in the casino, hotel, and food service industries believe the union is the path to the middle class. The PRO Act will remove many obstacles to joining a union and achieving a union contract through collective bargaining. It will give millions of workers a real opportunity to lift up themselves and their families into the American middle class.

One of the most significant provisions of the PRO Act is to introduce meaningful, enforceable penalties for breaking federal labor law. President Biden has spoken forcefully for the need to hold corporate executives personally accountable for interfering in union elections and violating other labor laws. We should hold corporate decision makers personally responsible in order to protect employees against illegal anti-union actions just as we hold executives responsible in order to protect investors against illegal financial reporting practices under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.

In Las Vegas, workers at the Station Casinos chain have fought for over a decade to unionize. These workers—cooks, food servers, bartenders, cocktail servers, porters, hotel housekeepers—have seen their efforts thwarted every step of the way by Station Casinos. The company and its two billionaire owners have faced little consequence for the company's long-running anti-union campaign of threats, intimidation, promises, and other interference in employees' efforts to exercise their right to join a union as well as Trumpian refusals to recognize workers' democratic decisions to unionize without costly litigation. The experience of Station Casinos workers shows exactly why it is vitally important to pass the PRO Act to provide for real penalties to corporate and executive wrongdoing when it comes to worker rights.

In September 2012, the National Labor Relations Board ruled that Station Casinos broke the law dozens of times in its initial response to worker organizing at its Las Vegas casinos. As a remedy, the NLRB required the company to post a notice at all its properties promising not to do so again. Given this mere slap on the wrist by the government, it is perhaps unsurprising that Station Casinos would continue to use certain of the same tactics to oppose unionization that it promised it would not engage in.

Notwithstanding their employer's opposition, Station Casinos workers persevered and won NLRB-conducted representation elections at several of the companies' properties. They did so amidst Station Casinos' ongoing anti-union campaign: at Boulder Station, 67% of workers voted Yes to joining the union in September 2016; 78% voted Yes for the union at Green Valley Ranch Casino in November 2017; 83% voted Yes at Palms Casino in April 2018; 82% voted Yes at Sunset Station in June 2019; 85% voted Yes at Fiesta Rancho Casino in June 2019; and 57% voted Yes at Fiesta Henderson Casino in September 2019.

But these election victories have not led to bargaining victories. Station Casinos refused to accept the results of several of these landslide results. Instead it mounted a time-consuming litigation campaign through the NLRB and, in two instances, the courts, seeking to overturn workers' democratic choices. It did so despite public statements that it would respect the results of NLRB elections.

Even after Station Casinos stopped litigating election results and started to negotiate with the union, it has made massive unilateral changes in what the Union alleges is an effort to frustrate the possibility of reaching collective bargaining agreements. While the Union expects that the NLRB's Acting General Counsel's office will do everything in his power to address these alleged unfair labor practices, he still has no better remedies available to him than when Station Casinos was first cited with lawbreaking in 2012.

Years of facing no real consequences culminated in a frenzied campaign by Station Casinos to stop workers at its largest property, Red Rock Resort, from voting for the union in December 2019. The company's action was so brazen and egregious that the NLRB is currently seeking a rare federal court injunction against it. But it should not have gotten to this point for there to be potentially real consequences for a company that repeatedly breaks federal labor law. Recidivism should have consequences.

Station Casinos has been able to attack its employee's federal rights to organize and collectively bargain for years with impunity because the company and its decision makers—ultimately its billionaire owners—have not had to pay, literally and figuratively, for management's breaking the law, denying workers' right to organize, and refusing to recognize the democratic decision to unionize.

The PRO Act would begin to change this unfair situation by putting real teeth into the National Labor Relations Act, including permitting the NLRB to impose personal liability on corporate directors and officers who participate in violations of workers' rights or have knowledge of and fail to prevent such violations. This and other changes are necessary to change the anti-union behavior of those who are insulated from the consequences of lawbreaking by their enormous amount of legal and other resources at their disposal.

Real monetary penalties and personal liability—including jail time, as President Biden has argued—are what will make corporate decision makers understand that it is the national policy of the United States, enshrined in the National Labor Relations Act, to encourage unionization and collective bargaining. With the PRO Act, we can begin to modernize our legal system to advance American workers' rights to organize and collectively bargain in accordance with that national policy.

I urge you to vote Yes on the PRO Act.

Sincerely,

D. TAYLOR,
President.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, unions make American companies less efficient, less profitable, less competitive, and they cost American jobs.

I actually worked in a unionized auto factory during college, and I saw the problems with unions firsthand.

Unions protect the unproductive worker; diminish the incentive to stand out and be exceptional; treat everyone the same based on seniority; encourage an entitlement mentality; and foster an attitude of resentment toward management.

They have outlived their value from when they originated to correct what are now unfair and unlawful labor practices.

Every employee should be inspired to progress within an organization without at some point stepping over to the dark side because they become stigmatized as a member of management.

The PRO Act is an example of government, or this very Congress, employing its own union boss tactics to try to reverse the Nation's downward trend in union membership.

It is no coincidence that unions are among the biggest contributors to the Democrat party with over $200 million given last year alone.

Every State should be a right-to-work State, and that is what we should encourage instead of trying to force union membership on the Nation's workers.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the aggressive concentration of wealth in corporate boardrooms, the unending attacks on unions and their attempts to organize, and the passage of so-called right-to-work laws, which we now know are really the right-to-deprivation laws, have left America's workers begging for scraps, rather than receiving the fair compensation and full benefits they deserve.

My father was a proud member of the Ironworkers Union. He showed up every day and worked hard, erecting buildings and bridges across New England.

And while he was at work, he knew that his union was fighting to defend him and his brothers and sisters and their families by looking out for our interests at the negotiating table.

It is thanks to the strong benefits and wages secured by his union that my parents were able to provide for my sisters and me.

The PRO Act is about making sure that other families have that same chance. It is about restoring dignity and power to where it belongs: with our workers.

After all, it is our workers who kept us afloat, fed, housed, and safe this last year. For that I urge this bill's passage.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees in support of this bill.

AFSCME,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I urge you to vote Yes on the ''Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act'' (H.R. 842). As the largest public-sector union our members believe that all workers, both private and public sector, deserve the right to organize and bargain collectively to improve their working conditions.

Workers need a voice on the job now more than ever before. Since the beginning of the pandemic, unions have advocated for workers' safety and protections. Nurses, teachers, first responders, bus drivers, grocery store workers and other essential workers were in desperate need of personal protective equipment and the right to use paid leave to self-quarantine or take care of someone who might have been affected, which unions fought for. Unions also helped to prevent layoffs and furloughs to save jobs and win additional premium pay and paid sick time.

The value that unions provide to workers and their families creates a strong middle class that makes the economy work for all Americans. With high unemployment and people struggling to make ends meet, it is important to strengthen workers' rights and the ability to organize. On average, a worker covered by a union contract earns 11.2 percent more in wages than a worker in a non-union workplace in the same sector. Living wages and benefits with union jobs can lead to job competition with nonunion jobs, helping to strengthen local economies.

The PRO Act strengthens federal laws that protect workers' rights to organize and collectively bargain for wages, paid leave, health insurance, retirement benefits, and workplace protections and safety. The bill increases penalties for employers that violate workers' rights. It strengthens support for workers who suffer retaliation. It prevents employers from misclassifying employees, and it prohibits employers from interfering in union elections.

AFSCME strongly urges Congress to pass the PRO Act to build back our country and to get us out of this economic crisis stronger than before.

Sincerely,

BAILEY K. CHILDERS,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is further proof that there is virtually no distinction between the Democratic Party and unions as a political organization.

In 1 week, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are bailing out failed union pensions with tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer moneys, and now they are forcing States and workers into this failed union system.

This bill is definitely prounion, but it is antiworker, anticompetitive, and antifreedom. This bill forces workers into unions, forces them to pay union dues. It deprives them of their right to privacy. It forces workers to divulge their personal information to their union bosses. What a racket. It would wreak havoc on our workers.

Talk is cheap, Mr. Speaker, and the American worker isn't buying this empty political rhetoric. They understand the best way to protect workers is through progrowth, America-first policies that give our workers more freedom, more opportunity, and more of their hard-earned money in their pockets.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), the co-chair of the Labor Caucus.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the PRO Act.

This bill supports workers in this country by implementing meaningful and enforceable penalties for companies that violate workers' rights.

It expands accessibility to collective bargaining and closes loopholes used to exploit workers while strengthening workers' access to fair union elections.

Unions are the bedrock of our Nation's prosperity and success. Many of us have been impacted by their good work. Healthcare benefits, pensions, safe working conditions, vacations, and holidays, teacher-to-student ratios, nurse-to-patient ratios were all negotiated and pushed forward by unions. Too many of us take for granted benefits that we enjoy because of hard-fought battles by unions.

A January 2021 Bureau of Labor Statistics report highlights that nonunion worker median weekly earnings were 84 percent of earnings for workers who were union members. Further research also underscores that strong unions lead to higher wages for all workers, regardless of their union status.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS, AFL-CIO & CLC,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of 90,000 workers represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), we urge you to vote for the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021, H.R. 842 (PRO Act). The bipartisan PRO Act, sponsored by House Education and Labor Chair Bobby Scott, restores the original intent of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 (NLRA) and levels the playing field between workers who want to form unions and employers who exploit weaknesses in the current law to frustrate union organizing drives and interfere with workers' legal rights to organize and bargain collectively.

If enacted, the PRO Act would counter the all-too-common anti-union intimidation tactics that workers who are organizing a union are subjected to. For example, upwards of 50 professionals employed by Animal Legal Defense Fund (ALDF) are currently voting by mail to form a union with the Nonprofit Professional Employees Union-IFPTE Local 70 (NPEU) so that they can have a voice in creating a workplace that is anti-racist, cooperative, equitable, inclusive, just, respectful, and transparent. These are attorneys, legislative affairs professionals, and communications professionals whose personal and professional dedication to their work ties their working conditions to ALDF's mission. Unfortunately, the employer's anti-union campaign has included spending undisclosed resources to hire an anti-union firm to engage in some of the very anti-worker behavior that this bill seeks to correct. This includes activities such as weekly coercive union avoidance meetings and anti-union communication filled with misinformation, intimidation aimed at discouraging union activity, as well as misclassifying employees as management ahead of the unionization vote.

This bill meaningfully restores workers' rights to determine for themselves if they want a union by providing a fair process for union recognition if the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) determines that the employer illegally interfered with the union representation election. Provisions in the bill also allow the union or the employer to request a mediation-arbitration process for first contract negotiations that take longer than 90 days. Language in this bill that prohibits captive audience meetings and reinstates the requirement that employers disclose the hiring of and compensation for anti-union consultants will help workers make informed choices when they receive information from their employers. By clarifying and updating the NLRA's definitions for employee, supervisor, and employer, the PRO Act clarifies the definition of joint employer and closes loopholes that allow employers to misclassify workers. Furthermore, this bill gives the NLRB the authority to conduct economic analysis as it sets policies and regulations, increases penalties against employers who violate the NLRA, requires employers to reinstate workers while the NLRB investigates the retaliatory firing, and gives unions the ability to collect fair-share fees.

For all the reasons above, IFPTE requests you vote for the PRO Act. We urge you to vote against any amendments that weaken sections of the bill, especially sections that prohibit and prevent the misclassification of workers. Further, IFPTE is hopeful that the Rules Committee makes in order and the House approves Rep. Andy Levin's SAFE Act as a part of the underlying bill. The inclusion of this provision would remove the long-standing NLRB prohibition against administering union elections electronically.

Thank you for considering our request. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact either of us.

Sincerely,

PAUL SHEARON,
President.
MATTHEW BIGGS,
Secretary-Treasurer/ Legislative Director.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member on the committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the PRO Act of 2021.

Out of many features that would hurt employees and economic growth in Arkansas in this bill is a hostile practice

banned by the National Labor Relations Act of 1959. This bill fully resurrects it.

Yet, these unfair practices continued post-1959 in the construction industry.

For example, Mr. Speaker, in 2004 the Eighth Circuit heard a hot cargo agreement case. In exchange for a no-strike pledge, a construction firm agreed to perform the work and agreed it would hire union workers, but they hired a subcontractor, who, while they didn't sign the agreement, agreed to use union labor anyway. They went on strike, Mr. Speaker, even though they hired union workers. This is the kind of unfair approach that does not deserve to be enshrined in this bill. As a result, the contractor received a cease and desist demand and workers lost the opportunity to work.

I tried to amend this bill to remove this hot cargo bad idea, but the amendment was rejected by House Democrats.

This is an example of how this party wants to go back to 1959 and instill this for all workers across our Nation. We need to oppose this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA).

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act.

Workers sacrifice so much to keep our country going during this pandemic. They risk their safety, and many have lost their lives.

But workers everywhere are also organizing to improve their working conditions and keep our communities safe.

This bill simply guarantees the right to fight for safety and dignity on the job.

It is for Amazon workers in my neighborhood in Chicago fighting for their safety on the warehouse floor; for nurses demanding safe staffing levels in hospitals and nursing homes; for rideshare drivers and delivery workers who don't even have basic rights at work.

I urge this body to pass the PRO Act for them and for all of us.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. FOXX for yielding.

I rise today in support of our Nation's workers and businesses. We must find ways to work together to help our economy recover from COVID–19.

However, this bill is not the answer, and it is not even close. This bill will nationalize the disastrous California policies that have forced businesses out of my State, killed jobs, and hurt workers.

As we saw in California, businesses that can afford lobbyists eventually get carveouts, while small businesses are left holding the bag.

The last thing we should be doing during this time is passing legislation that will kill jobs and make our recovery even harder. From Uber and Lyft drivers to financial advisers to local artists, we should support workers' freedom, our gig economy, and create policies to promote innovation.

We should learn from the failings of AB–5 in California and vote ''no'' on the PRO Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the earlier speakers said: ''This is the most dramatic change in labor law in 80 years.'' And I say: ''Thank God.''

In the late seventies, a CEO's earnings were 35 times that of the worker. Today, it is 3 to 400 times what the worker makes. And our friends on the other side are running around with their hair on fire.

Heaven forbid we pass something that is going to help the damn workers in the United States of America. Heaven forbid we tilt the balance that has been going in the wrong direction for 50 years.

We talk about pensions. You complain. We talk about the minimum wage increase. You complain. We talk about giving them the right to organize. You complain. But if we were passing a tax cut here, you would all be getting in line to vote ''yes'' for it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers in support of the PRO Act.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS AND AEROSPACE WORKERS,
Upper Marlboro, Maryland, March 9, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, On behalf of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, I strongly urge you to support the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act introduced by Representative Bobby Scott. In a functioning and recovering economy, working families and middle-class Americans cannot be left behind.

The PRO Act is a crucially bold piece of legislation that modernizes federal laws and expands workers' collective bargaining rights and closes loopholes that corporations use to exploit workers. The bill also establishes a process for mediation and arbitration to help the parties achieve a first contract. It protects workers' right to organize a union and bargain for higher wages and better benefits.

However, the right to freely form a union without the threat of company intimidation or interference is denied to workers today. The PRO Act strengthens protections for employees that engage in collective action and levels the playing field by prohibiting employers from requiring their employees to attend ''captive audience'' meetings whose sole purpose is to convince workers to vote against the union. In addition to imposing financial penalties on employers and individual corporate offices who violate the law, the bill would give workers the option of bringing their case to federal court.

Finally, the PRO Act would override state ''right to work'' laws. These laws are simply designed to give more power to corporations at the expense of workers, and have had the effect of lowering wages and eroding pensions and health care coverage in states where they have been adopted.

For all the above these reasons, I respectfully urge you to support the PRO Act and vote ''YES'' on this long overdue legislation.

Thank you,

ROBERT MARTINEZ, JR.,
International President.

Mr. RYAN. You need to stop talking about Dr. Seuss and start working with us on behalf of the American workers.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am using my inside voice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, during their floor speeches today, both Speaker PELOSI and Leader HOYER claimed this bill is for the workers.

If my Democratic colleagues care so much about American workers, why do they support incentivizing millions of illegal immigrants into our Nation to take away jobs from American workers?

Why do they support this bill that could force workers to pay union dues even if they don't want to?

Why do they want to take away Arizona workers' rights under the Arizona's right-to-work law?

This bill is bad for employees. It is bad for employers. And it is bad for America. I oppose this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 7 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), the chair of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud former member of Teamsters Local 170 in Worcester, Massachusetts, and a former member of AFL–CIO Local 2 in San Francisco. From that experience, I know personally the value of being a union member.

I am also a former small business person who knows the value of having good-paying jobs in a community represented by union members to small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, the wealthiest Americans continue to take home a larger and larger share of America's wealth. According to Fed data, the top 1 percent of Americans have a combined net worth of $34.2 trillion, which is 15 times more wealth than the bottom 50 percent of Americans. One percent has more wealth than 160 million Americans.

□ 1400

This is unparalleled in our existence and must be addressed if you really care about working people. This inequality has contributed to what is called diseases of despair by public health experts and has worsened the behavioral health crisis exponentially in this country.

At the same time, union coverage today is half of what it was 40 years ago, and research shows deunionization

accounts for up to one-third of the inequality of which I speak.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates that deunionization has led to working people losing $200 billion per year, and that money goes to make inequality greater and goes into the already exceedingly disproportionate wealth by those in the 1 percent. It hurts all of us, including them.

Strengthening access to unions and American workers being able to organize will help restore the balance of power between workers and employers, wages and capital. The research is clear that when workers collectively bargain and organize, their pay goes up. On average, a worker covered by a union contract earns 13 percent more than a peer in a nonunionized workplace.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I ask my colleagues to enthusiastically support this initiative.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I heard the majority leader speak about something that happened in 1870 and 1880, like the Pinkertons are still running around union busting.

Well, it is not 1870. It is not 1880. It is not even the time of President Obama. But during President Obama's time, he proposed the ambush election rule, and that is in this bill.

What does that mean? That means the employer must give up the addresses, the contact and personal information, and the working schedule of everybody in their facility. And they don't get to say no. The people who work there don't get to say no. Even the Obama NLRB said that they would be subjected to harassment, coercion, or robbery—or robbery.

Madam Speaker, I offered an amendment, which the majority refused, to close the loophole that exempts union violence, coercion, and extortion. Think about that, union violence.

If they have the information of the employees and are prone to violence, and if you live in Philadelphia, you just go back to the helpful union guy, the helpful union guys, the thugs and the presentment.

Reject this. This is the PRO Act, indeed—protecting corrupt union bosses from their own failures. Vote ''no.''

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. NORCROSS. Madam Speaker, the ''thugs.'' Are those the friends of the folks who attacked this Capitol? Is that who you are talking about? Those are thugs.

Madam Speaker, for 44 years, I have been a member of the IBEW. My brothers went to college. I did the other thing. I went to the other 4-year school, an apprenticeship. My entire life has been about speaking for those voices, those workers who didn't have a voice.

Listen to this: Employers shouldn't make the decision, and unions shouldn't make the decision. Employees make the decision whether or not they want to enter into a collective bargaining agreement.

That is one of the reasons why I and five others formed the Labor Caucus, because their voices are not being heard.

Unlimited money, the total control of the workplace—OSHA injuries are much higher on nonunion jobs than union jobs. Why? Because workers have a voice. They have better health benefits; they have better pensions; they have dignity in retiring.

Madam Speaker, I have spent 44 years and have been involved with 30 organizing campaigns. I know what it is like to go out and get those cards signed. I know what it is like to have a fair election, and that is what we need.

Fairness in America still counts, and workers have been on the wrong end of that deal for so long.

Madam Speaker, I am asking my colleagues to do what is right for America. Pass the PRO Act. We are all in this together.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. And I thank the Honorable BOBBY SCOTT for the opportunity to be heard. I will be terse.

Madam Speaker, unions protect people. Unions protect people because those workers will organize and make sure that there is a safe work environment.

This is important because if not but for the union, many companies would simply build into the cost of doing business the injuries that may be sustained. I am a member of Local 1550 of AFSCME and proud to say it.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation because it will save lives.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS).

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, if we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on Education and Labor to consider an amendment to prohibit labor organizations from encouraging illegal immigrants to join their ranks.

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 (Ms. SCANLON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, thanks to the COVID–19 pandemic and onerous government restrictions, the last year has been among the toughest for working Americans in our Nation's history. Congress' foremost duty today is to help the millions of hurting American workers recover their lost jobs and wages.

Madam Speaker, this bill prevents us from fulfilling that duty and, instead, prioritizes the interests of illegal immigrants and union bosses.

Madam Speaker, I am the grandson and son of proud union members, and my brother works at the same factory in northeast Indiana and belongs to the same union that my dad and grandfather and uncles and cousins, and many others, have as well.

So let me tell you, it is a travesty that Democrats think that people who broke our Nation's laws deserve the same labor rights as they do. This bill, as written, would lessen American citizens' union voting power and hand it to people who aren't even legally employed. It goes against the very purpose of unions: providing a forum where American workers can have a voice.

Madam Speaker, this bill would disempower American workers by drowning out their voices to the benefit of illegal immigrants.

The amendment I propose is simple: Individuals who are not eligible to work in our country should not be contacted or courted by labor leadership. If my Democratic colleagues insist on moving forward with this bill without my amendment, they wouldn't be protecting Americans' right to organize. They would be prohibiting American workers from organizing as a distinct group.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Indiana an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, the Democratic Party claims to have the best interest of American workers at heart so, please, prove it.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this bill is an effort by Democrats to cave to big labor and special interest groups' demands at the expense of the American workforce and the economy. Once again, Democrats are attempting to ram through radical, partisan legislation.

H.R. 842 is radical, backward-looking legislation, which will diminish the rights of workers and employers while harming the economy and providing a political gift to labor union special interests.

I thank my Republican colleagues for their hard work in fighting for American workers and job creators. I urge all of my colleagues to consider the serious damage that the passage of this bill would do, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

Madam Speaker, I reiterate, just before COVID hit, we had a booming, booming economy without this legislation. This will harm the economy, harm the American workers, and do great injustice to well-meaning employers who risk every day their capital and their energy to create jobs.

Madam Speaker, this bill deserves a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, each of us can agree that hard work in this country should pay off. Yet, for far too long, we have allowed wealthy special interests to pad the profit margins by stripping workers of their rights.

Madam Speaker, we often voice our support for workers. Today, we have the opportunity to match our words with action by taking a historic step to ensure that they can stand together and negotiate for higher pay, better benefits, and safer workplaces.

I want to recognize all the workers and advocates, especially my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor, for their leadership on this legislation.

There is an extensive legislative history underpinning this bill, including three hearings and a markup in the 116th Congress. The views of the committee are outlined in the committee report from the last Congress.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy in support of the PRO Act and a statement by President Biden on the House taking up the PRO Act.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 842—PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE ACT OF 2021—REP. SCOTT, D–VA, AND 212 CO-SPONSORS

The Administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act of 2021, which would strengthen the Federal laws that protect workers' right to organize a union and collectively bargain for better wages, benefits, and working conditions.

America was not built by Wall Street. It was built by the middle class, and unions built the middle class. Unions put power in the hands of workers. They give workers a stronger voice to increase wages, improve the quality of jobs and protect job security, protect against racial and all other forms of discrimination and sexual harassment, and protect workers' health, safety, and benefits in the workplace. Unions lift up workers, both union and non-union.

The policy of the United States Government, stated clearly in the National Labor Relations Act, is to encourage union organizing and collective bargaining. However, due to anti-union efforts by many employers for decades, lax enforcement of existing labor laws, and the failure to restore and strengthen labor laws to address the real-world of labor-management relations, only 6.3% percent of private-sector U.S. wage and salary workers were union members in 2020.

H.R. 842 would strengthen and protect workers' right to form a union by allowing the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to assess penalties on employers who violate workers' right to organize and ensuring that workers who suffer retaliation for exercising these rights receive immediate relief.

The PRO Act also defends workers' right to strike—a fundamental economic right—and to engage in boycotts and other acts of solidarity with workers at other companies without penalty. It clarifies that employers may not force employees to waive their rights to join together in collective or class action litigation. The bill also closes loopholes in Federal labor law by barring employers from misclassifying workers as independent contractors and preventing workers from being denied remedies due to their immigration status. It establishes an expansive joint employer standard, allowing workers to collectively bargain with all the companies that control the terms and conditions of their employment. The bill allows unions to collect fair-share fees to cover the cost of collective bargaining and administering a union contract for all workers who are protected by the contract's terms. H.R. 842 restores workers' access to fair union elections and ensures the results are respected.

The Administration strongly encourages the House to pass H.R. 842, and looks forward to working with the Congress to enact this critical legislation that safeguards workers' rights to organize and bargain collectively. The PRO Act will strengthen our democracy and advance dignity in the workplace.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT JOE BIDEN ON THE HOUSE TAKING UP THE PRO ACT

(Statements and Releases, March 9, 2021)

I strongly encourage the House to pass the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act of 2021, which would dramatically enhance the power of workers to organize and collectively bargain for better wages, benefits, and working conditions.

As America works to recover from the devastating challenges of deadly pandemic, an economic crisis, and reckoning on race that reveals deep disparities, we need to summon a new wave of worker power to create an economy that works for everyone. We owe it not only to those who have put in a lifetime of work, but to the next generation of workers who have only known an America of rising inequality and shrinking opportunity. All of us deserve to enjoy America's promise in full—and our nation's leaders have a responsibility to deliver it.

That starts with rebuilding unions. The middle class built this country, and unions built the middle class. Unions give workers a stronger voice to increase wages, improve the quality of jobs and protect job security, protect against racial and all other forms of discrimination and sexual harassment, and protect workers' health, safety, and benefits in the workplace. Unions lift up workers, both union and non-union. They are critical to strengthening our economic competitiveness.

But, after generations of sweat and sacrifice, fighting hard to earn the wages and benefits that built and sustained the American middle class, unions are under siege. Nearly 60 million Americans would join a union if they get a chance, but too many employers and states prevent them from doing so through anti-union attacks. They know that without unions, they can run the table on workers—union and non-union alike.

We should all remember that the National Labor Relations Act didn't just say that we shouldn't hamstring unions or merely tolerate them. It said that we should encourage unions. The PRO Act would take critical steps to help restore this intent.

I urge Congress to send the PRO Act to my desk so we can seize the opportunity to build a future that reflects working people's courage and ambition, and offers not only good jobs with a real choice to join a union—but the dignity, equity, shared prosperity and common purpose the hardworking people who built this country and make it run deserve.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021, or the PRO Act.

For too long, wealthy corporations and employers have dictated the stability and success of working and middle-class Americans—often without their best interests in mind. The PRO Act seeks to combat this injustice by providing increased opportunities for workers to organize, holding employers accountable for violations of workers' rights, and securing free, fair, and safe union elections.

The timing of the vote on this legislation is crucial. We have watched as the COVID–19 pandemic has further exacerbated the existing inequalities in our economy. The rich have gotten richer, while the employees on the front lines have faced harsh conditions, risks to their health, and a minimal, at best, increase in pay. It is therefore critical that these workers be able to exercise their right to organize a union so that they can advocate as one for higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions.

As a dues-paying, active member of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), I have seen firsthand the important role that unions play in empowering workers across the country. And I will continue to be a strong advocate for workers' rights—because our country is only as strong as our workers.

Madam Speaker, a strong middle class is essential to a strong economy. That is why I am proud to support the PRO Act and would encourage its immediate consideration in the Senate.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passage of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, a piece of legislation of which I am a proud co-sponsor. Importantly, this bill protects workers' rights to unionize, holds employers accountable for violating workers' rights, and ensures unions can have free, fair, and safe elections. By empowering workers to exercise their rights to organize, workers will be given the power to override ''right-to-work'' laws that prevent unions from collecting dues from the workers they represent.

It is significant to me that this body is coming together to pass this legislation on the same day as Mr. Joseph ''Joe'' Girolamo's 100th birthday. Mr. Girolamo of Livonia, Michigan is a veteran of World War II and the son of Italians, family he had a chance to visit while serving overseas. In a recent interview with Hometown Life, Mr. Girolamo shared that after returning home he moved to Livonia with his late wife Lillian. They met playing music and settled down in 1953. Mr. Girolamo worked at the River Rouge complex in Dearborn. He witnessed workers being treated unfairly and became a union man, and spent years advocating for workers' rights. His daughter Joyce Hermann shared with Hometown Life, ''So, there were actually thugs and goons running the place. It was a difficult situation until the union came in. He made sure

everything was done by the book and his workers weren't doing anything unsafe. It was a really big change back then.''

Earlier today as I wished Mr. Girolamo by phone a Happy Birthday and thanked him for his work with the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I got to listen to him play his harmonica and proudly informed him that today we were passing the PRO Act. He informed me he was smiling over the phone and glad to hear it.

When I think about the legacy and shoulders of giants we stand on in the Congress, it's incredible patriots like Joe, who represent the best of America and Michigan. I am proud and grateful we were able to take another productive step in the direction of the working men and woman in this country and all they are counting on to earn a decent living and save for retirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117–10 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 188, shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time after debate for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of House Report 117–10, not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 188, I rise to offer amendments en bloc No 1.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 4, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, printed in part B of House Report 117–10, offered by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. BOURDEAUX OF GEORGIA

On page 34, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 303. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

The amendments made by this Act shall not be construed to affect the jurisdictional standards of the National Labor Relations Board, including any standards that measure the size of a business with respect to revenues, that are used to determine whether an industry is affecting commerce for purposes of determining coverage under the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

In the table of contents, after the matter relating to section 302, insert the following:

Sec. 303. Rule of Construction.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. DAVIDS OF KANSAS

On page 3, in the table of contents, insert after the matter related to section 302 the following:

Sec. 303. Rule of Construction

On page 34, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 303. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to affect the privacy of employees with respect to voter lists provided to labor organizations by employers pursuant to elections directed by the Board.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

On page 33, line 13, strike ''Section 203(c)'' and insert ''(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(c)''.

On page 34, after line 2, insert the following:

(b) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.—The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating section 611 (29 U.S.C. 531) as section 612; and

(2) by inserting after section 610 (29 U.S.C. 530), the following new section:

''WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS

''SEC. 611.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—No employer or labor organization shall terminate or in any other way discriminate against, or cause to be terminated or discriminated against, any applicant, covered employee, or former covered employee, of the employer or the labor organization by reason of the fact that such applicant, covered employee, or former covered employee does, or the employer or labor organization perceives the employee to do, any of the following:

''(1) Provide, cause to be provided, or is about to provide or cause to be provided, information to the labor organization, the employer, the Department of Labor, or any other State, local, or Federal Government authority or law enforcement agency relating to any violation of, or any act or omission that such employee reasonably believes to be a violation of, any provision of this Act.

''(2) Testify or plan to testify or otherwise participate in any proceeding resulting from the administration or enforcement of any provision of this Act.

''(3) File, institute, or cause to be filed or instituted, any proceeding under this Act.

''(4) Assist in any activity described in paragraphs (1) through (3).

''(5) Object to, or refuse to participate in, any activity, policy, practice, or assigned task that such covered employee reasonably believes to be in violation of any provision of this Act.

''(b) DEFINITION OF COVERED EMPLOYEE.—For the purposes of this section, the term 'covered employee' means any employee or agent of an employer or labor organization, including any person with management responsibilities on behalf of the employer or labor organization.

''(c) PROCEDURES AND TIMETABLES.—

''(1) COMPLAINT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An applicant, covered employee, or former covered employee who believes that he or she has been terminated or in any other way discriminated against by any person in violation of subsection (a) may file (or have any person file on his or her behalf) a complaint with the Secretary of Labor alleging such violation. Such a complaint must be filed not later than either—

''(i) 180 days after the date on which such alleged violation occurs; or

''(ii) 180 days after the date upon which the employee knows or should reasonably have known that such alleged violation in subsection (a) occurred.

''(B) ACTIONS OF SECRETARY OF LABOR.—Upon receipt of such a complaint, the Secretary of Labor shall notify, in writing, the person named in the complaint who is alleged to have committed the violation, of—

''(i) the filing of the complaint;

''(ii) the allegations contained in the complaint;

''(iii) the substance of evidence supporting the complaint; and

''(iv) opportunities that will be afforded to such person under paragraph (2).

''(2) INVESTIGATION BY SECRETARY OF LABOR.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of receipt of a complaint filed under paragraph (1), and after affording the complainant and the person named in the complaint who is alleged to have committed the violation that is the basis for the complaint an opportunity to submit to the Secretary of Labor a written response to the complaint and an opportunity to meet with a representative of the Secretary of Labor to present statements from witnesses, the Secretary of Labor shall—

''(i) initiate an investigation and determine whether there is reasonable cause to believe that the complaint has merit; and

''(ii) notify the complainant and the person alleged to have committed the violation of subsection (a), in writing, of such determination.

''(B) GROUNDS FOR DETERMINATION OF COMPLAINTS.—The Secretary of Labor shall dismiss a complaint filed under this subsection, and shall not conduct an investigation otherwise required under paragraph (2), unless the complainant makes a prima facie showing that any behavior described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (a) was a contributing factor in the unfavorable personnel action alleged in the complaint.

''(3) BURDENS OF PROOF.—

''(A) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINATION.—In making a determination or adjudicating a complaint pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary, an administrative law judge or a court may determine that a violation of subsection (a) has occurred only if the complainant demonstrates that any conduct described in subsection (a) with respect to the complainant was a contributing factor in the adverse action alleged in the complaint.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a decision or order that is favorable to the complainant shall not be issued in any administrative or judicial action pursuant to this subsection if the respondent demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that the respondent would have taken the same adverse action in the absence of such conduct.

''(C) NOTICE OF RELIEF AVAILABLE.—If the Secretary of Labor concludes that there is reasonable cause to believe that a violation of subsection (a) has occurred, the Secretary of Labor shall, together with the notice under paragraph (2)(A)(ii), issue a preliminary order providing the relief prescribed by paragraph (4)(B).

''(D) REQUEST FOR HEARING.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of notification of a determination of the Secretary of Labor under this paragraph, either the

person alleged to have committed the violation or the complainant may file objections to the findings or preliminary order, or both, and request a hearing on the record. The filing of such objections shall not operate to stay any reinstatement remedy contained in the preliminary order. Any such hearing shall be conducted expeditiously, and if a hearing is not requested in such 30-day period, the preliminary order shall be deemed a final order that is not subject to judicial review.

''(E) PROCEDURES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A hearing requested under this paragraph shall be conducted expeditiously and in accordance with rules established by the Secretary for hearings conducted by administrative law judges.

''(ii) SUBPOENAS; PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE.— In conducting any such hearing, the administrative law judge may issue subpoenas. The respondent or complainant may request the issuance of subpoenas that require the deposition of, or the attendance and testimony of, witnesses and the production of any evidence (including any books, papers, documents, or recordings) relating to the matter under consideration.

''(4) ISSUANCE OF FINAL ORDERS; REVIEW PROCEDURES.—

''(A) TIMING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of conclusion of any hearing under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Labor shall issue a final order providing the relief prescribed by this paragraph or denying the complaint. At any time before issuance of a final order, a proceeding under this subsection may be terminated on the basis of a settlement agreement entered into by the Secretary of Labor, the complainant, and the person alleged to have committed the violation.

''(B) AVAILABLE RELIEF.—

''(i) ORDER OF SECRETARY OF LABOR.—If, in response to a complaint filed under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor determines that a violation of subsection (a) has occurred, the Secretary of Labor shall order the person who committed such violation—

''(I) to take affirmative action to abate the violation;

''(II) to reinstate the complainant to his or her former position, together with compensation (including back pay with interest) and restore the terms, conditions, and privileges associated with his or her employment;

''(III) to provide compensatory damages to the complainant; and

''(IV) expungement of all warnings, reprimands, or derogatory references that have been placed in paper or electronic records or databases of any type relating to the actions by the complainant that gave rise to the unfavorable personnel action, and, at the complainant's direction, transmission of a copy of the decision on the complaint to any person whom the complainant reasonably believes may have received such unfavorable information.

''(ii) COSTS AND EXPENSES.—If an order is issued under clause (i), the Secretary of Labor, at the request of the complainant, shall assess against the person against whom the order is issued, a sum equal to the aggregate amount of all costs and expenses (including attorney fees and expert witness fees) reasonably incurred, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, by the complainant for, or in connection with, the bringing of the complaint upon which the order was issued.

''(C) FRIVOLOUS CLAIMS.—If the Secretary of Labor finds that a complaint under paragraph (1) is frivolous or has been brought in bad faith, the Secretary of Labor may award to the prevailing employer or labor organization a reasonable attorney fee, not exceeding $1,000, to be paid by the complainant.

''(D) DE NOVO REVIEW.—

''(i) FAILURE OF THE SECRETARY TO ACT.—If the Secretary of Labor has not issued a final order within 270 days after the date of filing of a complaint under this subsection, or within 90 days after the date of receipt of a written determination, the complainant may bring an action at law or equity for de novo review in the appropriate district court of the United States having jurisdiction, which shall have jurisdiction over such an action without regard to the amount in controversy, and which action shall, at the request of either party to such action, be tried by the court with a jury.

''(ii) PROCEDURES.—A proceeding under clause (i) shall be governed by the same legal burdens of proof specified in paragraph (3). The court shall have jurisdiction to grant all relief necessary to make the employee whole, including injunctive relief and compensatory damages, including—

''(I) reinstatement with the same seniority status that the employee would have had, but for the discharge or discrimination;

''(II) the amount of back pay, with interest;

''(III) compensation for any special damages sustained as a result of the discharge or discrimination, including litigation costs, expert witness fees, and reasonable attorney fees; and

''(IV) expungement of all warnings, reprimands, or derogatory references that have been placed in paper or electronic records or databases of any type relating to the actions by the complainant that gave rise to the unfavorable personnel action, and, at the complainant's direction, transmission of a copy of the decision on the complaint to any person whom the complainant reasonably believes may have received such unfavorable information.

''(E) OTHER APPEALS.—Unless the complainant brings an action under subparagraph (D), any person adversely affected or aggrieved by a final order issued under subparagraph (A) may file a petition for review of the order in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the violation with respect to which the order was issued, allegedly occurred or the circuit in which the complainant resided on the date of such violation, not later than 60 days after the date of the issuance of the final order of the Secretary of Labor under subparagraph (A). Review shall conform to chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subparagraph shall not, unless ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the order. An order of the Secretary of Labor with respect to which review could have been obtained under this subparagraph shall not be subject to judicial review in any criminal or other civil proceeding.

''(5) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ORDER.—

''(A) ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY.—If any person has failed to comply with a final order issued under paragraph (4), the Secretary of Labor may file a civil action in the United States district court for the district in which the violation was found to have occurred, or in the United States district court for the District of Columbia, to enforce such order. In actions brought under this paragraph, the district courts shall have jurisdiction to grant all appropriate relief including injunctive relief, compensatory and punitive damages.

''(B) CIVIL ACTIONS TO COMPEL COMPLIANCE.—A person on whose behalf an order was issued under paragraph (4) may commence a civil action against the person to whom such order was issued to require compliance with such order. The appropriate United States district court shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties, to enforce such order.

''(C) AWARD OF COSTS AUTHORIZED.—The court, in issuing any final order under this paragraph, may award costs of litigation (including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, whenever the court determines such award is appropriate.

''(D) MANDAMUS PROCEEDINGS.—Any nondiscretionary duty imposed by this section shall be enforceable in a mandamus proceeding brought under section 1361 of title 28, United States Code.

''(d) UNENFORCEABILITY OF CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the rights and remedies provided for in this section may not be waived by any agreement, policy, form, or condition of employment, including by any predispute arbitration agreement.

''(e) SAVINGS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to diminish the rights, privileges, or remedies of any employee who exercises rights under any Federal or State law or common law, or under any collective bargaining agreement.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 34, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 301. ELECTRONIC VOTING IN UNION ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the provisions of this section, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Labor Relations Board shall implement a system and procedures to conduct representation elections remotely using an electronic voting system.

(2) PROCEDURES.—The procedures under paragraph (1) shall ensure that each employee voting in a representation election may choose to cast a vote using either an internet voting system or a telephone voting system.

(3) NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD SYSTEM.—If the Board does not implement a system under paragraph (1) before the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board shall enter into a temporary agreement to use the system used by the National Mediation Board to conduct representation elections for the period—

(A) beginning on the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) ending on the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.— Not later than 180 days of the enactment of this Act, and in each subsequent report under Section 3(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the Board shall submit to Congress a report containing a description of the following:

(1) For each representation petition under section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act filed—

(A) the case name and case number;

(B) the number of days between the petition and the election;

(C) the number of days between the stipulation or direction of election and the election;

(D) the method of the election;

(E) the results of the election; and

(F) the number of eligible voters, the number of voters participating in the election, and the method by which each of the voters submitted their vote.

(2) The total cost of conducting all elections the Board conducted through the system and procedures required by subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEM.—The term ''electronic voting system''—

(A) includes an internet voting system and a telephone voting system; and

(B) does not include machines used for casting votes at a polling site or an electronic tabulation system where votes are cast non-electronically but counted electronically (such as a punch card or optical scanning system).

(2) INTERNET VOTING SYSTEM.—The term ''internet voting system'' means an internet-based voting system that allows a participant to cast a ballot remotely using a personal computer or other mobile electronic device that is connected to the internet.

(3) TELEPHONE VOTING SYSTEM.—The term ''telephone voting system'' means a voting system in which participants may cast a vote remotely using a telephone.

(4) REMOTELY.—The term ''remotely'', used with respect to voting in a representation election, means a vote may be cast at any site chosen by a participant in such election.

(5) REPRESENTATION ELECTION.—The term ''representation election'' means a representation election under section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 159).

On page 34, line 4, strike ''301'' and insert ''302''.

On page 34, line 10, strike ''302'' and insert ''303''.

On page 3, in the table of contents—

(1) in the matter related to section 301, strike ''301'' and insert ''302'';

(2) in the matter related to section 302, strike ''302'' and insert ''303''; and

(3) before the matter related to section 302, as so redesignated, insert the following:

Sec. 301. Electronic Voting in Union Elections.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS. MCBATH OF GEORGIA

On page 34, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 303. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

The amendments made under this Act shall not be construed to affect the definitions of ''employer'' or ''employee'' under the laws of any State that govern the wages, work hours, workers' compensation, or unemployment insurance of employees.

In the table of contents, after the matter relating to section 302, insert the following:

Sec. 303. Rule of Construction.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MRS. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

On page 34, after line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 303. GAO REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General, through the Government Accountability Office, shall one year after the date of enactment of this Act commence a study on the impact of Section 101(a) and Section 101(b) of this Act regarding—

(1) the effect on coverage of employees under of the National Labor Relations Act, and the impact from such change in coverage, on their capacity in various sectors to form unions and collectively bargain as a means to improve wages, benefits, workplace safety, and other working conditions, and

(2) the effect on employers and other enterprises regarding the right of employees to organize and collectively bargain over wages, benefits, workplace safety, and other working conditions in such sectors.

(b) FACTORS.—Such study shall identify, compare, and analyze impacts from changes implicated by Section 101(a) and Section 101(b) on—

(1) flexibility for employees with respect to hours, shifts, assignments and working arrangements;

(2) rates of compensation, health care, and employee benefits;

(3) resolution of grievances and disputes, including employers' ability to terminate and employees' right to due process;

(4) use of technology or algorithms, including the adoption of new technology and algorithms; and

(5) workplace safety and health.

(c) STAKEHOLDER INPUT.—In preparing the report, the Government Accountability Office shall gather information from impacted stakeholders, including various business enterprises and labor organizations. In developing a list of stakeholders, the Government Accountability Office shall consult with the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL REPORT.—Six months after the commencement of the study, the Government Accountability Office shall transmit its findings and report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate, and consistent with its policies, make its findings and report available to the public.

(e) PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION.—The President, in consultation with the Department of Labor and other agencies as the President deems appropriate, shall, subsequent to the issuance of such report, consider such findings, and within 60 days may recommend that the House of Representatives and the Senate modify Section 101(a) or Section 101(b), or both or make no recommendations.

(f) SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the House of Representatives shall consider whether to accept, reject, or modify any recommendations received under (e), as it deems appropriate.

On page 3, in the table of contents, insert after the matter relating to section 302 the following:

Sec. 303. GAO Report.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. NEWMAN OF ILLINOIS

On page 13, on line 17, insert before the period the following: ''and to ensure that such notice is provided to employees in a language spoken by such employees''.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. STEVENS OF MICHIGAN

Page 34, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 301. GAO REPORT ON SECTORAL BARGAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall conduct a review of collective bargaining at the sectoral level in a geographically diverse set of countries where sectoral bargaining is facilitated and prepare and submit to Congress a report with respect to such countries that—

(1) identifies, analyzes, and compares—

(A) the laws and policies governing or related to collective bargaining at the sectoral level;

(B) the administrative systems facilitating such bargaining; and

(C) the procedures involved in sectoral bargaining;

(2) to the extent practicable, consider reported effects of the policies and procedures described in paragraph (1) on—

(A) the wages and compensation of employees;

(B) the number of full-time and part-time employees;

(C) prices, sales, and revenues;

(D) employee turnover and retention;

(E) hiring and training costs;

(F) productivity and absenteeism; and

(G) the development of emerging industries, including those that engage their workforces through technology; and

(3) describes the methodology used to generate the information in the report.

On page 34, line 4, strike ''301'' and insert ''302''.

On page 34, line 10, strike ''302'' and insert ''303''.

In the table of contents— .

(1) in the matter relating to section 301, strike ''301'' and insert ''302'';

(2) in the matter relating to seciton 302, strike ''302'' and insert ''303''; and

(3) insert before the matter relating to section 302, as so amended, the following:

Sec. 301. GAO report on sectoral bargaining.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 11, line 5, insert ''as soon as practicable and not later than within 120 days, absent extraordinary circumstances or by agreement or permission of the parties,'' after ''dispute''.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

On page 33, line 13, strike ''Section'' and insert ''(a) Section''.

On page 34, after line 2, insert the following:

(b) Section 203(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 433(b)) is amended in the matter following paragraph (2)—

(1) by striking the period at the end; and

(2) by inserting ''and shall make such information available to the public in a readily accessible and searchable electronic format, and through a secure software application for use on an electronic device.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

□ 1415

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY).

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment in the en bloc package. If it is approved, I will vote for the bill.

The PRO Act aims to protect the right of workers to decide whether to form a union that can negotiate with their employer over working conditions. It proceeds from the principle that America is stronger when the middle class is stronger, and the middle class is stronger when unions are stronger.

This principle is personal to me. I grew up in Virginia, and my dad worked at a power plant and he was in a union. He was a refugee from Vietnam. He had an incredible work ethic, but he struggled with English and relied on the union to fight for him to have a living wage and good healthcare. This allowed our family to have opportunities we otherwise wouldn't have had.

There are many provisions in the PRO Act I support. There are also provisions that give me pause, especially the changes made to the definitions of employee and joint employer in the National Labor Relations Act.

Madam Speaker, I thank the Education and Labor Committee and Democratic leadership for working

with me to craft an amendment that addresses my concerns enough for me to support the PRO Act passage. My amendment requires GAO to prepare a report on the impact of these two changes on workers in businesses. The President is required to consider the report, and he can recommend that Congress modify one or both of these definitions.

My amendment also expresses the sense of the House that Congress shall consider whether to accept, reject, or modify any recommendations received from the President. This is called evidence-based policymaking, and we should do more of it.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for my amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Democrat en bloc amendments. My Democrat colleagues are rushing a radical piece of legislation to the House floor without holding a single committee hearing or markup. Rushing sweeping, one-sided legislation to the floor without any prior debate or consideration this year silences Members of the minority. This is an outright assault on the legislative process and serves only to hide the Democrats' socialist agenda.

There are 20 new members on the Education and Labor Committee on both sides of the aisle, not to mention the dozens of new Members of the House, and their constituents deserve to have their elected representatives examine this dangerous bill.

Additionally, the last time the Education and Labor Committee held a hearing on any version of the PRO Act was July 2019. Since that time, a worldwide pandemic has devastated large sectors of the American economy. In light of this fact alone, Congress should hear from affected stakeholders before passing a radical sweeping bill.

Even more concerning than the muzzle imposed by this sham legislative process on the minority party and business owners around the country is the underlying bill's silencing and disenfranchisement of workers. This far-reaching legislation is nothing more than a union boss wish list aimed at rewarding Democrats' big labor allies at the expense of American workers.

Union membership in the United States has been decreasing for over 60 years, and continues to plummet due to the modern economy and unions' own failings. But instead of increasing transparency and accountability to serve their members better, labor union leaders are demanding House Democrats pass the PRO Act to tilt the scales in their favor. Democrats are doing exactly that, no matter the cost.

Madam Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that Federal law already protects the right of employees to organize, and Republicans respect that right. But any reforms to U.S. labor laws should help workers flourish in the modern economy. Unfortunately, the extreme bill before us today helps union bosses at the expense of workers.

The slate of Democrat amendments included in this en bloc amendment are ploys disguised as policy intended to provide political cover to the Democrat Members who are uncomfortable voting for the job-destroying underlying bill, and, in many cases, the amendments included make the bill even worse.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this partisan en bloc amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise enthusiastically to support the PRO Act and its protection against executives and companies who violate workers' rights, its support for collective bargaining, and also its access to fair elections with unions.

I rise to support my amendment, number 9. The Jackson Lee amendment is direct. The amendment explicitly extends whistleblower protections to employees, both employers, and unions, under the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. I am grateful to the unions and to the committee for working with this very important amendment.

It extends whistleblower protection to all employees of employers or of unions to encourage and empower them to come forward and make known that something is wrong.

Ms. Lawson, who was in a fight for $15, worked for a fast food industry. She was sexually harassed. She needs that kind of protection. So this amendment is very strong and adds to this very strong initiative.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Jackson Lee Amendment No. 9 included in the Chairman's En Bloc Amendment to H.R. 842, the ''Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021,'' or ''PRO Act,'' which protects the basic right to join a union by (1) empowering workers to exercise their right to organize; (2) holding employers accountable for violating workers' rights; and (3) securing free, fair, and safe union elections.

The LMRDA of 1959 protects union members through a ''bill of rights'' for union members, requires extensive reporting of union finances, and mandates transparency of arrangements between employers and anti-labor consultants.

I am pleased that the PRO Act includes reforms to the LMRDA that clarify that employers must disclose arrangements with consultants on indirectly persuading employees on how to exercise their labor rights.

Examples of indirect persuasion include planning employee meetings, training employer representatives, and identifying employees for disciplinary action or targeting.

The Jackson Lee Amendment No. 9 makes a simple common-sense improvement to the bill.

The identical version of this amendment was made in order by the Rules Committee in the 116th Congress and adopted by the House on February 6, 2020, by a roll call vote of 404–18.

Specifically, the amendment explicitly extends whistleblower protections to employees of both employers and unions under the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

This is a fair and balanced amendment.

Supreme Court decisions like *Janus* v. *AFSCME,* 585 U.S.____138 S. Ct. 2448, 201 L. Ed. 2d 924 (2018), and many others, have severely weakened the ability for unions to be able to organize and bargain collectively, or to discharge an essential mediating function upon which a vibrant democracy depends.

The PRO Act protects the workers who are trying to organize.

But the Jackson Lee Amendment No. 9 extends whistleblower protections to all employees, of employers or of unions, to encourage and empower them to come forward and make known something wrong or unlawful that they have learned or observed.

Let me give you an example.

Last year, I met Kimberly Lawson, who is part of the Fight for $15.

She also came to see me to advise me of the problems she has had with sexual harassment on her job in the fast-food industry.

She told me, on the record, that if we could pass the PRO Act, she would not be alone trying to raise our hourly wage or face sexual harassment without a union to help her.

Madam Speaker, this whistleblower protection is important because it gives workers like Ms. Lawson the ability to be able to report what is happening to them without losing or jeopardizing their jobs and the ability, like Ms. Lawson, to support her children on the income of a single mother.

Our economy needs a strong middle class, and unions are essential to rebuilding America's middle class and improving the lives of workers and their families.

When workers have the power to stand together and form a union, they have higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions.

Protecting workers' rights to organize will help rebuild the middle class and improve the quality of life for workers and their families.

Unions are essential to rebuilding America's middle class and improving the lives of workers and their families because they deliver higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions.

Unions deliver bigger paychecks for both union and nonunion workers.

Over the last eight decades, unions have consistently provided workers with a 10- to 20-percent higher wage.

The benefits of union membership are so strong that even the children of union workers enjoy greater economic mobility.

When union density is high, even nonunion workers receive higher wages.

Unions provide workers with a voice on the job to bargain for better wages and safer working conditions.

While the entire economy has suffered from massive job loss during the pandemic, union workers suffered fewer job losses because they were able to bargain with employers on how to respond to the pandemic.

Unions deliver greater access to affordable health care and a more secure retirement.

Private sector workers covered by a union contract are 27 percent more likely to be offered health insurance through their employer.

More than 9 in 10 unionized private sector workers have access to a retirement plan, compared to just 65 percent of nonunion workers.

Unions narrow both the racial wealth gap and the gender pay gap.

About two-thirds (65 percent) of workers age 18 to 64 who are covered by a union contract are women and/or people of color.

Union members of color have almost five times the median wealth of their nonunion counterparts.

Unions are one of the most effective solutions for closing the gender pay gap.

I urge all members to join me in supporting Jackson Lee Amendment No. 9 by voting for the En Bloc Amendment to H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, or PRO Act, of 2021.

I want to remind us that, in the early 1900s, women worked in factories where they died. They simply died because there were no provisions, no protections; and they died with drastic fires and other devastating actions.

Madam Speaker, I ask support of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support for the Jackson Lee amendment from the Government Accountability Project. It reads that they think that this is an especially important initiative to be added. I ask that in support.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LEE: Thank you for your leadership through legislation to add whistleblower protection rights to the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. That law strives for union accountability to its members and in management relations. Your bill reflects best practice rights that Congress has passed 16 times since 2005 in laws throughout the private sector. However, the reality is that not only employers abuse power and undermine worker rights. This legislation protects those who seek accountability within and by organizations whose mission is to protect employees.

As summarized below, your legislation would honor best practices by—

prohibiting retaliation against applicants, employees or former employees who are perceived as disclosing or assisting to disclose violations of the Act's provisions;

protecting both front line and management employees from retaliation;

extending identical protection to those who refuse to obey orders to violate the law;

providing an administrative remedy at the U.S. Department of Labor, with the right to a jury trial in federal court if there is not a timely decision;

governing enforcement with realistic Whistleblower Protection Act legal burdens of proof; and

so employees do not lose by winning, providing ''make whole'' remedies for those who prevail, including cancelation of all career damage, compensatory damages and costs including attorney fees.

Unless there are loopholes in the political mandate for accountability, this legislation should not be controversial. It merely applies almost identical legal rights in the labor-management context that Congress has enacted since 2005 for financial, food safety, consumer protection, energy, medical insurance and transportation whistleblowers. Thank you for your leadership. Please consider Government Accountability Project on call for further assistance.

Sincerely,

TOM DEVINE,
Legal Director.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask support of the Jackson Lee amendment in the en bloc amendment No. 1.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 842, the ''Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021, or ''PRO Act,'' which protects the basic right to join a union by (1) empowering workers to exercise their right to organize; (2) holding employers accountable for violating workers' rights; and (3) securing free, fair, and safe union elections.

Our economy needs a strong middle class, and unions are essential to rebuilding America's middle class and improving the lives of workers and their families.

The erosion of America's middle-class is a direct result of decades-long assault on workers' rights, funded by wealthy special interests.

When workers have the power to stand together and form a union, they have higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions.

Workers seeking to organize a union frequently face a surge of intimidation and retaliation from wealthy special interests.

After decades of anti-worker attacks, union membership is at historic lows and inequality is at historic highs.

It is imperative that we begin to recognize that the American people support unions—over 64 percent of Americans and millennials appreciate the idea of having representation for better quality of life and work.

When workers have the power to stand together and form a union, they have higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions.

Protecting workers' rights to organize will help rebuild the middle class and improve the quality of life for workers and their families.

Unions are essential to rebuilding America's middle class and improving the lives of workers and their families because they deliver higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions.

Workers with strong unions have been able to set industry standards for wages and benefits that help all workers, both union and nonunion.

Over the last eight decades, unions have consistently provided workers with a 10- to 20-percent higher wage.

The benefits of union membership are so strong that even the children of union workers enjoy greater economic mobility.

Unions provide workers with a voice on the job to bargain for better wages and safer working conditions, and never has it been more important that all workers have a voice in the workplace and access to a union.

While the majority of workers who are currently working onsite at their workplaces believe they face considerable risk of COVID–19 infection, Black and Hispanic workers are more likely to fear risks from work than are White workers.

In fact, Black workers make up one in six of all front-line industry workers, putting them and their family members at greater risk of contracting and spreading COVID–19.

Without unions, many workers are forced to work without personal protective equipment or access to paid leave or premium pay.

When nonunion workers have advocated for health and safety protections or wage increases, they have often been retaliated against or even fired for doing so.

Workers' lives and the health and safety of working families depends on their ability to have a say in how they do their jobs.

While the entire economy has suffered from massive job loss during the pandemic, union workers suffered fewer job losses because they were able to bargain with employers on how to respond to the pandemic.

Unions deliver greater access to affordable health care and a more secure retirement.

Private sector workers covered by a union contract are 27 percent more likely to be offered health insurance through their employer.

More than 9 in 10 unionized private sector workers have access to a retirement plan, compared to just 65 percent of nonunion workers

Unions narrow both the racial wealth gap and the gender pay gap.

The right to a union and collective bargaining is also directly relevant to our urgent national conversation around racial inequality in its various forms, including economic disparities by race.

Unions and collective bargaining help shrink the Black-White wage gap, and this means that the decline of unionization has played a significant role in the expansion of the Black-White wage gap over the last four decades, and that an increase in unionization could help reverse those trends.

About two-thirds (65 percent) of workers age 18 to 64 who are covered by a union contract are women and/or people of color.

Union members of color have almost five times the median wealth of their nonunion counterparts.

Unions are one of the most effective solutions for closing the gender pay gap.

Madam Speaker, here are 36 reasons why Americans should be thankful for unions and remain committed to ensuring there will always be a strong organized labor movement in the United States:

1. Weekends
2. All breaks at work, including your lunch breaks
3. Paid vacation
4. FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act)
5. Sick leave
6. Social security
7. Minimum wage
8. Civil Rights Act Title VII (prohibits Employer Discrimination)
9. 8-Hour workday
10. Overtime pay
11. Child labor laws
12. Occupational Safety & Health Act (OSHA)
13. 40 Hour Work Week
14. Worker's Compensation (Worker's Camp)
15. Unemployment Insurance
16. Pensions
17. Workplace Safety Standards and Regulations
18. Employer Health Care Insurance
19. Collective Bargaining Rights for Employees
20. Wrongful Termination Laws
21. Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967
22. Whistleblower Protection Laws
23. Employee Polygraph Protect Act (Prohibits Employer from using a lie detector test on an employee)

24. Veteran's Employment and Training Services (VETS)
25. Compensation increases and Evaluations (Raises)
26. Sexual Harassment laws
27. Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA)
28. Holiday Pay
29. Employer Dental, Life, and Vision Insurance
30. Privacy Rights
31. Pregnancy and Parental Leave
32. Military Leave
33. The Right to Strike
34. Public Education for Children
35. Equal Pay Acts of 1963 & 2011 (Requires employers pay men and women equally for the same amount of work)
36. Laws Ending Sweatshops in the United States

I urge all members to join me in supporting H.R. 842, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, or PRO Act, of 2021.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the PRO Act and to these amendments.

The PRO Act will ban right-to-work laws in 27 States. It will give unions millions more dollars to funnel to Democrats by requiring all workers to pay dues via payroll deduction, even if they don't support the union.

From 2010 to 2018, unions sent $1.6 billion from employee dues to leftwing groups, such as Planned Parenthood and the Clinton Foundation. The PRO Act will require companies to provide union organizers their private, personal contact information of employees so they can be pressured, harassed, and intimidated into supporting the union.

It will eliminate secret ballots and replace those with card check, where union bosses can simply collect authorization cards supposedly from employees agreeing to organize. If the Union doesn't win the election, it puts the burden on employees to prove they didn't engage in unfair labor practices to influence the outcome.

The PRO Act destroys the franchise model, independent contractor status, subcontractors, and gig workers by implementing a one-size-fits-all new employee classification. It repeals the ban on secondary boycotts and subjects suppliers and affiliates to union pressure, harassment, and intimidation tactics just because they do business with the company that is under attack.

It prohibits the replacement of striking workers, giving unions and employers risk-free leverage, unless the company closes; and eliminates the employer's ability to serve customers and operate during a strike. It massively increases fines and other penalties for employers.

The PRO Act will cost American businesses $47 billion annually, and I urge its rejection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. NEWMAN).

Ms. NEWMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the millions of American workers whose rights have been undermined and attacked for decades in this country. I am from a union family.

Americans who have been on the front lines of this pandemic since day one, yet they have been forced to work with lousy benefits, in unsafe conditions, and for insufficient pay. Too many of these workers don't have the ability to organize for stronger rights because too many don't even know their rights to organize.

Many times, employers deliberately don't want their workers to know their rights to organize and they hide it. Other times, it is because a worker's rights are posted in a language that he or she does not speak.

By passing the PRO Act, we will not only require employers to post notices informing workers of their rights to organize, but with the amendment I am proposing, we will also ensure that these notices are posted in the languages spoken by their employees, such as Spanish, Arabic, Polish, and any language, really. When one worker doesn't know their rights, the entire workforce is weakened.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment and the PRO Act so we can truly restore workers' rights in this country. All workers have rights.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. BOURDEAUX).

Ms. BOURDEAUX. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment, which clarifies that the PRO Act does not expand the National Labor Relations Board's jurisdiction over the smallest of small businesses, who help drive the economy in my district and across the country.

The NLRB uses metrics to determine whether a company affects interstate commerce, and, thus, is subject to its enforcement and standards with different thresholds for different types of businesses. My amendment ensures that these thresholds do not change.

In other words, my amendment provides certainty to the small family-run businesses found throughout my district because the labor standards they are subject to will not change under this bill. My amendment protects our employees while maintaining stability for small businesses that are already under so much strain.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a member of the committee.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this en bloc amendment, including my amendment to develop a system and procedures to conduct union elections electronically.

Last week, I was in Bessemer, Alabama, supporting workers fighting to form a union at an Amazon warehouse. Amazon, the company that got us all to stay home instead of going to a store in person, demanded an in-person election for 5,800 workers in the middle of a COVID hotspot, but the NLRB ordered a safer mail ballot election instead. Amazon circumvented that ruling and had a mailbox placed in the parking lot under a tent covered in antiunion propaganda, and urged employees to vote there.

This is why the PRO Act gives workers the right to choose the method of their own election, so they can vote away from such coercive environments.

Electronic union elections aren't new. The National Mediation Board has conducted secure electronic elections in the rail and airline industries for almost two decades without a single problem.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the PRO Act.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, workers in our Nation deserve human dignity. That means the right to fight for safety and fairness in the workplace, as residents in my district know this all too well because we birthed the labor rights movement.

One of the most important provisions in the PRO Act provides for mediation and arbitration if the employer and union cannot agree to a first collective bargaining agreement.

My amendment guarantees that there will be no undue delay providing workers that agreement. Currently, almost 50 percent of unions fail to reach an agreement within a year with the employer. So my amendment specifies that the arbitration panel must issue a decision within 120 days. This furthers the core purpose of the bill by preventing employers from delaying this and putting the harm on workers.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, a law is only as strong as the power to enforce it. For far too long, the NLRB has been too powerless to enforce the National Labor Relations Act. For too long, workers have been left to largely fend for themselves in the face of retaliation and intimidation and arbitration.

The PRO Act would breathe new life into the National Labor Relations Act. It would empower the NLRB to impose civil penalties on and empower workers to seek punitive damages against retaliatory employers. Most importantly, the PRO Act would preempt the Orwellian right-to-work laws so that union organizing is given the freedom

to flourish everywhere in the United States.

The PRO Act requires an employer to disclose every time it seeks the services of a professional union-buster.

□ 1430

I am proud to introduce an amendment that requires DOL to make these disclosures available through an app. App-based notification would empower essential workers to be vigilant in defending their essential right to organize.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, these amendments will provide whistle-blower protection for workers, expose violations of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, require the Department of Labor to make employment arrangements and payments to union avoidance firms available and more accessible, clarify that nothing in the bill would expand the National Labor Relations Board's jurisdictional standards, direct the NLRB to establish a system of electronic voting in representation elections, clarify that nothing in the bill will be construed to amend the definition of employer or employee in any provisions of State law, direct the GAO to produce a study of the use of sectoral bargaining in peer nations, require that workers are informed of their rights under the bill in a language that they actually speak, direct the GAO to produce a study of the impact of the PRO Act's changes to the definitions of employee and employer, adds a 120-day timeline for the arbitration process when workers and employers are unable to reach a first bargaining agreement, and confirms that the bill will not affect existing provisions for worker privacy.

These amendments make meaningful improvements to the bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on en bloc 1, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, as the party that claims to champion the working class, Democrats have certainly missed the mark with this bill.

H.R. 842 will force employers to hand over workers' private, personal information to union organizers without workers having any say in the matter or making sure their information will not be shared with others. This would make it even easier for union organizers to target, harass, and intimidate workers.

H.R. 842 also overturns all State right-to-work laws. These 27 State laws allow workers to decide for themselves whether to join a union and pay dues.

If the PRO Act becomes law, workers will be forced to take money from their paychecks and give it to labor unions even if they don't want to be represented by a union. This is astonishing since we know that from 2010 to 2018 unions spent $1.6 billion in member dues on hundreds of left-leaning groups such as Planned Parenthood, the Clinton Foundation, and the Progressive Democrats of America without consulting their members.

The PRO Act will also undermine workers' right to vote by secret ballot by imposing a biased card-check scheme in which workers could be unionized without the union winning a secret ballot election. Every Member of Congress is elected by secret ballot, and House Democrats elect their own caucus leadership by secret ballot; yet they want to deprive American workers of that same protection by passing the PRO Act.

The bill also deprives individuals of entrepreneurial opportunities, the ability to set their own hours, and the flexibility to care for children and family members by creating burdensome and discredited legal standards for determining joint employment and independent contractor status. The PRO Act means the elimination of the franchise industry and sharing economy as we know them.

The bottom line is the underlying bill is shameful, and so is the process under which it is being considered. The Democrats' en bloc package of amendments does nothing to change that. H.R. 842 is radical, backwards-looking legislation which will diminish the rights of workers and employers while harming the economy and providing a political gift to labor union special interests.

We are better than this.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this en bloc package, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 188, I rise to offer amendments en bloc No. 2.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 18, and 19, printed in part B of House Report 117–10, offered by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN OF GEORGIA

Page 3, in the table of contents, strike the item relating to section 111.

Beginning on page 32, line 5, strike section 111.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. COMER OF KENTUCKY

In title II of the bill, strike Sec. 202.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. FITZGERALD OF WISCONSIN

Page 33, line 13, strike ''Section 203(c)'' and insert ''(A) REPORT TO EMPLOYERS.—Section 203(c)''.

Page 34, after line 2, add at the end the following:

(b) RIGHT NOT TO SUBSIDIZE UNION NON-REPRESENTATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Title I of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 411 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 106. RIGHT NOT TO SUBSIDIZE UNION NON-REPRESENTATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

''No employee's union dues, fees, or assessments or other contributions shall be used or contributed to any person, organization, or entity for any purpose not directly related to the labor organization's collective bargaining or contract administration functions on behalf of the represented unit employee unless the employee member, or nonmember required to make such payments as a condition of employment, authorizes such expenditure in writing, after a notice period of not less than 35 days. An initial authorization provided by an employee under the preceding sentence shall expire not later than 1 year after the date on which such authorization is signed by the employee. There shall be no automatic renewal of an authorization under this section.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. FULCHER OF IDAHO

Page 14, beginning on line 22, in section 105, redesignate paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), respectively.

Page 14, line 25, insert before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following:

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: '': *Provided further*, That an employer's voluntary recognition of a labor organization as exclusive bargaining representative of an appropriate unit of the employer's employees under this subsection, and any collective-bargaining agreement executed by the parties on or after the date of voluntary recognition, will not bar the processing of an election petition unless (1) the employer and labor organization notify the Regional office that recognition has been granted; (2) the employer posts a notice of recognition (provided by the Regional Office) informing employees that recognition has been granted and that they have a right, during a 45-day period to file a decertification or rival-union petition; and (3) 45 days from the posting date pass without a properly supported petition being filed.'';

Page 19, after line 18, insert the following:

''(9) Whenever any party to a representation proceeding files an unfair labor practice charge together with a request that it block the election process, or whenever any party to a representation proceeding requests that its previously filed unfair labor practice charge block the election process, the party shall simultaneously file, but not serve on any other party, a written offer of proof in support of the charge. The offer of proof shall provide the names of the witnesses who will testify in support of the charge and a summary of each witness's anticipated testimony. The party seeking to block the election process shall also promptly make available to the regional director the witnesses identified in its offer of proof. The regional

director shall continue to process the petition and conduct the election. If the charge has not been withdrawn, dismissed, or settled prior to the conclusion of the election, the ballots shall be impounded until there is a final determination regarding the charge and its effect, if any, on the election petition or fairness of the election.''

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GOOD OF VIRGINIA

Page 14, line 23, strike ''Section 9'' and insert ''(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9''.

Page 21, after line 7, insert the following:

(b) PROHIBITION OF NEUTRALITY AGREEMENTS.—Section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 186) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''or deliver'' each place it appears and inserting ''provide, or deliver''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) As used in this section, the term 'thing of value' includes organizing assistance.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HERN OF OKLAHOMA

Page 3, in the table of contents, after the item relating to section 302 add at the end the following:

Sec. 304. Effective date.

Page 34, after line 13, add the following:

SEC. 304. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act (and the amendments made by such Act) may not take effect until the Secretary of Labor certifies that this Act will not have an adverse impact on rates of employment in the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KELLER OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 6, strike lines 16 through 19 and redesignate subsequent subparagraphs accordingly.

Page 31, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 32, line 4, and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

Page 18, beginning on line 14, strike ''not later than eight days after a notice of such hearing is served on the labor organization'' and insert ''not earlier than 14 days after a petition for an election under paragraph (1) is filed''.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 3, in the table of contents, amend the matter relating to section 111 to read as follows:

Sec. 111. National right to work

Beginning on page 32, line 5, amend section 111 to read as follows:

SEC. 111. NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK.

(a) Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 157) is amended by striking ''except to'' and all that follows through ''authorized in section 8(a)(3)''.

(b) Section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158(a)(3)) is amended by striking '': *Provided,* That'' and all that follows through ''retaining membership''.

(c) Section 8(b) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or to discriminate'' and all that follows through ''retaining membership''; and

(2) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated under section 104, by striking ''covered by an agreement authorized under subsection (a)(3)''.

(d) Section 8(f) of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158(f)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

(e) Section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 152) is amended by striking paragraph Eleventh.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Republican en bloc amendments.

Madam Speaker, of the 58 amendments submitted by Republicans, unfortunately only nine were made in order, and I remind my colleagues that no committee markup was held on the bill, which prevented any amendments from being considered prior to today.

The Republican amendments highlight the radical and flawed approach H.R. 842 takes which would completely unbalance American labor law in favor of unions while diminishing worker freedom.

I will briefly mention several of the amendments which are included in this en bloc package: Mr. ALLEN's amendment strikes the provision that overturns 27 right-to-work laws which ensure workers do not have to join or pay dues to a union if they choose not to.

Mr. COMER's amendment strikes the provision that would require attorney and consultants to disclose to the Federal Government the agreements they have with employers even if the attorney or consultant never has any contact with employees.

Mr. FITZGERALD's amendment protects worker paychecks by requiring that unions receive express consent to spend their money on activities unrelated to collective bargaining, such as politics.

Mr. GOOD's amendment highlights the often coercive nature of so-called neutrality agreements entered by an employer and union during an organizing drive.

Representative KELLER's amendment removes the provision that would allow intermittent strikes which would be incredibly disruptive to small businesses, and the amendment also removes the provision that would prohibit employers from replacing workers permanently to keep businesses open.

Representative WALBERG's amendment would give employers a reasonable amount of time to prepare for a free election hearing which is especially important for small businesses who have no HR personnel or in-house attorney.

Mr. WILSON's amendment would ensure that workers across the country do not have to join or pay dues to a union if that is their choice.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, we have heard a lot about complaints about the dues but what we don't hear are complaints about the higher salaries, safer workplaces, and better benefits that are accrued by virtue of investments from the unions. They enjoy those benefits, so it is not unreasonable to expect people to pay a fair share of those costs.

Now, fair share does not include the political activities, does not include the annual holiday parties, but those services that the union is obligated by law to provide, negotiating salaries, negotiating a safe workplace, individualized representation when necessary, whatever they do for union members they have to do for nonunion members, a fair share of those expenses is not unreasonable.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we would defeat these amendments that would undermine that idea, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I stand here today disappointed but not surprised that my Democratic colleagues and their union boss allies want my home State of Georgia to look just like New York and California.

This is made abundantly clear in the PRO Act where the bill outright bans State right-to-work laws.

I can tell my colleagues one thing: Not on my watch.

Georgia has been a proud right-to-work State since 1947, and it is one of the many reasons workers have prospered. That is why I rise today to offer my straightforward amendment that strikes the ban on right-to-work States.

No American should be forced to pay for representation and political activities that they do not agree with, and that is what will happen if we do not adopt my amendment.

It is a no-brainer: workers should be in control of their earnings and how they spend it. Americans want choice.

I urge my colleagues to support worker choice and vote ''yes'' on my amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN.)

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, it is interesting today listening to the debate. I didn't hear anything about workers, trying to actually help workers get a better wage or better benefits or better safety in their workplace from people on the other side of the aisle.

But what I have heard over and over and over again are Planned Parenthood, the Clinton Foundation, and Progressive Democrats of America which, by the way, Madam Speaker, don't appear anywhere inside this bill today.

I guess if you can't talk about what you are going to do on behalf of workers, you are going to talk about Planned Parenthood, Clinton Foundation, and Progressive Democrats of America, which, by the way, I would

argue the free time they have given them this afternoon on national TV is probably more than the donations that actually came from union organizations.

The bottom line is the other party here across the aisle has over and over said they want to rebrand themselves as the workers' party, and yet they haven't done a thing today to prove they care about workers. They have certainly proven for the bosses and corporations that they are best buddies, BFFs forever, but on behalf of workers it is this side of the aisle that is doing all the heavy lifting.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, my amendment protects the ability of employers to receive advice from an attorney or consultant regarding unionization without the attorney or consultant having to disclose the relationship to the Federal Government when the attorney or consultant will have no contact with the employer's employees.

Congress has no business forcing attorneys to report on an attorney-client relationship when the attorney will not be speaking with employees. Even the left-leaning American Bar Association opposed the Obama persuader rule, and I urge my colleagues to do the same by approving this amendment and protecting the First Amendment rights of employers.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, over 500 attorneys, including 244 Members of the American Bar Association, submitted a letter in support of the persuader rule. It does not require the disclosure of legal representation but only of persuader activities.

Employers hire union avoidance persuaders to consult with them, according to the Department of Labor in 2016, and between 71 and 87 percent of union elections persuaders produce antiunion literature and materials, write speeches and statements, and identify prounion employees for discipline or reward. The employees often do not know that their employer has retained such consultants in its campaign against the union. It is one of the things that they ought to have to disclose.

So, Madam Speaker, I hope that we will defeat this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, amendment No. 19 amends section 111 and replaces the text with the National Right to Work Act. Section 111 takes away the freedoms of hardworking Americans and overrules State right-to-work laws of 27 States enthusiastically enacted by voters.

American workers should not be forced to pay fees to a labor organization. American workers should not be forced to have a union represent them. American workers should not be forced to have their money go to political candidates they do not support. American workers deserve freedom, and this amendment delivers that.

Right-to-work States like South Carolina have seen firsthand the job creation and robust economy that develops when we expand freedom for jobs. It was crucial for South Carolina in our journey to become the leading manufacturer and exporter of tires with Michelin, Bridgestone, Continental, and Giti, while also being the largest exporter of cars in the United States with BMW, Volvo, and Mercedes vans.

□ 1445

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, this amendment would strike the bill's provision that allows unions to collect a fair-share fee for services they are legally required to provide, and create, in its place, a national right-to-freeload scheme.

This is a blatant attempt to undermine unions by making it harder to collect reasonable fees for the services they are required by law to perform equally for union members and nonmembers alike.

Let us understand where so-called right-to-work laws come from. They have nothing to do with a right to a job. Their history is rooted in Jim Crow-era laws designed specifically to prevent White and Black workers from organizing together in the same union.

Last week, I was in Alabama, supporting an overwhelmingly Black group of workers in their effort to form a union. I saw how difficult this was in a so-called right-to-work State. These laws are vestiges of a racist past, and it is time we reject them.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman giving me some time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, H.R. 842 codifies the one-sided Obama-era ambush election rule, which deprives employees of the necessary time to learn about the potential implications of refraining from or joining a union.

My amendment ensures workers have appropriate time to learn the pros and cons of an enormously important decision affecting their careers, their families, and their livelihoods.

Unions often begin organizing campaigns weeks or even months before employers are made aware of this activity, creating a scenario in which workers are only hearing one side of the issue, like the other side of the Chamber today is trying to get across.

Additionally, H.R. 842 imposes a complex scheme of new regulations and penalties on employers of all sizes. Small businesses lacking internal human resources or legal departments would be most harmed by this ambush election.

Providing appropriate time for workers to hear both sides and inform themselves does not substantially change the organizing process. It merely creates a more informed electorate.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for my amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, this amendment that I authored would prohibit labor organizations from using union dues and fees collected from workers for non-collective bargaining purposes without the written consent of the employee. No employee should be forced to subsidize political positions they disagree with at the cost of employment.

According to the Center for Union Facts, 43 percent of union households voted Republican, yet 86 percent of the union political support went to Democrat candidates in 2016. Clearly, there is a strong difference of opinion between union bosses and union members on the best pathway forward, but union bosses continue to spend their members' money with little accountability.

Workers across Wisconsin and this country pay annual union dues to labor organizations in exchange for representation, not to line the pockets of the politicians. This amendment would stop unions from sending workers' hard-earned money into a black hole and ensure that the voices of workers are being heard.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment. Employees nationwide deserve to have a say in how their money is spent.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, my amendment maintains longstanding current law, which protects the ability of employers to continue to do business and provide for their customers during a labor relations dispute.

One of the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act is to eliminate ''substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce.'' During the economic chaos of the 1930s, Congress passed the NLRA, which struck a careful balance by protecting workers' ability to strike while not protecting the practice of intermittent strikes that create upheaval and uncertainty.

The PRO Act aims to make it impossible for employers to continue to do business in the event of a labor dispute, a death sentence for thousands of small businesses. Allowing intermittent strikes and banning permanent replacements would be devastating to

our economy, our global competitiveness, and the incentive to invest in American workers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and to prevent dangerous disruptions to our economy.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, this amendment seeks to hinder workers' First Amendment right to assemble peacefully to better their workplace situation.

No worker wants to go on strike. No worker wants to forgo a paycheck so they can walk a picket line, often in the frigid cold of winter or in the burning sun in the summer. Workers strike because they are left with no other option.

The right to withhold labor is a core right, supposedly protected in our labor law, and the PRO Act would restore that fundamental right because, in practice, it has been gutted.

I actually agree with the gentleman that what we need is to restore the balance that the National Labor Relations Act sought to create when it was passed in 1935.

The things we are changing aren't the National Labor Relations Act that was passed. It is not that balance. It is the ways that employees' freedom to withhold their labor has been gutted in the interim by State and Federal courts and by this body.

We need to restore workers' freedom to withhold their labor in order to improve their situation. That is all this bill does. Let's get back to that balance.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, could I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 4½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the right to organize is appropriately protected in America, the right to organize fairly, honestly, and transparently.

My amendment would provide greater fairness and transparency by prohibiting so-called neutrality agreements. These prevent an employer from saying anything negative about the union and ensure that workers only hear one side, the union boss's side.

Neutrality agreements often include card check in lieu of a secret ballot, permit unions access to company property for organizational efforts, and give private employee contact information to the unions. The company, which was inevitably threatened with retaliatory consequences if they didn't agree to the neutrality agreement, will often provide the unions with a captive audience on company time to present the prounion argument.

Neutrality agreements are grounded in the same leftist view that companies are trying to take advantage of their employees. Neutrality agreements should be prohibited. Employees should be permitted to hear both sides, pro and con, regarding organizing, and then permitted to make informed decisions by secret ballot.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these amendments.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, this amendment is truly amazing to me as a longtime union organizer. It seeks to undermine the freedom of contract, the ability of employers and unions to agree on how to handle a situation freely together.

The shock of giving the employees' addresses and other contact information: That is required in every NLRB election, and it has been since the Excelsior Underwear case many decades ago.

The shock of letting the workers have access to hearing from the union on company time: The current law is that employers can force employees, on company time, to listen to antiunion propaganda the entire time. If you refuse to go, you could be fired. But if an organizer tries to step on the premises of the employer, they could be arrested.

I have been arrested for trying to talk to workers. It was on a public sidewalk, but the police said we were too close. Anyway, that was thrown out, as it should have been. We were exercising our First Amendment rights.

In any event, this amendment is truly astounding in a capitalist society. We need to let parties be free, and I urge rejection of the amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman so much for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, at base, what we are talking about here is whether workers in this country are free to come together and form a union. All of these amendments are designed to undermine that right.

Let's get back to the basic concept of a free market for workers, where they, prounion or antiunion, can decide amongst themselves whether they want to form a union or not, and not have the person in the world who has the most power over them, their boss, who decides their wages and their hours, to pressure them, to force them to listen to things, to subject them to propaganda.

The PRO Act simply creates freedom for workers to form unions, at long last, so that the workers who want to form a union can do so freely.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my Republican colleagues for offering these thoughtful amendments, which would protect the interests and rights of workers and employers alike. They negate some of the worst aspects of the PRO Act.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that the PRO Act gives workers the right to form a union. That right has been around since the 1930s, Madam Speaker. Workers are already free to form a union, and Republicans do nothing to try to stop that freedom.

What the underlying bill does, however, is take away the freedom not to belong to a union. That is a fundamental freedom in this country, and we ought not to be taking that away from the American workers.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Republican en bloc amendments and a ''no'' vote on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, as a group, these amendments would erode workers' rights, slow down elections, allow workers to freeload, or even prohibit employers from agreeing not to interfere with the election. I would hope that we would defeat these amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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.

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. 842 is postponed.

□ 1500

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1319, AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117–11) on the resolution (H. Res. 198) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1319) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 5, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1319, AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 198 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 198

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1319) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 5, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for two hours equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, today, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 198, providing for a motion to concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 1319, the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

The rule provides 2 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Budget and Ways and Means.

Madam Speaker, a once-in-a-century pandemic brought us the need to act, and a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President have seized the moment, not as a chance to help big corporations or the already well-off, as those on the other side have done over and over again, but as an opportunity to invest in our workers, our students, our communities, and the very people who need help the most.

More than 18 million Americans are receiving unemployment benefits today. Nearly 24 million adults are going hungry. Roughly 12 million children are living in households with food insecurity. Up to 40 million people cannot afford to pay rent and fear eviction. Over 2 million women have been forced to leave the workforce. Eight of 10 minority businesses are on the brink of closure. That is what COVID has wrought in America today.

This is more than a Band-Aid; this is a lifeline, Madam Speaker. It will put more vaccines in arms, put more kids back safely in schools, put more money in people's pockets, and put more people back to work. It is hard to overstate just how important this is.

This bill, Madam Speaker, attacks inequality and poverty in ways we haven't seen in a generation. This legislation makes the biggest investments in our workers and our middle class that I have seen in my two-and-a-half decades of service here.

Make no mistake, I am disappointed to see the cut in the unemployment insurance made over in the Senate, and we are going to keep fighting to raise the minimum wage so that no one who works full time lives in poverty. We are going to keep focusing on the hunger crisis in this country until we end it once and for all. These should be fundamental priorities of the wealthiest nation on the planet.

But let's be clear. Today, we are on the doorstep of history. We are about to send the most sweeping and progressive economic investment in modern times to the President of the United States: $1,400 in direct payments, a historic child allowance, school infrastructure, an expansion of the Affordable Care Act, student loan relief, billions in rental assistance, aid that will cut child poverty in half, and I could go on and on and on.

Everything included in this final package is necessary to crush the virus and revitalize our economy.

As I have noted, I have been in Congress for more than 20 years, but this, Madam Speaker, this is among my proudest moments.

I want to thank our distinguished Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, and my fellow committee chairs who worked so hard on this bill. I want to thank Budget Committee Chair YARMUTH and all of my colleagues here in the House for getting us to this point.

Democrats on both sides of the Capitol, together with the Biden administration, have crafted something historic. In 1 day, with a single vote in favor of this bill, we will change the lives of millions of Americans for the better.

For all of our important work, day in and day out, we don't get many chances like this. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for this rule and the underlying rescue plan.

Let us rise and meet this moment, and let's send this historic bill to the President's desk for his signature.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1319, the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

First, the House considered the budget resolution setting the budget reconciliation instructions for this massive coronavirus relief bill. Then, the House considered and passed, on a partisan basis, the budget resolution authorizing a deficit increase of nearly $2 trillion. After an all-night vote-a-rama in the Senate, the House will consider this package for the third time.

Three times the House will have debated and passed a partisan package, and only 9 percent is dedicated to actually crushing the coronavirus. This isn't just disappointing; it is irresponsible, and it is unrepresentative of the American people.

Currently, Democrats only hold the majority by five Representatives. That means that the 211 Republicans, representing nearly 150 million Americans, have been shut out of this process; 150 million Americans are not represented in the package before us today.

Madam Speaker, we all want to provide the resources to successfully emerge on the other side of the pandemic. This bill does include funding for testing and vaccine deployment, as well as some economic support and aid to those who are unemployed or experiencing food shortages, but this support is not targeted toward those identified as most vulnerable.

This bill includes $1,400 in economic stimulus payments to anyone making $75,000 a year or less, including those who may not have lost their jobs or experienced reduced employment. In addition, there is no mechanism to ensure that these payments go only to American citizens.

Republicans were pleased that the infrastructure projects in California and New York, projects that had nothing to do with coronavirus relief, have been removed. We are glad of that.

My Democratic colleagues may argue that these projects would have created jobs, but why then are Democrats also providing $125 billion to schools even if they remain closed? Teachers want to teach. Teachers want to be safely in their classrooms teaching. The Centers for Disease Control has confirmed that with appropriate safety precautions, the risk of coronavirus transmission in schools is minimal. In fact, many States are prioritizing teachers for vaccines. Madam Speaker, our State of Texas is doing so. Why are we paying schools to keep them home?

This bill also provides $362 billion for State and local governments. The CARES Act, passed on March 27, already provided a $150 billion Coronavirus Relief Fund to help local entities with lost revenue during the shutdowns. However, many local authorities have chosen to keep their economies shut down, despite a drop in coronavirus cases and the effectiveness of safety measures like social distancing and mask-wearing.

Congress should not bail out State and local governments for mismanagement that occurred prior to the pandemic. The total revenue loss of State and local governments during the pandemic is $7.6 billion. This bill provides over $219 billion, and it is available until expended.

Let me say that again: It is available until expended. That is $200 billion more than the lost revenue due to the pandemic, the crisis which this bill is meant to target.

□ 1515

This bill also provides $400 million for an emergency food and shelter program, with $110 million set aside specifically for humanitarian relief to families and individuals encountered by Department of Homeland Security officials.

Since his first day in office, President Biden has worked to overturn the advances achieved by the Trump administration to limit border crossings by those undocumented, which is particularly concerning given that limited coronavirus testing is occurring along our Southern border. Just recently, over 100 individuals crossing without documentation tested positive for the coronavirus, but were subsequently released into the interior of the United States.

We cannot allow the desires of foreign nationals to come before the needs of American citizens. We should provide testing and personal protective equipment to all encountered along our Southern border so that we can protect our frontline officials and protect American communities.

These are only a few of the concerning provisions included in this so-called relief package, but the most concerning piece is that Republicans' participation in this process was extremely limited by Democrats. Bipartisanship is not unprecedented. We came together to pass prior coronavirus relief bills. Literally, 1 year ago, March of last year, we passed three bipartisan coronavirus relief packages through the House and the Senate. And we can do so again.

Why now are the Democrats deciding Republicans are not worthy, we are not worthy partners, and limiting the voices of our constituents?

Why should only half of the Congress be allowed to participate in the making of a law that will affect the entire country?

Is only half of the American population worth saving?

Those are the questions being asked today. With that, I urge opposition to the rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article that appeared in Politico entitled, ''`Check Partisanship At the Door': Biden finds GOP allies for rescue money.''

[From Politico, Mar. 5, 2021]

'CHECK PARTISANSHIP AT THE DOOR': BIDEN FINDS GOP ALLIES FOR RESCUE MONEY

(By Kellie Mejdrich)

Republicans in Congress attacking President Joe Biden's plan to pour hundreds of billions of dollars in pandemic relief aid into local governments are facing resistance—from GOP-run states and cities.

Republican mayors in Texas, Arizona, Florida and Oklahoma are among those backing Biden's state and local government funding plan as part of the $1.9 trillion coronavirus aid bill that's before the Senate, defying GOP lawmakers in Washington, who are broadly resisting the spending.

''In a crisis and an emergency, you check partisanship at the door, and you get through the crisis,'' said John Giles, the Republican mayor of Mesa, Ariz. ''You can get back to playing politics when the crisis is over. And so this is one of those times.''

The clash between local and national Republicans is a rare public division in a party that has generally been united in opposition to policies being pushed by Biden and Democrats in control of Congress. It's a breach that Biden and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi have gone out of their way to exploit as the coronavirus legislation enters the final stretch.

Lawmakers including Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, Sens. Rick Scott and Marco Rubio of Florida, and Ted Cruz of Texas have been among the most vocal national Republicans in rejecting the aid, calling it a ''bailout'' of what they say are poorly run Democratic states and arguing that state budgets fared much better than expected during the pandemic. They also say that a good chunk of the money doled out to the states by Congress last year remains unspent.

McConnell slammed the relief package in his opening remarks Friday, calling it ''an ideological spending spree packed with non-Covid-related policies'' and panning the $350 billion targeted for state governments as a ''massive cash bailout for mismanaged state and local governments.''

But Giles and other mayors say their residents are locked in a struggle to fill pantries with food as municipal reserves and other dedicated funds are running dry.

''There has been an overwhelming backlash from our Republican congressmen and senators because of how much money is in this bill,'' said Arlington, Texas, Mayor Jeff Williams. ''For us, the reality is the need is very much here for cities.''

Williams said that when he talks with his counterparts in Washington he tells them ''we have seen the great economists of our country all come together'' in support of these additional funds for state and local governments.

He also draws on comments by Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell. While Powell hasn't taken a specific position on state aid or the coronavirus legislation itself, he has often spoken of the drag on the economy from the loss of more than a million state government jobs during the pandemic.

Biden underlined the conflict within the party by inviting a bipartisan group of governors and mayors to the White House last month to discuss local funding issues. Pelosi late last month said Republicans in Congress were choosing to ''mock'' the aid package despite its broad support, citing a bipartisan letter signed by mayors across the country requesting more aid—including signatures from more than 30 Republicans.

Miami Mayor Francis Suarez, a Republican who attended the White House meeting, told POLITICO, ''We're hoping that it doesn't become a partisan punching bag.'' He said he hoped that ''hearing from local officials that are on the ground, day in and day out, will be something that motivates elected officials from both parties'' to support the funding.

GOP lawmakers say that a surge in tax revenue for most states following last year's massive aid packages makes more help unnecessary now. But while the financial picture is brighter than many officials projected, some of the states hardest hit by the pandemic are represented by these lawmakers.

A recent report from Moody's Analytics showed that five of the 10 states with the biggest budget shortfalls are Louisiana, Oklahoma, Alaska, Florida and Kansas. They were among 19 states where Moody's identified looming budget shortfalls even after accounting for federal aid and local reserves. Ten of the 19 are represented by at least one GOP senator.

''It would be a dereliction of duty for me not to try to fight for $116 million that would allow us to restore our police, fire and other core services,'' said Oklahoma City Mayor David Holt, a Republican.

City and county leaders are amplifying calls for support because the new bill sets aside more than $100 billion for municipal and county governments—just over $120 billion in a ''local fiscal recovery fund,'' according to the latest Senate version of the bill.

So while just 38 cities got funding in the first round in March, the United States Conference of Mayors estimates the new formula expands eligibility to 19,000 cities, towns and villages. That's why more than 30 Republican mayors signed on to the letter in support of the package last month that Pelosi touted, with Giles, Holt, Suarez and Williams among them.

Giles said the city of Mesa was lucky enough to get $90 million in the first round of aid, but added, ''We could have turned in twice that much in receipts that were tied to virus relief; our expenses have gone higher.''

''Because we're in the food bank business, we're in the buying laptop computers for school business, we're in the rent, utility business. We're doing all of these things that we weren't doing a year and a half ago,'' he said.

Even some Republican governors have publicly vouched for the plan, including Asa Hutchinson of Arkansas and Larry Hogan of Maryland, citing the financial stakes ahead.

Meanwhile, 22 Republican governors in a statement issued at the end of February criticized Biden's funding plan—but only because their states will see a smaller share of the direct grant funding compared to what Congress sent them in March.

''The new stimulus proposal allocates aid based on a state's unemployed population rather than its actual population, which punishes states that took a measured approach to the pandemic and entered the crisis with healthy state budgets and strong economies,'' read the statement, whose signatories included Republican Governors Ron Desantis of Florida, Kevin Stitt of Oklahoma and Doug Ducey of Arizona.

Many of Florida's tourism-dependent cities have taken a financial beating, and the state faces a big shortfall for the coming budget year. Local media reported last month that the state deficit was estimated at $2 billion.

Yet the same day that Miami's Suarez traveled to Washington to discuss local funding with the president, Republican Sen. Scott slammed Biden's proposed aid package for the states in an editorial, saying the money would be used to ''bail out fiscally irresponsible governors in New York and Illinois.'' Rubio, Florida's other Republican senator, has also spoken critically of more local aid, saying that some states ''see this as the latest opportunity to get bailed out.''

But even with better outcomes for states overall, state and local government employment still hasn't recovered from the pandemic downturn. The latest Bureau of Labor Statistics data show that they are still down about 1.4 million jobs from a year ago—about 1 million of which are in education.

Teryn Zmuda, chief economist of the National Association of Counties, said states do need the help.

''Local government specifically is down 1 million of those 10 million jobs that the nation is short right now,'' Zmuda said. ''So, aid to local governments will get those 1 million workers back in the workforce.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I raise that because the only place where this bill isn't bipartisan is here in Washington. Republican mayors and Republican Governors all across the country want this bill. Seventy percent of the American people want this bill. But here in Washington, my Republican friends think they know better than their constituents. They have what we call Potomac fever or they have gone Washington on their constituents.

The bottom line is people back home need help. People back home are struggling, businesses back home have been devastated because of this pandemic. This is a bill designed to help the American people.

Before I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, we are about to be treated to a little bit of theatrics, and I understand that they want to delay the passage of this bill and bring up an alternative, a bill that they claim is going to help our schools but provides no new funding.

What we are doing here, Madam Speaker, is we are not only providing funding to help our schools reopen safely, we are also providing money to help those who are unemployed, to help those who are hungry, to help our cities and towns that are on the verge of laying off first responders.

In a moment, everybody in this House needs to stand and be counted; and on this side of the aisle—and I hope some of my Republican friends will join with us—we are going to stand with the people. We are going to stand with the people.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, after a year of battling this pandemic, our communities are on the edge, and the American Rescue Plan is here.

To the American public, help is on the way.

It will put money directly into people's pockets. The $1,400 per person payment, the expansion of unemployment benefits will help people deal with increasing debt, paying rent, buying food, and paying healthcare bills. State and local funding is necessary to prevent our State and local governments from relying on tax increases to stay afloat; to keep first responders, frontline health workers, and other providers of vital services on the job.

One of the provisions included in the American Rescue Plan that I am particularly proud of, that I have championed for nearly two decades, is the expansion and the improvement of the child tax credit. In this plan, the credit increases from $2,000 to $3,000 for children 6–17, with an additional $600 each for children under 6. Think of that. It is a new lifeline to the middle class, and it cuts child poverty nearly in half.

Franklin Roosevelt lifted seniors out of poverty—90 percent of them—with Social Security. And with the stroke of a pen, President Biden is going to lift millions and millions of children out of poverty in this country.

As families struggle to stay in their home, feed their families, purchase necessities, this plan provides for hard-working Americans. It includes $12 billion in emergency food assistance, including an extension of increased food stamps. The relief also provides $45 billion for rental and mortgage assistance.

It is time to make a bold investment in the health and the security of the American people. This is a watershed moment, an historic piece of legislation. We will vote for the American Rescue Plan with the determination to adequately meet the moment with strength, with action, and with hope.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. HINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for purposes of the unanimous consent request?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I will not yield for that purpose. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished Republican leader, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair now recognizes that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classrooms.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back into the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FEENSTRA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back into the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON), a valuable member of the Doctors Caucus, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MACE. Madam Speaker, as a single working mom, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back into the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The chair would advise Members that even though a unanimous consent request is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE) for the purposes of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 862, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1530

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for

that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for the purposes of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CARL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. SPARTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), a valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R.

682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN), another member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), another valuable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1545

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JACOBS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JACOBS of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind the screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. HAGEDORN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HAGEDORN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back into the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HERRELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HERRELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back into the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), another valuable member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back in the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, to get our kids out from behind screens and back into the classroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ).

Mrs. SPARTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

I am not going to talk much about the underlying bill since it will not

change anyone's vote at this point. I would just summarize it as advancing a socialist agenda by putting temporary bandages on old problems without fixing them, at the expense of the middle class and the future of our children.

Madam Speaker, I mainly just wanted to express my strong disappointment with how broken our legislative process is and how dysfunctional Congress is. If we do not fix it soon and have some common sense, we are going to destroy our great Republic. We should be embarrassed to call ourselves policymakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, it is interesting that we just saw a parade of Republicans come before the microphone and urge us to move on a bill, and they read the short title of the bill. But the real title of the bill, and let me read it to you, is: ''To encourage local educational agencies to resume in-person instruction at elementary and secondary schools.'' That is what the bill does.

Now, let me just say to my Republican friends, I don't know if you go home and you don't talk to principals, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students, but our schools don't need encouragement. What they need are resources to be able to reopen safely.

This bill that you are talking about here doesn't provide one additional cent to help schools reopen. Nothing. No money. No resources. Nothing. Give me a break. Come on.

Madam Speaker, the bill that we are about to debate here will provide $130 billion to help K–12 schools reopen safely. That is not encouragement. It is real resources to make it a reality.

By the way, this bill also requires States to award K–12 funds to local school districts no later than 60 days after receipt and school districts to develop plans to ensure that schools return to in-person learning.

I could have saved you a lot of time and a lot of embarrassment. That was bad theater. It was terrible theater.

Madam Speaker, people need help. We are trying to crush this virus, get this economy back on the right track, and reopen our schools, and this is what we get. Look, I hope everybody takes note of those who went before the mike to argue against this bill and for a symbolic bill that provides no resources, because, at the end of the day, people need to know who was on their side in the middle of this crisis, who stood up and fought for them and provided much-needed Federal relief to our local communities and our schools. That was pathetic.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS), a distinguished new member of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let me remind Members to direct their comments to the Chair.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, the American Rescue Plan will finally deliver needed aid to individuals, families, workers, businesses, and healthcare systems. I am proud that this Congress has taken such swift action to get this important work done.

I want to highlight one part of the bill that would be life-changing for hundreds of thousands of people in my State.

Sadly, North Carolina is one of only 12 States that has not expanded Medicaid under the ACA. This failure has left over 600,000 low-income North Carolinians without healthcare.

The American Rescue Plan provides an added incentive for States like mine to expand Medicaid. The bill offers a 5-point increase in the Federal funding match for Medicaid for 2 years to States that choose to expand the program during this pandemic. This would bring North Carolina more than $2 billion in Federal healthcare coverage for our most vulnerable people and help our hardest-hit hospitals.

Madam Speaker, our State desperately needs the relief provided in this bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 22½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 18 minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to immediately consider H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, introduced by Mrs. HINSON from Iowa, to ensure that the $54.3 billion that Congress appropriated in December in order to help schools reopen is, in fact, prioritized to meet the expenses of actually being open for in-person learning.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), who is here to explain the amendment.

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose the previous question and to offer an amendment to help our schools safely reopen their doors for in-person learning.

Madam Speaker, millions of children around the Nation have been out of the classroom for the better part of a year. This has taken a serious toll not only on their learning and social development but also on their working parents, who have been forced to juggle home-schooling their children and working full-time jobs.

The data is in, and it makes abundantly clear that at-home learning is not a sufficient substitute for in-person education. One recent study found that children began to fall significantly behind in math. The study concluded that it would take students in grades 5 and 6 at least 12 weeks, on average, to catch up to where they were expected to be.

Madam Speaker, the science is in, and it, too, makes abundantly clear that schools can reopen safely if the right precautions are taken. Commonsense social-distancing measures significantly reduce the spread of COVID–19 in schools and make the classroom a safe place for our students and our teachers. The CDC Director said last month that the science shows our schools can reopen safely even before every teacher is vaccinated.

Madam Speaker, this is what the science tells us. Yet, despite these facts, too many children in my district and around the country are still not in the classroom. Students are losing out on a true, sound, basic education guaranteed them by the New York State Constitution, and parents are being forced to choose between going to work to earn a paycheck or staying home to teach their children. It is an impossible decision that no parent should be forced to make.

In my home State of New York, Governor Cuomo has said one thing and done another. The result has been confusion across the State and a patchwork of incoherent and conflicting policies. Governor Cuomo claims to support the science. Yet, it is March 2021, and New York still does not have a statewide plan to reopen our schools. It is clear that he is putting special interests before our students' education.

Sadly, we New Yorkers aren't surprised. Governor Cuomo has already lost credibility due to his unconscionable coverup of nursing home deaths. He failed to put our seniors first, and now he is failing to put our students first. We can and we must do better.

Madam Speaker, under the American Rescue Plan that the House will consider again later this week, nearly $130 billion is set aside for schools. But if you read the fine print, 95 percent of that money won't be spent until after 2021 is over. If you keep reading, you realize that there is no requirement that the funding be used to reopen schools safely, something our Nation is desperately crying out for.

The rescue plan fails to prioritize our students and does not do enough to return safely to in-person learning, which our students desperately need.

□ 1600

If we defeat the previous question, we will move to immediately consider the Reopen Schools Act, which states that schools, which accept a portion of the COVID–19 funding, must reopen. In order to receive full funding, schools are required to allow at least 50 percent of their students in the classroom, in person, at least 50 percent of the time.

This is what New York families are requesting, and it is exactly what families across the country are demanding from their leaders in Washington.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman if she could tell me how much money is in her bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) to ask how much money is in the gentlewoman's bill.

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, the money is coming from the American Rescue Act that the gentleman voted for, but what we are doing here is prioritizing the spending.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I reclaim the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, here we have a Republican colleagues coming to the floor basically advocating nothing. Their bill—read the long title again—is to encourage local educational agencies to resume in-person instruction at elementary and secondary schools. Not one new cent in money.

Schools don't need to be encouraged. They need the resources to be able to deal with issues like ventilation, to be able to make sure that the infrastructure is such that it is safe for students and teachers and others to come back to the schools.

And my Republican friends, while they are coming here and trying to find ways to delay the American Rescue Act, they are going to vote against it. They are not advocating for one additional cent for vaccines. They are not advocating for any additional help for those who are unemployed, for small businesses and restaurants that are struggling. They don't want any more resources to go to cities and towns.

So I hope that we don't see some of my Republican friends show up at announcements announcing money and resources for schools and cities and towns, for those who are struggling, trying to take credit for something that they voted against.

Madam Speaker, I would, again, urge my colleagues on both sides to look at this for what it is. This is not about trying to help people. This is about a continuing effort to delay much-needed resources to our schools, to our struggling families, and to our small businesses.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the American Rescue Plan.

Madam Speaker, I have been honored to be in public service in my State legislature, as mayor of West Palm Beach, and now here in Congress. I can unequivocally say that this is the most important, impactful piece of legislation that I have ever had the honor to vote for.

We all know that this past year has tested us like never before. The pandemic has destroyed lives and livelihoods. It has disproportionately hurt women, especially women of color, who are already at an economic disadvantage. The impacts have been devastating. Women have lost 5.3 million jobs, 2 million of which are permanent losses. And that is not all. Women also make up the majority of our frontline workforce. In fact, Madam Speaker, we are calling this a ''she'' session.

Schools close and the loss of accessible childcare have only added to the crisis, but this bill will rescue women and their families with the relief they need. It will crush COVID–19, get our children safely back to school, and rescue the childcare industry. It is going to increase the child tax credit, taking half of our children in poverty out of poverty. It is going to get the vaccines into the arms of Americans.

I will tell you this, Madam Speaker: My office is getting calls day after day, all day, from people who want these vaccines.

This rescue package will put money directly into the pockets of working people and get people back to work.

Women have shouldered so much of this pandemic. So it is time to extend the helping hand that they and their families need to get through this pandemic.

I believe, Madam Speaker, that better days are ahead with this rescue plan, and I urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I would just like to address the question that the gentleman from Massachusetts posed.

What is allocated for this bill?

$54.3 billion is going to be appropriated immediately.

Madam Speaker, at this point, the bill that he is talking about has no money—only 5 percent until after 2021.

We have students and parents and everyone coming to us, and they want to open their schools because the children are falling far behind. This is particularly difficult in New York, where we have no plan in place and the Governor has failed to give us a plan, and our students are failing and we need to have our students back on track.

That is all that we are asking for, is that this money be allocated now and not wait for only 5 percent to be allocated until after 2021.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just state for the record and respond to the gentlewoman. The bill she is talking about is not an appropriations bill. Let's be clear. Let's make sure we are clear about what we are talking about here. This is not an appropriations bill.

She is talking about money that was previously allocated in previous bills. The bill that my Republican friends are bringing forward allocates zero. It encourages schools to open up.

Again, our schools don't need encouragement. What they need are resources. And if my friends would go home and listen to their superintendents, to the principals, to the teachers, to the parents, to the students, they would understand how desperate the situation is.

Now is the time for action, not more empty rhetoric, not more political theater, not more words. People need resources and they need it now.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and underlying act, the American Rescue Plan Act.

The COVID–19 pandemic has taken the lives of over 525,000 Americans. Our communities are struggling and our constituents are desperate for relief. Millions remain out of work, and as many as 12 million children are living in households where they don't get enough to eat.

We are grateful to have new leadership in the White House and in the Senate. I look forward to passing legislation that will end the pandemic and open our economy and let America get back to work. The American Rescue Plan puts money directly in the hands of American people.

The direct cash infusion will help millions of Americans pay their rent and keep the lights on at home. In addition to $1,400 worth of direct stimulus payments for a large chunk of Americans, support for small businesses and restaurants, and an extension of unemployment insurance benefits, the American Rescue Plan Act expands the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit to give families the support they so desperately need. The child tax credit expansion alone will cut childhood poverty in half.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to passage of this act because, unlike the political charade that our colleagues just treated us to and wasting the time of the House and the American people, the American Rescue Plan Act will, number one, crush the virus; number two, get Americans back to work; and number three, actually help children get out from behind their screens and back in the classroom.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill and this rule.

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

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I would like to remind my Democrat colleagues across the aisle that I am from the State of Georgia, where, proudly, we are open. My son has been going in person to school this entire school year. As a matter of fact, he played football, where they had practices and games and parents got to attend and sit in the stadium.

Children being kept home from school is about the worst thing that

you can possibly do. If you really want to do anything to help Americans, reopen the schools, reopen America, and stop wasting more American tax dollars.

It is a complete lie to the American taxpayers that you are going to save the day with your $1.9 trillion spending bill, and you think you are going to save children. If you want to save children, reopen the schools.

The Biden administration is fine with having 100 percent open schools at the border for children who are coming into our country.

Why are our children being forced to stay home in blue States and, many places, for no reason when their parents pay the taxes?

The best way to save America is reopen.

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

Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

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

Madam Speaker, we all want schools to reopen, but we want them to reopen safely. There is such a thing called science that we need to respect, and we need to make sure that our schools are reopened safely.

This is a deadly disease that has invaded our country. We have all lost friends and loved ones to COVID–19. We lost a congressman-elect and a sitting Member of Congress on the Republican side to COVID. So to get up here and to talk like this is much ado about nothing? Come on. What are my friends thinking? This is serious.

Communities after communities all throughout this country are trying to find ways to reopen schools safely. Some of them are trying to invest in infrastructure for better ventilation to make sure that it is safe. Some are talking about additional school buses to be able to transport kids to and from school safely. They need resources, not encouragement.

Give me a break. How insulting to somebody watching this debate in any of our districts to hear Members of Congress get up and say, you know, you don't need any help, you don't need any resources, you don't need any money to be able to help institute these changes so we can get kids back to school safely, but we are going to give you encouragement instead.

Come on. We can do better than that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HERRELL).

Ms. HERRELL. Madam Speaker, I just rise in opposition to this.

Madam Speaker, I would say it is more disingenuous for this body to pretend to tell the American people that we are doing something good for their children when, in fact, more money in this bill is going to help one Democratic district in California than is going to help all of the COVID relief efforts.

We have got our priorities very wrong. Our children are the future.

And thank God that the Senate took the $15-an-hour minimum wage out of this because that was another nail in the coffin for our small business owners. But to sit here and think we are doing something special for our constituents, that is not really truthful. We are doing something special for Speaker PELOSI and a lot of others who want big bailouts for the Democratic cities.

We can do better. We can do better for our students and for our families because those are the people in the trenches. Our future depends on it. Our students depend on it. We need to put our children back in school and we need to open our economy.

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

Madam Speaker, I would encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to read the bill, to look at what is in this bill, and to look at the people who it will help. To claim somehow that this is not going to help with reopening of schools or helping our small businesses or helping children struggling in poverty or helping people who are hungry shows that people are not reading the bill.

This is a big, bold, appropriate response to a horrific pandemic that has struck our country and struck the world. So we are acting, and it is the right thing to do.

□ 1615

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES).

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the American Rescue Plan.

I was sitting in my office listening to debate, and I was thrilled to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak up about reopening schools. These are words I have been waiting a year to hear. I immediately looked up H.R. 682 to read it, and I was so disappointed that this bill offers no support, no assistance, and no funding for school reopenings.

The American Rescue Plan, on the other hand, invests in helping K–12 schools reopen safely and addresses learning loss in the classroom.

The bill provides nearly $130 billion to help schools take the steps recommended by the CDC to ensure students and educators can return to the classroom safely.

This includes repairing ventilation systems, reducing class sizes, implementing social distancing guidelines, purchasing PPE, and hiring support staff to address students' well-being.

Madam Speaker, as someone who has spent over a decade in the classroom, I can tell you that this is what every teacher in America is looking for, this is what every parent is looking for, and this is what is necessary to reopen schools safely—not just in communities that are largely Democrat but also in Republican communities. All of our children will benefit from the provisions of this bill.

The bill also sets aside 20 percent for long-term learning loss to get our kids from behind screens and back into the classroom by providing comprehensive after-school programs, summer learning programs, extended schooldays, reengaging students who have been absent from remote learning, and hiring counselors and nurses to care for students' emotional and physical well-being.

I am thrilled to see part of my own legislation included in this bill, the Save Education Jobs Act, which will not only make sure that we are not laying off support staff and personnel to meet our students, but to make sure that there are not budget cuts in light of the catastrophic shortfalls that are expected as a result of this pandemic.

I am so proud to be a part of a body that came up with this legislation that gives America's schools exactly what they need, gives America's children the support that is necessary, and reopens our economy by investing $130 billion.

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

Madam Speaker, here are the facts: This bill is not going to reopen our economy. It is not going to reopen our schools or provide targeted relief to those who need it most. This is the most expensive bill in the history of the United States House of Representatives, and it does not even prioritize the immediate needs of the American people. Rather than work for the American people, Democrats are fine working for their own future 2 years from now. That is really not the way it is supposed to be. We are supposed to be focused on the next generation, not the next election. I find this unacceptable.

This is a $1.9 trillion partisan wish list that could ultimately increase the deficit $3 trillion without addressing the immediate needs of Americans who are trying to survive this pandemic. With $1 trillion of unspent funding—cash already in the till from previous bills—why is it so urgent to pass another $2 trillion now without the representation of literally one-half of the country?

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question, ''no'' on the rule, ''no'' on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, we can talk and talk and talk and talk, and it might make us feel better, but it doesn't do any good for the people we represent who are in desperate need. They are crying out for help. People are struggling, people are hungry, and businesses are shutting down.

My friends talk about reopening schools. They offer a measure that

would encourage our schools to be reopened but don't offer one additional penny in resources to help them reopen, which is so tone deaf and so disconnected from reality. People need help, and they need it now.

Madam Speaker, let's be really honest here. My Republican friends do not have a problem spending $2 trillion. They spent that with their tax cut bill that benefited mostly people who are well-off and well-connected, and they were willing to spend that on COVID when Donald Trump was President.

What they have a problem with is where this is going: to our workers, not the wealthy; and to our communities, not corporations. That is the fundamental difference in how we govern. Democrats govern for the people.

Right now people are hurting, Madam Speaker. An overwhelming majority of the American people across all party lines and divisions support the American Rescue Plan. We have seen that in poll after poll after poll. My Republican friends just say that they are uninformed, including their Republican mayors and Republican Governors. How insulting.

This bill will put more vaccines in arms. It will put our kids back to school safely. It will put food on dinner tables and put workers back in jobs.

This pandemic is an all-hands-on-deck moment. After weeks and weeks of work, Congress doesn't have a moment to spare.

I urge all of my colleagues to support these historic investments in our Nation. We have told our neighbors and communities that help is on the way. Let's deliver on that promise.

I am proud to be on the House floor today. I am proud to speak in favor of the American Rescue Plan. And I am proud to vote in favor of this important piece of legislation. This will help save lives and will help save our economy.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 198

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 682) to encourage local educational agencies to resume in-person instruction at elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 682.

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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 216, nays 206, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—216

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
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
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—206

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
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)
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop (GA)
Brady
Fudge
Mooney
Neal
Tiffany
Valadao
Webster (FL)
Williams (GA)

□ 1708

Messrs. MULLIN and GONZALEZ of Ohio changed their votes from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 65.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I apologize for missing this vote. I was unable to be present. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 65.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS))
Amodei (Kelly (PA))
Babin (Norman)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Beyer)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (TX) (Calvert)
Cohen (Beyer)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
Grijalva (García (IL))
Haaland (Davids (KS))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Banks)
McNerney (Raskin)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Morelle (Tonko)
Moulton (Rice (NY))
Napolitano (Correa)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Wexton)
Roybal-Allard (Leger Fernandez)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Steube (Franklin, C. Scott)
Strickland (DelBene)
Thompson (MS) (Butterfield)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BEATTY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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 219, nays 210, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
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

NAYS—210

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
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
Obernolte
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)
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—2

Katko
Tiffany

□ 1754

Ms. SEWELL, Messrs. THOMPSON of California and SMITH of Washington changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 66.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS))
Amodei (Kelly (PA))
Babin (Norman)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Beyer)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (TX) (Calvert)
Cohen (Beyer)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
Fudge (Kaptur)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Haaland (Davids (KS))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Banks)
McNerney (Raskin)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Morelle (Tonko)
Moulton (Rice (NY))
Napolitano (Correa)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Wexton)
Roybal-Allard (Leger Fernandez)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Steube (Franklin, C. Scott)
Strickland (DelBene)
Thompson (MS) (Butterfield)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 842) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

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. 1, printed in part B of House Report 117–10, 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 gentleman from Mr. Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—227

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

NAYS—196

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
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
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
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
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Crenshaw
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Mullin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Stivers
Tiffany

□ 1842

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mses. MCCOLLUM and BOURDEAUX changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

Stated against:

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, electronic vote not cast. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. En Bloc No. 1.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I missed the vote and I would like to submit my vote for Roll Call No. 67. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 67.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS))
Babin (Norman)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Beyer)
Bush (Ocasio-Cortez)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (TX) (Calvert)
Cohen (Beyer)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
Fudge (Kaptur)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Haaland (Davids (KS))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Banks)
McNerney (Raskin)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Morelle (Tonko)
Moulton (Rice (NY))
Napolitano (Correa)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Wexton)
Roybal-Allard (Leger Fernandez)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Steube (Franklin, C. Scott)
Strickland (DelBene)
Thompson (MS) (Butterfield)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEGUSE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 2, printed in part B of House Report 117–10, 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 gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 243, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—185

Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
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 (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McHenry
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy

Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young

NAYS—243

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

NOT VOTING—3

Aderholt
McClintock
Tiffany

□ 1926

Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mses. OCASIO-CORTEZ, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, MENG, and Mr. YARMUTH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Messrs. PALMER, BUCK, MURPHY of North Carolina, and DUNN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the en bloc amendments were 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

Allred (Davids (KS))
Babin (Norman)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Beyer)
Bush (Ocasio-Cortez)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (TX) (Calvert)
Cohen (Beyer)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
Fudge (Kaptur)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Haaland (Davids (KS))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Banks)
McNerney (Raskin)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Morelle (Tonko)
Moulton (Rice (NY))
Napolitano (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Wexton)
Roybal-Allard (Leger Fernandez)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Steube (Franklin, C. Scott)
Strickland (DelBene)
Thompson (MS) (Butterfield)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BANKS. 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. Banks moves to recommit the bill H.R. 842 to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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

On page 14, line 21, strike the quotation mark and the period at the end.

On page 14, after line 21, insert the following:

''(j) A labor organization shall not communicate with an employee regarding joining or supporting the labor organization if the employee is not authorized to work in the United States.''.

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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BANKS. 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 206, nays 218, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—206

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

NAYS—218

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline

Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmuter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
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—7

Burgess
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Meuser
Nadler
Ruppersberger
Tiffany

□ 2016

Mr. HUIZENGA changed his 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. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 69.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS))
Babin (Norman)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Beyer)
Bush (Ocasio-Cortez)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Cohen (Beyer)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
Fudge (Kaptur)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Haaland (Davids (KS))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Morelle (Tonko)
Moulton (Rice (NY))
Napolitano (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Wexton)
Roybal-Allard (Leger Fernandez)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Steube (Franklin, C. Scott)
Strickland (DelBene)
Thompson (MS) (Butterfield)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HORSFORD). 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.

Ms. FOXX. 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 225, nays 206, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—225

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

NAYS—206

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
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
Obernolte
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)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—1

Tiffany

□ 2052

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

Allred (Davids (KS))
Babin (Norman)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Beyer)
Bush (Ocasio-Cortez)

Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (TX) (Calvert)
Cohen (Beyer)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
Fudge (Kaptur)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Haaland (Davids (KS))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Morelle (Tonko)
Moulton (Rice (NY))
Napolitano (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Wexton)
Roybal-Allard (Leger Fernandez)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Steube (Franklin, C. Scott)
Strickland (DelBene)
Thompson (MS) (Butterfield)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VETERANS' AND CAREGIVERS' COVID–19 IMMUNIZATIONS NOW EXPANDED ACT OF 2021

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1276) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID–19 vaccines to certain individuals, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1276

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans' and Caregivers' COVID–19 Immunizations Now Expanded Act of 2021'' or the ''VA VACCINE Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO FURNISH COVID–19 VACCINES TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may furnish a COVID–19 vaccine to a covered individual during the COVID–19 public health emergency.

(b) VACCINES FURNISHED ABROAD.—In the case of an individual who is a covered individual by reason of subsection (d)(1)(B), the Secretary may furnish a COVID–19 vaccine to such individual under subsection (a) regardless of whether the Secretary determines that such vaccine is needed for the treatment of a service-connected disability of the veteran or as part of a rehabilitation program under chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) ENROLLED VETERAN PRIORITY.—In furnishing COVID–19 vaccines, the Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize the vaccination of veterans who are enrolled in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, over the vaccination of covered individuals under this section; and

(2) only furnish such vaccines to covered individuals under this section to the extent that such vaccines are available.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''covered individual'' means any of the following:

(A) A veteran who is not eligible to enroll in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code.

(B) A veteran who is eligible for care under section 1724 of such title.

(C) A family caregiver of an eligible veteran participating in the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers under section 1720G(a) of such title.

(D) A caregiver of a covered veteran participating in the program of general caregiver support services under section 1720G(b) of such title.

(E) A caregiver of a veteran participating in the Medical Foster Home Program, Bowel and Bladder Program, Home Based Primary Care Program, or Veteran Directed Care Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) The term ''COVID–19'' means the coronavirus disease 2019.

(3) The term ''COVID–19 public health emergency'' means the public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on January 27, 2020, with respect to the coronavirus disease 2019.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after section 1 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO FURNISH COVID–19 VACCINES TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may furnish a COVID–19 vaccine to a covered individual during the COVID–19 public health emergency.

(B) VACCINES FURNISHED ABROAD.—In the case of an individual who is a covered individual by reason of subsection (d)(2)(B), the Secretary may furnish a COVID–19 vaccine, in a geographic location other than a State, to such individual under subsection (a) regardless of whether the Secretary determines that such vaccine is needed for the treatment of a service-connected disability of the veteran or as part of a rehabilitation program under chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code.

(C) VETERAN AND ACCOMPANYING CAREGIVER PRIORITY.—In furnishing COVID–19 vaccines, the Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize the vaccination of veterans who are enrolled in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, veterans who fail to so enroll but receive hospital care and medical services pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of such section, and accompanying caregivers over the vaccination of covered individuals under this section not otherwise described in this paragraph; and

(2) only furnish such vaccines to covered individuals under this section to the extent that such vaccines are available.

(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''accompanying caregiver'' means a caregiver described in subparagraph (C), (D), or (E) of paragraph (2) who is accompanying a veteran as described in subsection (c)(1).

(2) The term ''covered individual'' means any of the following:

(A) A veteran who is not eligible to enroll in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code.

(B) A veteran who is eligible for care under section 1724 of such title.

(C) A family caregiver who is approved as a provider of personal care services for an eligible veteran under the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers under section 1720G(a) of such title.

(D) A caregiver of a covered veteran participating in the program of general caregiver support services under section 1720G(b) of such title.

(E) A caregiver of a veteran participating in the Medical Foster Home Program, Bowel and Bladder Program, Home Based Primary Care Program, or Veteran Directed Care Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(3) The term ''COVID–19'' means the Coronavirus disease 2019.

(4) The term ''COVID–19 public health emergency'' means the public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on January 27, 2020, with respect to the Coronavirus disease 2019.

(5) The term ''State'' has the meaning given that term section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

Mr. TAKANO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CLIMATE CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment pursuant to section 4(d) of House Resolution 8, 117th Congress, as amended by section 18 of House Resolution 188, 117th Congress, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, of the following Members to the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis:

Mr. PALMER, Alabama
Mr. CARTER, Georgia
Mrs. MILLER, West Virginia
Mr. ARMSTRONG, North Dakota
Mr. CRENSHAW, Texas
Mr. GONZALEZ, Ohio

TEXANS NEED TO DO WHAT IS RIGHT TO SAVE LIVES

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, over 500,000 dead; 44,000 or more dead in the State of Texas.

The State of Texas, throughout the entire pandemic, remained one of the top hot spots of the Nation. They started testing late. We started vaccines and still have not reached a certain percentage, but yet, tomorrow, on March 10, 2021, our Governor has announced that there will be no mask mandate, and there will be no restrictions on any form of entertainment, restaurants, any large gatherings.

Tomorrow, March 10, the people of Texas get a death notice. I am asking my friends in Texas to wear your masks, socially distance, wash your

hands. We are vaccinating as fast as we can, but I am letting you know that Texas has all five of the variants of COVID–19. They have long-haulers in Texas, people who have continued to have COVID–19.

To save lives, I am asking my fellow Texans—as I know President Bush always used to call us, his ''fellow Texans''—to wear your masks, wash your hands, socially distance to save lives.

Let's ignore wrong-headed advice and do what is right to save lives.

HONORING KERRY McDANIEL

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, sadly, Kerry McDaniel passed away in February at just 65 years of age from COVID–19 complications.

Kerry was described as ''can't be replaced,'' ''top-notch in every regard,'' and ''an exemplary model of generosity and selflessness.''

Kerry loved serving his community and did so in various positions throughout the years. For almost three decades, Kerry worked for the Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection, and most recently, he was the Hart County Emergency Management Director and Solid Waste Coordinator.

As a frontline responder, he worked hard to obtain personal protective equipment and protect Hart County from COVID–19. Throughout the county, Kerry was known for his service and generosity to others.

Kerry is survived by his dear wife, Vicki; his son, Curtis; his daughter-in-law, Tara; his grandson, Briar Allen, and many other family members he loved so dearly.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have known Kerry; he was an exemplary citizen. Kerry was a great friend, and he will be missed by all who knew him.

□ 2100

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN WILL MAKE ECONOMY STRONGER

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

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, for the one in eight Americans who will go to bed hungry tonight; for the 60 million Americans out of work and the 40 million who fear they might be evicted tomorrow; for the 2.3 million women, a million mothers, who have left the workforce, the American Rescue Plan is for you.

It will put money directly in your pockets; expand access to affordable healthcare and childcare; extend unemployment insurance and housing and nutrition assistance; and support 27 million children with an expanded child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, for the 1.4 million public-sector employees who are out of work—our firefighters, our teachers, our frontline public health workers, our first responders—we are going to provide $350 billion for States and localities, including $13.7 billion for my State of Illinois, to get you back to work, too.

We can't fix everything. 524,000 American lives lost to COVID are never coming back. But tomorrow, when we vote to pass the American Rescue Plan, we will honor their memory. We will make things a little easier for their loved ones. We will get their kids back in school safely, their family businesses back in the black, cut child poverty in half, create 4 million new jobs.

Most importantly, we will emerge from this crisis with an economy that is stronger, more equitable, and poised for growth for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues in the House and Senate who made this possible. Let's get this done.

PRO ACT MUST HAVE EXEMPTIONS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am from California, and almost 2 years ago, the State passed a bill known as AB–5, where all workers would be presumed as employees unless the worker can show that they satisfy all three prongs of what is known as the ABC test.

It went into effect in January 2020, and it had quite a few exemptions in it—barbers, musicians, translators, home inspectors, golf caddies, things like that. But after the bill passed, flaws were found in it. They had to go back and legislate again to add newspapers. They had to go back and extend the time for others for when it would kick in.

So, what is happening? Here in this House, we are on H.R. 842. Now, I had an amendment that would provide for some of those exemptions. This provides for zero exemptions for this requirement that all would be presumed as employees.

We are going to go ahead and do actually worse than the State of California, passing the PRO Act without the exemptions.

Government should be here to foster economic growth, not restrict it. The PRO Act would kill growth, squash innovation in the gig economy and the American economy.

Why are we going backward here when we can learn from California's mistake?

SUPPORTING WORKERS BY SUPPORTING UNIONS

(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 in support of our Nation's greatest asset, our workers, our essential workers—nurses, teachers, mail carriers, transportation, sanitation, and food industry workers, among so many others—who have lifted the Nation with their sacrifice and bravery.

Just as they have supported us, we must support them by supporting unions. Attacks on unions, and a series of significant actions by the former administration, have weakened worker protections and, in turn, destroyed the middle class.

That is why I was proud to just vote to pass the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, the most significant upgrade for workers' collective bargaining rights in more than 80 years.

If we are to fully recover from this deadly pandemic and build back better, we must invest in and protect the rights of our workers to unionize. American workers and their families are depending on us.

ENTREPRENEURS WILL BE HARMED BY PRO ACT

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

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I fear that H.R. 842 is going to have serious long-term consequences for entrepreneurialism here in America.

Mr. Speaker, I started a company 30 years ago out of my college dorm room at Caltech, and I grew it the way that most small businesses are grown in America. I grew it organically. That means that when I had a little bit more business than I, myself, could do, I contracted that business out to other people who could do that business for me.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill, that practice will be illegal because it violates the so-called B pillar of the bill that prohibits any contracting that is related to the core business that a company engages.

Mr. Speaker, if H.R. 842 had been the law of the land, I would not have been able to start my company, and the hundreds of jobs that we have created would not have been created here. But they will be created elsewhere, in other countries, with more sane and less restrictive laws.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 842.

GETTING BACK ON TRACK WITH AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, almost to this very day, is the day when COVID–19 was officially declared a pandemic. One year ago, we didn't know that this pandemic would infect millions of Americans or kill thousands of Texans in my home State and hurt so many disadvantaged communities.

But after a year of darkness, we are finally seeing the light because the

House will pass, tomorrow, the American Rescue Plan, a comprehensive plan that the Biden-Harris administration and our Democrat-led House and Senate has crafted which will give constituents in the district that I represent, and all Americans, the chance for some relief.

Our plan will help crush the COVID–19 virus and get the economy moving again by getting vaccines into arms across the country. Because in places like my home State of Texas, where Greg Abbott, who is the Governor, is prematurely lifting COVID–19 restrictions, the best thing we can do to combat a potential surge against the virus is to make sure that everybody has a vaccine.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am a proud supporter and will vote for the American Rescue Plan tomorrow, because we need a bold solution like this one for our country and economy to get back on the right track and to get back to normal.

DELIVERING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a Michigander as my home State is recognizing 1 year from the arrival of our first cases of COVID–19.

I rise today to say that more help is on the way, that today we are delivering for the American people and delivering for my home State of Michigan.

I rise today to say that we passed the PRO Act to stand up for hardworking Michiganders, that we will get rid of right-to-work, that people are at the heart of what we do here in this Chamber, and that by prioritizing the legislation that stands up for hardworking Americans, we are delivering for them.

Tomorrow, we will pass the Butch Lewis Act. We will right the pensions of almost a million Americans. That is what we came here to do. That is what unity is.

DEMOCRATS' SPENDING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), my friend, who had someone that was very special in his life that he wanted to talk about.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DREW DANIEL

Mr. KUSTOFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here tonight saddened because a little over a year ago, I took to the House floor to pay tribute to a dear friend, Peggy Daniel of west Tennessee, who had recently passed away.

Today, we honor the life of her son and my friend, Drew Daniel, who left us way too soon. Drew passed away last week. He was a native of west Tennessee, the son of my friends, Peggy and Jimmy Daniel.

Drew moved to Shelby County in the early 1990s for college, and he received his bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Memphis, where he then later achieved a master's degree in public administration. Drew interned in the House of Representatives for then-Congressman Don Sundquist, who also was a close and dear friend of Drew's parents.

Drew loved to volunteer for his community, and he was an active member of the Boy Scouts of America, the Midtown Rotary Club, and Memphis City Beautiful Commission.

Drew was also extremely active in the Shelby County Republican Party and the Tennessee Republican Party. He had served as the Shelby County Young Republican chair and was an elected member of the Tennessee State executive committee of the Tennessee Republican Party. In 2019, Drew was selected as a Tennessee Republican Party Statesman of the year.

Drew was also a longtime valued employee for David Lenoir in the Shelby County Trustee's Office and then an agent for New York Life.

Without a doubt, Drew was a dedicated leader with a heart for public service and also for volunteerism. I really don't know many people who were more passionate about politics or their community than Drew Daniel.

I have so many memories, seeing Drew and Peggy cheering on the Memphis Tigers in the Liberty Bowl and the FedEx Forum. Truly, as good of a person as Drew was, he was a great son to his parents and a terrific brother to Mike and Melanie.

We are all better because of Drew, and he will be deeply missed by everyone. Roberta and I extend our deepest sympathies to his brother, Mike, and his sister, Melanie. Rest in peace, Drew.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, when we have someone special in our districts like that, sometimes with the chaos around here, it is hard finding time.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I wanted to do this evening is to start to build on a theme that I have done in the past, and I hope to be able to do over the coming months. But it is a little difficult right now because, let's be honest, the House is spending money at a pace where it is really hard for the Joint Economic Committee and even my own staff to try to keep up.

We are going to talk about what is going on, a couple of things I really want us to start to put in the RECORD, talk about, and get our heads around.

I have an absolute fixation of a moral obligation to the working poor in this country and an understanding of what happened in 2018 and 2019 when the working poor, the value of their labor—and understand, for many of us who have graduate degrees and those things, who can work behind a computer, great. Our skill set is what we are selling.

For much of the workforce, if you didn't finish high school or you have moderate skill sets, your labor is your value. What is going on here right now is almost a type of economic violence to that labor value.

Yet, I am not sure my brothers and sisters on the other side even see it. So, let's first delve into a little bit of what is going on at the border. Do understand, one of the things we see in the math from 2018 and 2019, when the working poor got dramatically less poor, the first 2 years in modern times where income inequality shrank—not because rich people got less rich, but because poor people made money—the value of their labor increased because they weren't competing with armies of other unskilled labor.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to be honest around here and say we care about the poor, that we care about the working poor, don't you see the economic violence we are allowing to happen at the border, making our folks have to compete with floods of moderate- to low-skilled immigrants? I know it is an uncomfortable conversation, but we need to see it in the totality of the people we claim we care about.

Then, the other day, I made a mistake on one of the hard-left-leaning cable television shows. They were trying to compare what we did in tax reform to the Democrats' $1.9 trillion spending bill and said: Well, they are both $1.9 trillion. But look here, this went to tax cuts, where this goes to spending. Isn't the spending so much more wonderful?

□ 2115

Once again, I need my brothers and sisters on the left to go back to school and spend a moment paying attention in their economics class. The elegance of the tax reform was that it made the value of workers' labor more valuable because the economy grew. We specifically made it so businesses would take part of that tax reform and put it into things that made their businesses more productive, making it so you can pay people more.

Remember, individuals' wages go up on two things, inflation and productivity. It is one of the reasons in 2018 and 2019 we had the fastest wage growth of workers, particularly the working poor in modern history.

So what is the Democrat solution to help these populations?

We are going to send them a check. And maybe part of that is good. There are people out there who are really suffering and hurting.

But what do we do next year?

The elegance of when you have someone's labor become more valuable is

that value sets; and then the next year, it builds on it; and the next year, it builds on it; and after a little while, they are no longer in the working poor.

We are going to do a patch that is going to load another $1.9 trillion of debt. And over the decade, the amount of interest we are going to pay on that is not $1.9 trillion, but it is probably $1.6 trillion. That is one of the things we are going to talk about just real quickly here.

I cannot produce these boards fast enough to keep up with the Democrats' spending agenda right now. The CBO can't produce the data fast enough. The Joint Economic Committee can't produce the data fast enough to even get our heads around it.

So this slide here is from September. Understand, the numbers are much uglier today. It was a simple point in functioning 8 budget years. In September, we were saying each family would have $230,000 of Federal debt applied to their household, the amount of debt. So that is every household. That is not tax-paying households; that is every household. Today, my back-of-the-napkin math is about a quarter of a million dollars in 8 years for every family in America. We are spending that fast.

Being the father of a 5-year-old, I see the economic violence being done by the left here to her future, to the kids' futures. I am looking for the day I have to sit her down and apologize that she is not going to live as well as I have lived because of what we allowed to happen here today.

Let's have a quick education. Let's walk through real quick where the money goes. Social Security, about $1 trillion. Remember, this is based on last year's numbers. Today, these numbers have ballooned again. Defense, 724. Medicare, right now, I believe this year has now surpassed defense. So my last bit of math was Medicare was now starting to pass defense in total spending. Health, that is ObamaCare, that is all the other entitlements.

But if you actually look at the slide, Social Security, Medicare, the other health entitlements, income security, interest, veterans. It is the vast majority of spending. Yet you look at these tiny little slices, like, this little slice over here is foreign aid.

Yet how often do the politicians get behind these microphones and say, well, if we would cut foreign aid?

If this were a clock, I think foreign aid would cover about 14 minutes of spending in an entire day, in a 24-hour day.

If we don't get our heads around the fact that the Medicare, the health entitlements, the net interest are the things now which will drive our debt, I am terrified of what is coming. Because, understand, it is really hard to say, but our demographics, we are getting older very quickly as a society. If you look at the 30-year curve, we are a country that doesn't make it. We are so buried in debt.

And the economic violence the Democrats are committing tomorrow by adding another $1.9 trillion on top of the trillion that is already sitting in the bank and hasn't been expended, that we have done this last year, are we thinking about anything other than our next reelection?

How about thinking about my 5-year-old daughter and what her economic future is. How about everyone else's economic future.

I am going to try to do a couple of these quickly. We were trying to use CBO's numbers. The problem is, they haven't updated them yet on how fast we are spending. But what is so important here in functionally 8 budget years—now, this slide looks a little different than your typical debt slide because we calculate it on debt that is sold to the public, not internal debt.

Remember, when you look at U.S. sovereign debts, there are, sort of, two pies. There is stuff where we reach into the Social Security fund, grab that money, and borrow it, and put IOUs in it.

The other debt that is economically dangerous—because when interest rates move, it causes a problem—we are going to talk about that real quickly. This is debt sold to the public. It might be China; it might be Japan; it might be your grandma's pension. In about 8 years, debt held by the public will double from where we were last year. Understand how fast.

Now, a lot of this, believe it or not, even though some of the crazy spending we are doing right now is the demographics, demographics aren't Republican and Democrat. It is just math that we don't like to talk about. But the fact of the matter is that we have made promises, and the money that we collected for those promises, we have already spent and we are going to have to borrow.

So understand the fragility—I love that word, fragility—we have given ourselves. Interest rates in January were under 1 percent. They were actually at .91. Today, when the market closed, I think it was, 1.54, something in that nature. Most of us go, big deal, this still is historically really, really, really cheap. Except, think about it. Just that little movement in the last 2 months is about $600 billion over the next 10 years. Just that little movement, $600 billion of interest.

What are we buying with that interest?

Nothing.

And there are a lot of economists out there who think, because we are spending at such a fast rate, we are going to start to chase our tail. Part of that may be because the economy actually is getting healthier. One of the great intense ironies is we are about to spend $1.9 trillion, pretend it is a stimulus—even though a bunch of that money doesn't get spent for a year, 2 years, a little bit, 3 years from now—claim it is a stimulus, pile it on as debt that is going to cost $2.6 trillion with financing costs added to it. Only a sliver of it is actually economic stimulus. And because we are going to the markets to finance every dime of it, we are helping drive up our own interest rates. Meaning, we are going to chase our tail economically.

Do you understand?

Remember the pie chart from before, that interest right now. We expect, within about a decade, interest may be the second most expensive thing in our budget. You will be seeing Social Security, Medicare, and then interest right up there, and that is going to consume everything. There functionally will be no more money left.

I know I am getting a little thick, but to try to drive this home, the changes in debt that happen from where the CBO was projecting back in January to some of the numbers we are seeing right now.

So just for the fun of it—I know this is hard to read. We just did a calculation and said, hey—the CBO basically said, hey, interest rates are going to go up a quarter percent. Think of it as 25 basis points. But if we went up 100 basis points in interest, over the 10 years of financing that, we are basically looking at—what is that—another $3.5 trillion of financing costs.

So, yes, you get to say we are spending that $1.9 trillion today, but do you understand the total cost of that?

So it is not just the cost of the legislation. It is the cascade effect that you are creating to the economy; where that family who wants to buy their first home, you just raised their mortgage interest rates.

But on a national basis, this year we will finance probably about $10 trillion. My quick estimate is about $7 trillion on just our bonds that are rolling off, that we have to refinance because we have no cash to pay for them. So they get reset at the new interest rates.

Then we have our typical spending. So there goes another trillion dollars, plus the trillion we authorized back in December and last year, and now another couple trillion dollars. So another four on top of that seven, and you start to look at over $10 trillion of new issue or refinancing coming to market of U.S. sovereign debt.

What did we just do to our interest rates, the world interest rates, the value of money?

And this comes back to my earlier point. We talk about what is happening in income inequality, the working poor. Those of us who have stocks or have a house or have assets, when you do this type of monetization of debt, when it requires the Federal Reserve to keep pumping in—today, we have 20 percent more cash floating around in our economy than we had a year ago.

People who are wealthy own things. They make a lot of money because their assets get more and more valuable.

The working poor who don't own a house, they don't own stocks, they don't have a bond, they don't have a

pension. What they have, they get crushed. That is what we are doing to the working poor here.

Please, someone, buy an economic book for my Democrat brothers and sisters to understand. There is going to be a lot of singing and happy in a couple months when they get the check. And next year, when they realize they are being crushed, who will step up and actually take blame, saying, we could have done things that would have grown the economy, grown your future income, made so the working poor actually had a future?

Instead, we are going to flood the market with competing labor. We are going to devalue any asset you have, and we are going to make it so you can never afford to get out of the quartile where you are trapped. And this is what leftist policies do to poor people.

So, look, this is a theme. We are going to build on it and we are going to bring in more and more data and facts and see if we can turn around some of the heads here to say it is not enough to talk that we care. It is when you actually can stand up and say Republican policies in 2018 and 2019, before the virus, we actually made a difference. We are the party that actually closed income inequality. We are the party that actually made the working poor less poor.

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

THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for his very informative speech here about our coming, looming economic issues.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 weeks, the majority has attacked the First Amendment; and now they are attacking the Second Amendment. The Second Amendment clearly states the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. And as Justice Scalia noted in his decision in Heller, the Second Amendment does not give Americans a right; it protects a preexisting right. Hence, the phrase, ''Shall not be infringed.''

□ 2130

Our theme for the next 30 minutes will be about H.R. 8 and the damage it will do to the Second Amendment which is, as Justice Scalia noted, a preexisting right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned with this bill, H.R. 8. And the reality is, the big money donors and powerful special interest groups behind the Democratic Party for a long time have sought to undermine, restrict, and even eliminate the Second Amendment rights of Americans.

With the Democratic Party now calling the shots here in Washington, quite frankly, the majority party is not even trying to hide their true agenda.

Masquerading as supposedly good-faith proposals to end gun violence, what they are really putting in place are the stepping-stones to creating a national firearm registry and eventually even confiscating firearms.

H.R. 8 is being considered later this week, and it would implement a universal background check system. The majority claims that this is an obvious solution to gun violence, but that is simply not the case at all.

Gun violence in America is complex, and so are the solutions. But the overwhelming majority of criminals would not be stopped by H.R. 8 whatsoever. In fact, the Justice Department itself, by its own data, says that 75 percent of criminals in prison who possessed a firearm obtained it through theft, the black market, or family and friends.

Secondly, we know that the vast majority of mass shooters would have been able to pass background checks. This bill does not in any way end gun violence.

But what it does do is create a national gun registry that will eventually be used against law-abiding Americans.

Without a permanent database of who owns a firearm, the Federal Government would not be able to determine whether a private firearm transfer took place with the required background check.

So that brings to us the real aim of this bill, H.R. 8. It paves the way for this database to be used at a later date in a national gun confiscation program.

Mr. Speaker, don't take my word for it.

Even President Biden, himself, in August 2019, said that he does support confiscating assault weapons which he would consider AR–15 style.

So, Mr. Speaker, the threat is real. We are in a major fight for those who are trying to dismantle and eliminate the Second Amendment. We are not blowing smoke here. H.R. 8 is a massive move in that direction, and we stand here tonight to say: No, we are not going to allow that to happen on our watch.

We have to be vigilant, and we have to stand guard for our freedoms.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Arizona, for yielding to me.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I thank this body for still continuing the tradition of this opportunity to speak and have our voices heard, even though we are in the minority.

We don't control the floor, we can't put our bills on the agenda to have a debate, and often we can't even get an amendment considered on the bills. The Rules Committee strips out anything that would materially change a bill. Sadly, that has been a bipartisan approach to governing in this body. That is not a functioning legislature when those kinds of things happen.

Why is that important?

Every Member needs to have their voice heard, and they should be heard on the bill. They should be heard when this body wants to change our constitutional protections fundamentally. The right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. The majority doesn't seek to amend the Constitution, but they seek to nullify that constitutional guarantee with subterfuge.

They say that this is a background check bill. Well, every commercial firearm transaction today already requires a background check. It doesn't matter whether you do it at a gun store, at a gun show, or at any other forum, if you buy a firearm from a commercial seller of firearms, a Federal firearm license holder, you have to do a background check. You can't do it, Mr. Speaker.

Now, what does this do?

It basically says, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to even loan a gun to a family member to go on a hunting trip, then you have to get a background check. Someone would be criminalized for doing that. You can't have private transfers. Essentially, the government says you can't be trusted to sell a firearm to anybody. You have to go to a licensed agent of the Federal Government.

How do they guarantee that?

They guarantee that by creating a registry.

Why should we be concerned about that?

Well, that is the path toward seizing it. It doesn't guarantee that the Government will do it, but let me tell you about the Supreme Court and what is going on right now, Mr. Speaker.

Under the Fourth Amendment, there is a clause that has been interpreted by Court opinions to allow seizures for community care—warrantless seizures of property. This goes with civil asset forfeiture and all kinds of abuses of warrantless surveillance and the Fourth Amendment. If we do not stand up and defend the Second Amendment today, it will be just as abused as the Fourth Amendment's guarantee of privacy is today.

We have to oppose this bill. The people of the United States of America are constitutionally guaranteed the right to keep and bear arms, and this body shall not infringe it, and it shall not be infringed without a constitutional amendment, and that is not what is on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to oppose H.R. 8 and any such effort to deny the American citizens the protections our Constitution guarantees.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, as a Federally licensed gun store owner, I have a unique perspective on our Second Amendment rights, and I actually happen to know how background checks actually work.

It seems that H.R. 8 is being sold as universal background checks, and it would impose harsh penalties, like six-figure fines and jail time, for the simple act of handing a firearm to another person even for temporary use, like instruction.

The exemptions under H.R. 8 are woefully inadequate to protect the rights of law-abiding gun owners.

Let's say, Mr. Speaker, that you loan your firearm to a victim of domestic violence because their abuser is just getting ready to be released from jail, or if a suicidal friend asks you to take possession of their firearm, or if you loan your cousin a gun after a series of burglaries in their neighborhood. These new transfer penalties would turn law-abiding citizens into criminals.

We simply cannot sacrifice our rights by passing laws that will make our families less safe and laws that criminals will simply ignore. We must always protect and preserve our God-given Second Amendment rights.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his speech.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Shall not be infringed. Shall not be infringed. The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

James Madison, our fourth President, the primary architect of the Constitution and the first Congressman from Virginia's Fifth District, said: ''Americans have the right and advantage of being armed—unlike the citizens of other countries whose governments are afraid to trust the people with arms.''

Our right to arm and defend ourselves is a God-given right, and we are privileged to live in a country whose Founders had the wisdom and the strength to codify that right in the Constitution.

James Madison and our other Founders recognized that this was a fundamental right to protect our rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and they had the foresight to include this right among those first 10 amendments listed in the Constitution which were intended to protect us from our government. It was James Madison who also said: ''The truth is that all men having power ought to be mistrusted.''

The Second Amendment is not about hunting—that is great. It is not, again, primarily about self-defense or protecting our family—that is essential. It is about being a check against tyranny and ensure we remain a free people.

There is a reason it was the second right listed in the Bill of Rights—second only to the First Amendment protections of our right to free speech, assembly, and worship. The Second Amendment is the guarantor or protector of all other rights. If our Second Amendment right is not safe, then no rights are safe, and with this Democrat majority in this Congress, this right is not safe.

In my last quote tonight from James Madison, he also said: ''I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments by those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations.''

We are witnessing the gradual encroachment on our fundamental Second Amendment right today by this Democrat majority.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, what we are considering here today with H.R. 8 has been dubbed a universal background check bill, but in reality, it would criminalize—let me say that again—it would criminalize the private transfer of firearms.

As part of the march to strip Americans of their guaranteed Second Amendment right, this gun control bill would make it a crime to sell or transfer a firearm without first seeking permission from the almighty Government.

The dirty secret is that the proponents of gun control, Mr. Speaker, want you to think that this is the end of the road when, in fact, that is not true. In 2013 President Obama's Department of Justice's National Institute of Justice said that the effectiveness of universal background checks depends on requiring gun registration.

So what we are witnessing here today is the first step to requiring a nationwide gun registration in America.

The Second Amendment to the Constitution says: ''A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.''

In this Nation of ''We the People,'' we recognize that we as citizens are not subjects of our government and that our inalienable rights are not a grant from the government but a gift from God, and to that end the Second Amendment doesn't grant us a right, but rather those carefully crafted words acknowledge an already existing right: the right of the people to possess a firearm.

The Constitution does not say you may or may not be able to own a firearm, we will circle back with you, we will get back with you on that.

It doesn't. It guarantees the right.

This bill does nothing to make communities more safe. This is another overreaching attempt by leftist leaders drunk on unchecked power to control the lives of freedom-loving citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the right of the people to keep and bear arms in the United States is a fundamental principle expressed in our Bill of Rights.

Let me be clear: I will never do anything to infringe upon this right clearly laid out in our Second Amendment, but this bill, H.R. 8, will do just that.

H.R. 8 is a sweeping piece of legislation that imposes burdens on the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. It is plain and simple. This bill is another attempt by Democrats to limit the rights of the American people.

This legislation would make it a crime, subject to limited exceptions, to simply hand a firearm to another person. This bill could trigger penalties of up to a year in prison and a $100,000 fine.

This bill would make it illegal to transfer a firearm to another person during a life-threatening emergency. That could be considered a crime punishable by a fine of monetary dollars.

Also, just so we are on the same page, universal background checks do not stop criminals from possessing firearms. As my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said: In the United States less than one percent of criminals who had possessed a firearm during their offense got firearms through legal channels—less than one percent. That means that these criminals obtained their firearms outside of the setting that would require a background check to begin with.

What makes you believe that this legislation would change that, Mr. Speaker?

Our solution should be focused on improving access to mental healthcare services, addressing the root causes of violence, and carrying out our existing laws through investments in our law enforcement and community programs—not walking all over law-abiding citizens for protecting their loved ones. We all swore to uphold the Constitution, and it should be our goal in this Congress to work against legislation like this that would clearly infringe on our Second Amendment rights of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I will be a resounding ''no'' when it is time to vote.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Democrat gun control bills far and wide.

I would like to tell you about a gun law in Georgia: In order to provide for the emergency management of the city, and further, in order to provide for and protect the safety, security and general welfare of the city and its inhabitants, every head of household residing in the city limits is required to maintain a firearm, together with ammunition.

□ 2145

Mr. Speaker, that is Kennesaw, Georgia, where, over 6 years, there has only been one murder and a violent crime rate of 2 percent.

Would you like to know why? It is because every single criminal knows that if they are going to attack someone in Kennesaw, Georgia, they are going to go across a gun owner, and it is the law that every household and homeowner owns a gun and keeps one in their household.

You see, guns are not scary. The fact that we may not have guns is scary. Guns are a great form of protection. It is an equalizer to a criminal who could care less about all the gun laws that Democrats want to pass on Americans, infringing on their Second Amendment rights.

H.R. 8 and H.R. 1446 are just more gun control legislation violating Americans' great right to bear arms. I rise in opposition to both of these bills, and I hope that the Democrats will come to their senses and figure out that gun rights are American rights.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, in 2019, as a private citizen, a mom, a small business owner, I was ticked off that a politician running for President of the United States wanted to strip away our enumerated constitutional rights. So with my Glock on my hip, I drove 3 hours to tell Robert Francis O'Rourke, also known as Beto, hell no, you are not taking our guns.

That message resonated with millions of Americans. But, sadly, the Democrat Party, isolated in their basements and gated mansions, still hasn't gotten the message. Those on the left who would steamroll the rights of law-abiding citizens are still at it.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be totally oblivious to the message Americans sent in 2020. Nearly 8.5 million Americans purchased a firearm for the very first time in 2020. With the left defunding the police, and antifa rioting, looting, burning down businesses, people made the reasonable and rational decision to take self-protection seriously and arm themselves.

And the Democrat response? More regulations, more bureaucracy, more control, less freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I will say it again, and I will say it nice and loud so everyone can hear me. Those on the left are still tucked away safely in their gated mansions with their armed security, ignoring everyday Americans.

For me, this is a hell no. It is a hell no to government treading on our rights. It is a hell no to the regulation of our Second Amendment. It is a hell no to government trampling on our freedoms.

All these new gun laws will do is leave law-abiding citizens defenseless while criminals—wait for it—break the law.

So, I have a few questions for my colleagues on the left. I want to know, why do you trust the American people so little? Why do you look down on them as lesser than you? How detached are you to believe that someone else's rights should be subject to bureaucratic permission, to your permission? Why is it okay to provide armed security for yourself but take away the right of Americans to do so themselves?

Why do you feel the need to keep a registry of gun owners? Do you not trust the American people? Are you afraid of your neighbors? Do you despise their rights?

How much power over the American people will it take to satisfy these radicals on the left? Our rights don't come from politicians. They come from God Almighty. Stop pretending to be God. Do your job and protect the rights of the American people.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the extreme gun control measures being pushed by the Democratic majority. Make no mistake, they are extreme and an assault on our freedoms.

The Second Amendment guarantees the right of every American to keep and bear arms. I am proud to be from the State with the highest rate of gun ownership in the Nation. In Montana, law-abiding gun owners use firearms every day and exercise their God-given liberties.

Mr. Speaker, the bills in the House this week serve only to punish responsible gun owners and take away the Second Amendment rights of Montanans.

H.R. 8 would not just require background checks for the sale of firearms but for changes of ownership and even the most temporary transfers of possession. Someone who simply hands a firearm to another person could be subject to a year in prison and a $100,000 fine.

This would include the rancher who lends his gun to a neighbor whose cattle are being harassed by coyotes or to the hunter who lends a rifle to a buddy who is going on a hunting trip. This is deeply troubling, as these scenarios are very common in Montana.

H.R. 1446 is just as bad. While it claims to close a gun-buying loophole, it would give the FBI discretion to delay firearm purchases or transfers indefinitely and could even put the burden on law-abiding citizens to prove that they are eligible to purchase a firearm.

The Framers of our Constitution did not intend for us to have to beg the government to be able to exercise our freedoms. In fact, they included the Second Amendment to make sure that we didn't have to. ''Shall not be infringed'' is extremely clear. Unfortunately, that is exactly the path that Democrats seem intent on pursuing.

I thank my colleagues who stand with me today, and I urge all of my colleagues who cherish our constitutional liberties to join me in opposing these bills and any other bill that would infringe on our Second Amendment rights.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, Congressman BIGGS, for this Special Order.

We swore an oath to defend the Constitution, which includes the Second Amendment. But now, Democrats are going back on that oath by proposing H.R. 8, saying that we should enforce universal background checks on guns.

Continuing to put forth far-reaching laws on guns will only significantly increase the burden of the millions of law-abiding Americans who wish to exercise their Second Amendment right to self-defense.

In my State of Illinois, Chicago has the fourth-strictest gun laws in the country, but criminal misuse of firearms in Chicago remains at the top of the list. This is because, if there is one thing that we know about criminals, it is that they don't care about obeying the law.

The Second Amendment was written to prevent the government from seizing arms. H.R. 8 is an attack on our rights and is one step closer to doing exactly what our Founders were guarding against.

We do not need to punish law-abiding citizens. Instead, we should do all we can to cherish and protect this right that we are so blessed to have.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the Second Amendment and in opposition to H.R. 8, the universal background checks act.

Federal law already restricts transferring firearms to prohibited individuals. Instead of working to strengthen the enforcement of laws currently on the books, this legislation will criminalize many activities that are common practice among law-abiding gun owners, while failing to prevent guns from getting into the hands of criminals.

Criminals do not follow the law when obtaining their firearms, and nothing in the bill would prevent them from continuing to obtain firearms through avenues like the black market, theft, or illegal straw purchases.

Federal law already strictly prohibits the possession, receipt, or purchase of firearms by prohibited individuals, including convicted felons, fugitives from justice, unlawful users of controlled substances, illegal aliens, and individuals subject to protective orders or convicted of a crime of domestic violence.

Meanwhile, law-abiding citizens could face up to a year in prison and a $100,000 fine for common practices such as trades, private sales, gifts, or temporary loans of firearms if this bill becomes law.

Lastly, I will note that under the rules of interpretation in H.R. 8, it says: ''Rules of interpretation. Nothing in this act, or any amendment made by this act, shall be construed to: authorize the establishment, directly or indirectly, of a national firearms registry.''

That is false. This bill will create a national registry. That is because every firearms transfer has to go through a Federal firearms licensee's acquisition and disposition logbook. And every time a Federal firearms license is not renewed, those records must be sent to the ATF for storage, which, in turn, scans those records into a database for a future use. That is, in effect, a national firearms registry in the making.

If the rules of interpretation of H.R. 8 are correctly followed, then one could logically argue that this bill actually prohibits itself by, in its own words, prohibiting, directly or indirectly, a national firearms registry.

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

I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I thank all of my colleagues. I appreciate the opportunity to be with so many of my friends who support the Second Amendment and oppose H.R. 8.

I was talking earlier tonight about the Heller decision, where Justice Scalia said the Second Amendment is a preexisting right. Justice Scalia wrote: ''There seems to us no doubt, on the basis of both text and history, that the Second Amendment conferred an individual right to keep and bear arms.'' He did state ''the right was not unlimited,'' but the bill being considered goes well beyond acceptable limitations.

H.R. 8 is another bill that the majority is bringing to the floor this session without a hearing or markup in the Judiciary Committee.

Last Congress, the markup of H.R. 8 was cut short when the chairman of the committee introduced an amendment in the nature of a substitute right in the middle of the markup after Republicans repeatedly offered amendments highlighting flaws in the bill. He didn't allow Members opposed to the amendment to speak or offer amendments. He then called for the vote on the substitute amendment. This hurried process demonstrated that Democrats cared more about simply passing a bill than passing a good bill.

H.R. 8 would not have prevented recent shootings. In Parkland, the shooter acquired the firearm legally from an FFL after undergoing a NICS check.

In Sutherland Springs, Texas, the shooter made purchases from an FFL following a NICS check.

In Las Vegas, the shooter purchased his firearms from an FFL after a background check.

In Orlando, the shooter purchased his firearms legally from an FFL following a NICS check.

I can go on, but there are so many more examples that are just the same because criminals who seek to do harm will get guns, regardless of the new restrictions imposed by H.R. 8. That is just the nature of criminals.

I was a prosecutor and a criminal defense attorney. I can tell you, that is the way criminals are. They violate the law.

With very limited exceptions, H.R. 8 makes it illegal for Americans to get a gun if a nonlicensed importer, manufacturer, or dealer is involved. And how will the government know if an illegal transfer occurs?

Eventually, the government will have to create a registry of all firearms and firearm owners so that they can track all transfers. That is what they want to do here. Without a registry, this bill is utterly unenforceable.

I have heard supporters of this bill say that other countries have similar restrictions, so we need to do the same as well. But the reality is, there is no other country on the face of this planet that has a Second Amendment, where the Founders of that country said the right to bear arms and protect yourself against government and individuals is a God-given right and deserves to be protected. It is, as Justice Scalia said, a preexisting right.

Supporters say that this bill is about saving lives. If that is what is important, then I would encourage every supporter of this bill to join me in cosponsoring the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which actually will save lives. I urge Speaker PELOSI to bring that bill to the floor today.

I oppose this bill. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for being here tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a)(1)(B) of House Resolution 8, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 10, 2021, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-544. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting Major rule — Net Stable Funding Ratio: Liquidity Risk Measurement Standards and Disclosure Requirements [Docket ID OCC-2014-0029] (RIN: 1557-AD97) received February 25, 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-545. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pentachlorothiophenol (PCTP); Regulation of Persistent, Bioaccumulative, and Toxic Chemicals Under TSCA Section 6(h) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2019-0080; FRL-10018-89] (RIN: 2070-AK60) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-546. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Phenol, Isopropylated Phosphate (3:1) (PIP 3:1); Regulation of Persistent, Bioaccumulative, and Toxic Chemicals Under TSCA Section 6(h) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2019-0080; FRL-10018-88] (RIN: 2070-AK58) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-547. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hexachlorobutadiene (HCBD); Regulation of Persistent, Bioaccumulative, and Toxic Chemicals Under TSCA Section 6(h) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2019-0080; FRL 10018-91] (RIN: 2070-AK61) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-548. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Lead and Copper Rule Revisions [EPA-HQ-OW-2017-0300; FRL-10019-23-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF15) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC-549. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 24-27, ''Non-Public Student Educational Continuity Temporary Amendment Act of 2021'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-550. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2019-1056; Product Identifier 2018-SW-047-AD; Amendment 39-21193; AD 2020-16-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) 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 Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-551. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2021-5 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 Ways and Means.

EC-552. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting interim final rule — Mandatory Advance Electronic Information for International Mail Shipments [Docket No. USCBP-2021-0009; CBP Dec. 21-04] (RIN: 1651-AB33) received March 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 198. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1319) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 5 (Rept. 117–11). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1669. A bill to amend the State Small Business Credit Initiative Act of 2010 to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAHELE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MANNING, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 1670. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the use of funds for comprehensive reproductive health care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1671. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to safeguard access to information for consumers and to stop abusive debt litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 1672. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for the establishment of a program to expand access to broadband service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 1673. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to make the provision of Wi-Fi access on school buses eligible for E-rate support; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1674. A bill to authorize assistance for fair housing enforcement activities to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. MOORE of Utah):

H.R. 1675. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to fixed guideway capital investment grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 1676. A bill to amend title XVIII to provide for certain Medigap coverage for Medicare beneficiaries with end-stage renal disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BALDERSON (for himself, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. CROW, Mr. BUCK, and Mrs. HINSON):

H.R. 1677. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, and the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission to conduct studies and report to Congress on actions taken to expand access to telehealth services under the Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance programs during the COVID-19 emergency; 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 Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 1678. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Parks, Jobs, and Equity Program to support job creation, economic revitalization, and park development for communities impacted by COVID-19; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BOEBERT (for herself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ESTES, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 1679. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from conditioning any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. BROOKS (for himself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. CARL, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. GUEST, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 1680. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 1681. A bill to report data on COVID-19 immigration detention facilities and local correctional facilities that contract with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and 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. CLEAVER (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1682. A bill to provide emergency rural housing assistance to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain student loan forgiveness from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1684. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1685. A bill to authorize the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance

Use, acting through the Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, to award grants to States to expand access to clinically appropriate services for opioid abuse, dependence, or addiction; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1686. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate and report on the inpatient and outpatient treatment capacity, availability, and needs of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HILL, and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 1687. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to add membership in a significant transnational criminal organization to the list of grounds of inadmissibility and to prohibit the provision of material support or resources to such organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Rules, 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. GALLEGO (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 1688. A bill to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SOTO, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 1689. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to apply to territories of the United States, to establish offshore wind lease sale requirements, to provide dedicated funding for coral reef conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HERRELL (for herself, Mr. BACON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GUEST, Mr. KELLER, Mr. CARL, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. BABIN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 1690. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make the murder of a Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer a crime punishable by life in prison or death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 1691. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue guidance to identify firearms business operations of licensed manufacturers and licensed dealers as essential businesses during certain national emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BRADY, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. FALLON):

H.R. 1692. A bill to extend and expand the Wildfire Hurricane Indemnity Program to cover losses due to high winds, polar vortexes, and hailstorms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 1693. A bill to eliminate the disparity in sentencing for cocaine offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BUSH, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 1694. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to make certain limitations on the transfer of personal property to Federal and State agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1695. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1696. A bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 1697. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to increase accessible transportation for individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1698. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish the Nuclear Industrial Base Analysis and Sustainment Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. BURCHETT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BARR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. MEIJER, and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 1699. A bill to provide for congressional review of actions to terminate or waive sanctions imposed with respect to Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Reform, Ways and Means, and Rules, 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. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mrs. AXNE):

H.R. 1700. A bill to establish a broadband infrastructure finance and innovation program to make available loans, loan guarantees, and lines of credit for the construction and deployment of broadband infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia (for herself and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 1701. A bill to promote exports of goods and services from and facilitation of business investment in rural areas of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 1702. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to require Federal agencies to submit to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on rules that are revoked, suspended, replaced, amended, or otherwise made ineffective; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1703. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to require the Administrator of General Services to enter into a cooperative agreement with the National Children's Museum to provide the National Children's Museum rental space without charge in the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 1704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend the deduction for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1705. A bill to repeal section 115 of the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. WATERS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. NEGUSE, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ):

H.R. 1706. A bill to provide emergency homelessness assistance to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 1707. A bill to ensure operational control of the southwest border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 1708. A bill to provide additional appropriations to the Indian Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1709. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to all United States nationals who voluntarily joined the Canadian and British armed forces and their supporting entities during World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1710. A bill to provide emergency assistance to homeowners to respond to the coronavirus pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1711. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to direct the Office of Community Affairs to identify causes leading to, and solutions for, underbanked, un-banked, and underserved consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BANKS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. PALMER, Mr. CLINE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LONG, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BACON, Mr. GUEST, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KELLER, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mrs. LESKO, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. COMER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. KATKO, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MAST, Mr. BARR, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. BOST, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. EMMER, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MANN, Mrs. STEEL, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. STEIL, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HERN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CARL, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SMUCKER, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. NEHLS, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 1712. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 1713. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 to require a study and report on adoption outcomes and the factors affecting those outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H.R. 1714. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report evaluating the process used by Federal Communications Commission for establishing, reviewing, and updating upload and download broadband internet access speed thresholds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. REED, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1715. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to limit the authority of States and localities to regulate conduct, or impose penalties or taxes, in relation to rifles or shotguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 1716. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, to conduct or support research on the mental health consequences of SARS-CoV-2 or COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

H.R. 1717. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make permanent the protections under Medicaid for recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE (for herself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FITZGERALD, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. GARBARINO, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 1718. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to report on small business recovery and the impact of an hourly Federal minimum wage increase, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1719. A bill to provide homelessness and supportive services assistance for Native Americans to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1720. A bill to provide additional funding under the Defense Production Act of 1950 related to medical supplies and equipment directly related to combating the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 1721. A bill to amend the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 to authorize additional funds for the Emergency Broadband Connectivity Fund, to provide grants to States and Tribal Entities to strengthen the National Lifeline Eligibility Verifier, to provide for Federal coordination between the National Lifeline Eligibility Verifier and the National Accuracy Clearinghouse, 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 Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN):

H.R. 1722. A bill to amend titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act to stabilize the Medicaid program in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1723. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, to require the voluntary collection of demographic information for patent inventors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1724. A bill to provide emergency rental assistance vouchers to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1725. A bill to provide emergency assistance for renters to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. STAUBER, and Mrs. BOEBERT):

H.R. 1726. A bill to provide that an order or action by the President or the Secretary of the Interior imposing a moratorium on oil and gas leasing shall not take effect without the express approval of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 30. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution directing the Architect of the Capitol to preserve evidence of the January 6, 2021 attack on the United States Capitol so that evidence of the attack may be made available for viewing by visitors to the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Mr. KATKO):

H. Res. 199. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Homeland Security in the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri):

H. Res. 200. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the

One Hundred Seventeen Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H. Res. 201. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Natural Resources in the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H. Res. 202. A resolution expressing support for the need for a replacement fleet that meets the climate goals of the United States, protects critical supply chains, and promotes a cleaner, more stable future for a burgeoning 21st century domestic vehicle industry; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H. Res. 203. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States should take Executive action to declare National COVID-19 Vaccination Awareness Day as a one-time Federal holiday to act as a galvanizing moment to promote the more rapid distribution of COVID-19 vaccines to all areas of the country, show appreciation for the heroic partnership between government and health care stakeholders to develop effective and safe vaccines in record time, and increase public awareness of the important role vaccination can play for a return to normalcy as soon as possible; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CROW, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. NEWMAN, and Ms. OMAR):

H. Res. 204. A resolution honoring the essential staff of the United States Capitol Complex as unsung heroes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MANN (for himself, Mr. LATURNER, and Mr. ESTES):

H. Res. 205. A resolution honoring Army chaplain Emil J. Kapaun; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Res. 206. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NADLER:

H. Res. 207. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Judiciary in the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H. Res. 208. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. CARSON):

H. Res. 209. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2021 as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H. Res. 210. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Agriculture in the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H. Res. 211. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services in the One Hundred Seventeen Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H. Res. 212. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Budget in the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

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 Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 1669.

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

Taxing and Spending Clause: Article 1, Section 8, clause 1—provides Congress authority to, inter alia, enact spending legislation.

Commerce Clause: Article 1, Section 8, clause 3—provides Congress with the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the states, including the use of the channels of interstate commerce, the instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or persons or things in interstate commerce.

Necessary and Proper Clause: Article 1, Section 8, clause 18—allows Congress the power to make all laws that are necessary and proper for executing its enumerated powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the U.S. Government.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1670.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 1671.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—Commerce Clause

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1672.

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

Article 1, Section 8, 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. WELCH:

H.R. 1673.

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

Article 1, Section 8, 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. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 1674.

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

Commerce Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 3)

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

Taxing and Spending Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 1)

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 1675.

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

Article I Section 8

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 1676.

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

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BALDERSON:

H.R. 1677.

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

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

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 1678.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. BOEBERT:

H.R. 1679.

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

Amendment X ''powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution . . . are reserved to the States . . . or to the people.''

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 1680.

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

Article I Section 8 and the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 1681.

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. CLEAVER:

H.R. 1682.

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. 1683.

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. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1684.

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 limpose and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1685.

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

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

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1686.

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

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

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 1687.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 1688.

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

Article I, Section 8, 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 Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 1689.

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

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

''All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution

''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Ms. HERRELL:

H.R. 1690.

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

Clause l8 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into the 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. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 1691.

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

Under Article 1, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H.R. 1692.

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

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1693.

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

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1694.

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

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 1695.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 14 providing Congress with the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1696.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1697.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1698.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Executive 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. McCAUL:

H.R. 1699.

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. McNERNEY:

H.R. 1700.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 1701.

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

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 1702.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1703.

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

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 1704.

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

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1705.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 1706.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 1707.

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

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

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 1708.

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. 1709.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: ''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. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1710.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1711.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 1712.

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

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

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1713.

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

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 1714.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 1715.

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

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

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1716.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1717.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 1718.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 1719.

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

(1) To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 1720.

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

(1) To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) To make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 1721.

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

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to interstate commerce)

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 1722.

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 Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 1723.

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 Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1724.

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

Article I, Section 8, cl. 1, To pay debts and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States.

Article I, Section 8 cl. 3, To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, Among the Several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, cl. 18, To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1725.

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

Article I, Section 8, cl. 1, To pay debts and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States.

Article I, Section 8 cl. 3, To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, Among the Several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, cl. 18, To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1726.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 30.

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

Article V

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 25: Mr. PALMER, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 38: Mr. OWENS, Mr. MANN, and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.

H.R. 82: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.

H.R. 95: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 152: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 154: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 315: Ms. DEAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. COLE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 322: Mr. LATURNER and Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 350: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. MANNING, and Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 380: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 381: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 422: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 460: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 463: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 471: Mr. NEHLS.

H.R. 481: Mr. KIND, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 485: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 488: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 492: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 496: Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 508: Mr. KHANNA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 525: Mr. SOTO and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 541: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 543: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 554: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 563: Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 568: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 571: Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 591: Mr. POSEY and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 604: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 622: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 623: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 628: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 666: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 677: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 679: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 682: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CLINE, Mr. HERN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BOEBERT, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. FALLON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BARR, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. SPARTZ, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 695: Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 707: Mr. MANN, Mr. CARL, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 748: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. MENG, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CARSON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 838: Mr. COHEN and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 872: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 970: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 991: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 994: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. CHU, and Mr. TORRES of New York.

H.R. 1011: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 1012: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1017: Mr. MOONEY and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 1021: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1023: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 1035: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 1072: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1113: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1117: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1140: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1176: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1182: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1184: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1193: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1194: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 1198: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1202: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1207: Mr. JONES and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1210: Mr. FEENSTRA and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1276: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. JACOBS of New York, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1302: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1313: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 1330: Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 1345: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1346: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1370: Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1378: Ms. TLAIB, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1379: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1384: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 1394: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 1407: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1443: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1446: Mrs. LEE of Nevada and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1454: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1464: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1470: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1480: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1490: Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 1503: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1522: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. DEAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1527: Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 1534: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 1547: Mr. SAN NICOLAS and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1551: Ms. SPANBERGER and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1560: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 1573: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1603: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VELA, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1604: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1620: Ms. CHU, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr.

RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1626: Mr. GOHMERT and Ms. VAN DUYNE.

H.R. 1633: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 1635: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1652: Mr. KATKO, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 1655: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1656: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1668: Mr. ROSE.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 17: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H. Res. 143: Mr. COSTA and Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H. Res. 157: Mr. NEHLS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. GARBARINO.

H. Res. 162: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H. Res. 191: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H. Res. 196: Ms. BROWNLEY and Ms. DEAN.

H. Res. 197: Mr. BABIN.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 2021 *No. 44*

Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, today, make our Senators custodians of truth. Remind them that when people call a lie the truth, they tamper with their value judgment.

Lord, give our lawmakers the wisdom to know that to scrape away their value judgment will eventually cause them to lose their sense of moral distinctions. May they understand that deception is difficult to quarantine and will corrupt all sense of moral discrimination.

Lord, thank You for being a shelter for the oppressed, a refuge in times of trouble.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of MARCIA LOUISE FUDGE, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

CENSORSHIP

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, most Americans know that there are two sexes, male and female, and that sex is rooted in science. Most Americans also know that we ought to treat all people, including those who feel conflicted about their gender, with respect and dignity, without sacrificing the truth in the process.

These beliefs are now under attack from some of the most powerful corporations in the history of the world. Just a few weeks ago, while House Democrats were passing their far-left Equality Act, the leftwing media was busy canceling Dr. Seuss, Amazon quietly erased a book from its online store without notice, without warning, without explanation. That book is ''When Harry Became Sally: Responding to the Transgender Moment by Ryan Anderson.''

Amazon claims it banned this book for violating its brandnew policy on ''hate speech.'' Of course, that excuse is arbitrary and patently false. You can go to Amazon right now—right now you can go to Amazon on your phone or on your computer and buy copies of actually hateful books. You can get Hitler's ''Mein Kampf'' shipped to your door with free Amazon Prime delivery. You can get the ''Unabomber Manifesto,'' written by a serial killer who murdered 3 people and maimed 23 others. You can even get ''How to Blow up a Pipeline.'' I assume the title speaks for itself. All those books are available for purchase on Amazon right now, one click away. But Amazon wants you to believe that a conservative book is somehow beyond the pale, unacceptably hateful, literally worse than Hitler, as they like to say.

My office asked Amazon to send us the exact passages from ''When Harry Became Sally'' that it deemed so hateful that it couldn't even sell the book on its website. Shocking surprise, I know, they never got back to us. That is because the book doesn't say anything hateful. To the contrary, the book makes very clear that we should treat people who feel conflicted about their gender with the same respect and compassion that are due to all people. To quote the author, ''We should have abundant compassion and charity and patience with people who feel this form of alienation. But we also need to insist on telling the truth . . . ''

That is not hate. That is far from it. The author's real offense, his only offense, was telling the truth. He said calmly and compassionately that boys are boys and girls are girls. And the richest man in the world banned his book from his company's platform.

But, of course, you don't have to agree with the commonsense historic understanding of gender in order to acknowledge how dangerous it is for one of the biggest corporations in the history of the world to start banning books because while Amazon's censorship may start with conservative views, it could easily mutate to censor other views that offend Jeff Bezos and his bottom line. Perhaps Amazon will come after union organizers next since they are trying to bust up a union election in Alabama or maybe environmental activists or maybe trustbusters, since so many people are talking about potential antitrust violations in the world of Big Tech.

And even if Amazon goes only this far and no further, the damage of free

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

speech has already been done. Books like ''When Harry Became Sally'' won't get published anymore. Writers who hold unfashionable opinions that just a few days ago were considered basic mainstream views of a large majority of Americans, may decide to self-censor, stay silent.

The virtual book burning may spread to other companies. Maybe Amazon will put a book burning app on its Kindle so readers can drag books from its catalog into the virtual bonfire.

Political correctness will only grow more oppressive if its enforcers, like Amazon, don't face some consequences for their actions. Amazon, for instance, makes billions of dollars each year hosting websites and storing data for the government. Almost all of Amazon's profit is made in these enterprise services, not in its consumer-facing retail business. Those are our tax dollars flowing to a company that uses its power to censor the beliefs of a large majority of Americans. Perhaps it is time for lawmakers to reconsider whether these contracts are in the best interest of our country.

I also note Amazon is the country's largest bookseller, selling three out of every four e-books in America. It is time for lawmakers to evaluate whether Amazon's practices are consistent with our antitrust laws or whether antitrust laws need to be updated to address this type of behavior from a monopolistic firm. We better hurry, though, because maybe they will ban all books on antitrust and monopoly behavior before we have a chance to study the question.

I will close by quoting from the book that Amazon banned, which predicted the very events we are witnessing here today:

> If trans activists succeed in their political agenda, our nation's children will be indoctrinated in a harmful ideology, and some will live by its own lies about their own bodies, at great harm to themselves physically, psychologically, and socially. Lives will be ruined, but pointing out the damage will be forbidden. Dissent from the transgender worldview will be punished in schools, workplaces, and medical clinics. Trying to live in accordance with the truth will be made harder.

This is not a fight over hate or bigotry, respect or compassion. It is a battle over truth itself, the truth of who we are as human beings and the fundamental freedom to speak that truth or any other truth without fear.

Throughout our history, Americans have never surrendered to an oppressive tyranny of opinion, whether a majority or, in this case, a small but highly influential minority, and we won't be cowed in silence today. We will fight for what is true. We will fight for the freedom to say it. No matter what the cultural forces arrayed against us do, we will never back down.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SINEMA). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate returns this week to the business of nominations. Today, the Senate will confirm Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE to be the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, followed by confirmation votes later this week for Merrick Garland to serve as Attorney General and Michael Regan to serve as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Finally, the Senate will begin the confirmation process for Congresswoman DEB HAALAND before the week is out. She would be the first Native American Cabinet member of any Agency and the first indigenous Secretary of the Interior—a profoundly important moment given the historically troubled relationship between the Federal Government and Tribal nations. Despite Republican obstruction, Representative HAALAND will be confirmed by the Senate to be Secretary HAALAND. I will file cloture on her nomination immediately after my remarks.

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN

Now on the rescue plan, on Saturday, the American people got to see what a responsive and effective government looks like. A month and a half after assuming the majority, Senate Democrats followed through on our promise to deliver a bold COVID relief bill to help crush the virus, lift this country out of the crisis, and set our economy on a path to a strong recovery.

Earlier today, the final text of the Senate bill was sent to the House of Representatives. Congress remains on track to deliver the American Rescue Plan to President Biden's desk for his signature before enhanced unemployment benefits expire on March 14.

We said we would do it. We are doing it.

Once President Biden signs the American Rescue Plan into law, it will immediately become one of the most sweeping Federal recovery efforts in modern history. It will help restore Americans' faith in government at a time when that is sorely needed, and it will deliver more help to more people than almost anything Congress has accomplished in past decades.

Already the positive reviews are pouring in. According to several reports, the bill will help millions of Americans save hundreds of dollars in healthcare costs. Thanks to a historic expansion of the child tax credit—up to $3,000 per child under 17 for an overwhelming majority of families—analysts predict the American Rescue Plan will cut child poverty in half.

Let me say that again: Analysts predict the American Rescue Plan will cut child poverty in half. This has been a goal of this country for decades, and now we are taking real steps to accomplish it.

In fact, the Tax Policy Center predicts the American Rescue Plan will boost the incomes of the poorest 20 percent of Americans by 20 percent, including significant boosts all the way through the middle class.

Meanwhile, the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans will receive an income boost of zero—zero percent for the top 1 percent wealthiest Americans.

Let me say that again because this shows who we are as a party here in the Senate and who we should be as a nation. Let me say: A 20-percent boost in incomes for Americans who are struggling the most; zero percent for those who are at the top already, who are doing very well.

Let's contrast this to the Republican tax bill, which skewed in exactly the opposite direction. If people want to know the difference—the difference in terms of how Democrats feel about whom we should help and how Republicans feel about whom we should help—contrast this bill with the most major accomplishment during the 4 years that Donald Trump was President and it is very apparent.

Back in December, Democrats promised that, if we won the majority, we would deliver $2,000 checks to American families. That is exactly what we have done. Promise made; promise kept. We helped pass $600 checks in December and added $1,400 in the bill we just passed.

Because Democrats kept that promise, Americans are going to receive the help they need quickly. The checks will stimulate the economy, and they are targeted to those Americans who need it the most. It is a promise kept.

The OECD, or the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, projected that the American Rescue Plan could as much as double America's economic growth this year. As a result, it also revised upward its projections for the entire world's economic recovery. Once again, the United States is going to lead the way.

And so, because of what the Senate did last week, healthcare costs will go down, child poverty will be cut in half, Americans will receive direct financial support, and the economy is set for an enormous boost. It is a great beginning for a new administration and a new Senate.

And that is to say nothing of the schools that will receive support to reopen faster and safer, the restaurants and small businesses that will receive a lifeline, the millions of recently unemployed Americans who will continue to receive enhanced benefits until Labor Day, and the millions of workers and retirees who will see their pension plans protected.

Of course, one of the most important aspects of all is the support this bill will give to speed vaccinations and expand testing—exactly what we need to defeat the virus.

In short, this is one of the very most significant pieces of legislation to pass the Senate in years. It is broader, deeper, and more comprehensive in helping working families and lifting Americans out of poverty than anything—anything—Congress has accomplished in a very long time.

So I am extremely proud of the bill we passed this week—exceedingly proud. I am exceedingly proud of everybody in our caucus; our committee chairs, whose leadership allowed us to act swiftly at a moment when Americans needed help fast; and the Members, who pulled together and realized no one is going to get everything he or she wants, but the need to come together and get something done when we had no margin for error was wonderful.

I want to thank President Biden for his bold and steady leadership. He was instrumental in putting this bill together and helping to get it over the finish line.

And I am exceedingly proud of the staff, who toiled behind the scenes, who worked incredible hours under incredible stress to prepare, perfect, and pass the American Rescue Plan. The staff are the unsung heroes of this bill. So I want to spend just a moment to sing their praises.

First of all, to all the members and staff of the Senate committees, thank you. I have submitted all of their names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to acknowledge their weeks of hard work assembling different portions of the bill, negotiating compromises, writing legislative text, petitioning the Parliamentarian, and managing a colossal amendment process.

To all of the floor staff—the doorkeepers, the clerks, the reporters, the cafeteria workers, the custodial staff, the Capitol Police and National Guard—the entire Senate gave you a standing ovation on Saturday, and you deserved every second of it. Thank you, thank you, thank you once again.

And, finally, I need to spend some time thanking my own staff. I think they are the best staff anyone could ever have. They are amazing. They are amazing. Every Senator believes they have the best staff on Capitol Hill, I guess, but I am no exception. I couldn't do what I do without them. They are amazing. The chiefs who run the show: Mike Lynch, Martin Brennan, Erin Sager Vaughn. The floor staff: the amazing Gary Myrick, Tricia Engle, the whole floor staff—thank you.

And then three names that I have to give a particular shout-out to because you could truly say that without these three we wouldn't have a bill: Gerry Petrella, Meghan Taira, Charlie Ellsworth.

My staff—I would like to brag a little about them if I might. My staff boasts some of the most brilliant legislative minds in the country—folks who know the nitty-gritty of every issue in their portfolio, who fashion solutions to the most difficult problems in the country and then turn those solutions into action.

And thank you to my executive team, who keeps me somewhat on time and is a tremendous asset to the entire Democratic caucus.

Thank you to our phenomenal research team, ready to supply the right fact at the right moment. You ask them: Look this up, find this out. Boom, the answer appears right away.

To everyone at the Senate Democratic Media Center, the SDMC, who are clipping and editing videos at 3, 4, 5 in the morning; to our amazing press team, who gets the word out so skillfully; our engagement team, who does fantastic work with the groups affected by the legislation we pass; and our entire State staff—I just visited some of them. I just came back from Buffalo and Syracuse—who make sure that our work in Washington always responds to the needs of New York.

I wanted to mention each of these different groups, but in reality they are a team. They pull together, and they are friends as well. They celebrate holidays together, and we share each other's joys and sadnesses in life—a team that works together, helps each other, supports each other, and supports me; a team that gets up every morning with a passion to make the lives of their fellow citizens better. It is impossible, just impossible not to be inspired by them and by that.

So I ask unanimous consent to enter the names of my entire staff into the RECORD because, as I told them on the phone Sunday, even if they do nothing else in life, they have saved by their work many, many lives. They have made the lives of millions—millions—of people considerably better because of their hard work, their dedication, and their faith.

So I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of my entire staff.

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

I would like the Record to include the names of my staff who worked tirelessly to prepare, perfect, and pass the American Rescue Plan: one of the most significant pieces of legislation to pass the United States Senate in decades. Their names are as follows:

Abdelhaq, Yazeed, Achibar, Kathleen, Aleman, Jasmin, Armwood, Garrett, Babin, Reggie, Banez, Robert, Barjon, Didier, Barton, Steve, Battle, Sharon, Benavides, Jackie, Biasotti, Allison, Bluitt, Tinae, Bodian, Lane, Bowman, Quinn, Brennan, Martin, Burns, Caroline, Byrne, Sean, Cardinal, Jon, Cardona, Selena, Carranza, Ramon.

Chang Prepis, Joyce, Charlery, Kristen, Cole, Emily, Contes, Helena, Cook, Andrew, Cooke, Dave, Coutavas, Sophie, Daly, Annie, Dayal, Tushar, Deveny, Adrian, Dickson, Jeff, Dirienzo, Lindsay, Donovan, Patrick, Eagan, Ryan, Ellsworth, Charlie, Emanuel, Marissa, Engle, Tricia, Fado, Kelly.

Flood, Sam, Fuentes, Matt, Geertsma, Joel, Glander, Megan, Goodman, Justin, Gray-Hoehn, Hayley, Gutmaker, Joshua, Haberl, Gunnar, Harris, Jasmine, Hawley, Marisa, Hickman, Rob, Housley, Jon, Huus, Amber, Iannelli, Mike, Ileka, Steven, Jackson, Rachel, Jamaica, Jessica, Jean, Mike, Kazibwe, Rodney.

Kiandoli, Cietta, Kuiken, Mike, Lee, Monica, Lopez, Julietta, Lynch, Mike, Magaletta, Grace, Mann, Steve, Mannering, Amy, Marcojohn, Anneliese, Martin, Ryan, Mehta, Hemen, Meyer, Ken, Molofsky, Josh, Moore, Catey, Moreno-Silva, Michelle, Morgan, Rachel, Murphy Vlasto, Megan.

Myrick Gary, Najafi, Leela, Nam, Alice, Nehme, Joe, Nguyen, Alex, Nicholson, Jordan, Nunez, Diana, Odgren, Andrew, Olvera, Lorenzo, Orlove, Suzan, Ortega, Sol, Osmolski, Rebecca, Oursler, Nate, Paone, Stephanie, Patel, Vandan, Patterson, Liza, Patterson, Mark, Petrella, Gerry, Pina, Oriana, Reese, William.

Revelle, Justine, Rivera, Tony, Robinson, Alexandra, Rodarte, Sam, Rodman, Scott, Rodriguez, Crisitian, Roefaro, Angelo, Rosenblum, Zack, Ryder, Tim, Seijas, Nelson, Shah, Raisa, Sharbaugh, Tyson, Sinpatanasakul, Leeann, Skapnit, Amanda, Sledge, Alexa, Smith, Hannah, Sonnier-Thompson, Bre, Spellicy, Amanda, Sundaramoorthy, Dili, Sweda, Emily.

Talley, Hanna, Taira, Meghan, Tam, Catalina, Taylor, Anna, Taylor, Terri, Tepke, Paige, Timothy, Kimarah, Tinsley, Dan, Vaughn, Erin Sager, Velez, Cyre, Virgona, Nicole, Vogel, Kai, Vorperian-Grillo, Karine, Watt, Brad, Watters, Veronica, Weir, Emma, Yoken, Dan, Younkin, Nora, Zeltmann, Chris, Zomorrodian, Reza.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I want them all to know how much I appreciate their work and how much the country does and what a great difference it has made in the trajectory of our wonderful Nation.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Debra Anne Haaland, of New Mexico, to be Secretary of the Interior.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 31, Debra Anne Haaland, of New Mexico, to be Secretary of the Interior.

Charles E. Schumer, Chris Van Hollen, Michael F. Bennet, Jack Reed, Tammy

Duckworth, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Patrick J. Leahy, Amy Klobuchar, Tina Smith, Brian Schatz, Robert Menendez, Richard J. Durbin, Martin Heinrich, Maria Cantwell.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to this motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, when Senators were last in this Chamber, our Democratic colleagues were shooting down amendment after amendment to ensure their largely non-COVID-related spending plan remained very liberal and purely partisan.

Republicans proposed amendments to cap extra government help for wealthier Americans, to ensure that direct checks would only go to citizens and legal residents and not to people in prison, and to rein in runaway State and local bailouts and refocus the bill on urgent COVID-related actual needs. But Democrats banded together to defeat every one of these commonsense changes. As the Democratic leader happily explained to reporters later on Saturday, his whole conference put lockstep party unity ahead of substance and ahead of bipartisan compromise.

So the nearly $2 trillion partisan spending spree that President Biden's Chief of Staff brags is ''the most progressive domestic legislation in a generation'' is on its way over to the House. Already, we hear reporting that this giveaway will simply wipe out the budget deficit of New York State and eliminate a big part of the deficit in San Francisco, courtesy of the taxpayers in Kentucky and Middle America. Already, we hear the administration saying they want some of these sweeping new welfare policies to become permanent, like a no-strings-attached benefit that disregards all the pro-work lessons of bipartisan welfare reform. Meanwhile, it only manages to spend about 1 percent on vaccinations and less than 9 percent on the entire health fight.

Democrats inherited a turning tide. The vaccine trends and economic trends were in place before the bill was ever voted on, before this President was sworn in, but they are determined to push to the front of the parade with an effort to push America to the left.

Meanwhile, House Democrats are wasting no time pursuing even more purely partisan legislation. Last Wednesday, the House passed H.R. 1, their effort to rewrite the ground rules of American elections and seize power from States and localities. Just like the spending plan, in both Chambers, once again the only thing bipartisan about the bill was the opposition.

This is House Democrats' bid to put Federal bureaucrats in charge of local election rules; to undermine voter ID requirements with massive loopholes that undermine them; to require every State to permit ballot harvesting, which lets paid political operatives produce stacks of ballots with other people's names on them; to overturn or change hundreds of State election laws; and to turn our highest election authority, the equally balanced FEC, into a partisan majority body to crack down on speech and ideas they don't like.

It is quite the recipe for rebuilding public faith in our democracy on all sides—a purely partisan effort to seize unprecedented power for Washington, DC, on a razor-thin majority. It is a hugely harmful idea at the worst possible time.

NOMINATIONS

Madam President, on a different matter, this week, the Senate is set to consider more of President Biden's nominations. I have consistently said that the President should have latitude to staff their administration with people of their choosing so long as they nominate qualified and mainstream individuals. That is why I and many other Republicans have supported many of the President's mainstream nominees.

Secretaries Austin and Vilsack were each confirmed with more than 90 votes; Secretaries Raimondo, Yellen, and Buttigieg with more than 80. Senator Blinken got 78 votes, including mine. Secretaries Cardona and Granholm each got more than 60 votes. Even with the time spent on impeachment, half of the nominees I just mentioned were confirmed faster than President Trump's nominees to the same spots, and most of them received a more bipartisan margin now than 4 years ago. So this administration is receiving perfectly fair treatment from the Senate. Frankly, the President and his team must be thrilled that Senate Republicans are proving to be more fair and more principled on personnel matters than the Democratic minority's behavior 4 years ago.

But the fact remains that millions and millions of Americans elected 50 Republican Senators—an even split—to stand against policies and personnel who lean too far to the left. That is why many of us voted against confirming Secretary Mayorkas, who stood idly by while a major crisis exploded on the border in just his first several weeks. Rather than confront the problem, he absurdly claims that a record number of unaccompanied children in custody, overflowing shelters, and catch-and-release policies during a pandemic do not actually constitute a ''crisis'' at all.

Xavier Becerra, the partisan California attorney general with no significant healthcare experience, whom the President has nominated to run Health and Human Services during COVID–19, could not even get one Republican vote to get out of committee.

So Republicans will continue to distinguish between qualified, mainstream people and nominees who are way outside the mainstream.

I have already announced I will support Judge Merrick Garland, whose nomination to be Attorney General we will vote to advance later today, but we will continue to fight hard against people who are the wrong choices for key positions. We are going to shine a bright spotlight on anyone who seems more focused on far-left ideology than serving all of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I had a press conference this Sunday back home in Illinois to talk about what the American Rescue Plan means to our State. It is dramatic. Dramatic.

Millions of dollars will be coming to our State to buy vaccines. I can tell you, all across Illinois, people are asking: When is it my turn? When do I get my chance? And we want to make sure they get that chance sooner rather than later.

Think about what President Biden inherited just a few weeks ago. Surely they had found some vaccines—excellent vaccines by Pfizer and Moderna—approved by then, but he came to the White House to find that there was no plan to administer those vaccines across the Nation.

Vaccine is important, but it is of little value if it is not in the arms of Americans. So he set out to establish a standard that we would be distributing this vaccine across the United States as quickly as possible and the mechanism, the infrastructure to make certain that it was administered by professionals who know what they are doing. That is quite an undertaking. It is the largest vaccination in the history of our Nation. But President Biden said he needed help to do it—not just money for the vaccine but money for testing, money for the genomic sequencing necessary to detect variants that might be emerging in the United States. That was a major element of the bill that passed this Senate last Saturday.

He also put money in there that had already been promised to the American people. Remember when President Trump said $2,000 for every American? We agreed on a bipartisan basis. The first downpayment was last December, $600, and the remainder, $1,400, was included in the bill that passed on Saturday.

I have yet to hear a Republican Senator come to this floor and criticize that sum of money. All of them—I should say most of them have publicly supported it, and others say little or nothing about it, but no one is saying that it shouldn't be given as a result of the promise made. We kept that promise. That was part of what we were doing.

We also had a responsibility to millions of Americans who are still collecting unemployment. As of March 14,

they were going to lose their opportunity to continue that unemployment check.

There were arguments made on the floor here that these were just lazy people and that if you give them an unemployment check, they will just continue to be lazy and won't go back to work. I don't buy that. I don't believe it. Are some lazy? Well, possibly. I think the vast majority of these people are desperate. They are desperate because they have been laid off or lost their jobs and they need to keep their families together.

Unemployment benefits do that, and they also give fuel to the economy to recover. We were told that by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve and others—to put enough stimulus back in this economy so we can come out of it strong sooner rather than later. I believe that. Yet people like the Republican Senator from Ohio came to the floor talking about the recovery underway and we don't really need to do as much as President Biden had asked for. I disagree.

All across the board, the bill that we passed, whether it is money for schools or money for hospitals or money for clinics or money for administering this vaccine, was money that will be well spent in the State of Illinois and all across the United States.

Now what troubles me is this: Last year, we had two major bills for COVID relief. They talk about five. There were two major bills. The first was in March, the CARES Act that was worth $2 trillion. That bill passed the Senate after it had been engineered by Treasury Secretary Mnuchin of the Trump administration. It passed the Senate with every Senator voting yes, 96 to nothing. Every Democratic Senator voted for it.

Then came the followup bill in December, some $900 billion for more COVID relief, for a temporary, first-quarter-of-this-year fix. When you look at the final rollcall there, it was 92 to 6. All six ''no'' votes were Republicans. Every Democrat who voted, voted for it—again, a Trump proposal that we supported on the Democratic side.

So then the tables turned on January 20, and a new President came to town. Joe Biden said: Let me finish this and do it effectively. Give me an American Rescue Plan.

How many Republican Senators stood up and said: Well, since the Democrats, in the spirit of responding to this pandemic, came around and supported the Trump plans last year, we will do the same this year. The number—zero. Not one Republican Senator supported the bill that passed on Saturday. We passed it with 50 Democratic votes. That is what it took, with one Republican Senator being missing. But what a disappointment that is, to think that this pandemic and the economic crisis that followed was addressed on a bipartisan basis with every Democratic vote in the major legislation last year, and this year, under President Biden, we couldn't get one Republican Senator to join us in that effort. It is a disappointment, but I hope it isn't a portent of things to come. We have a lot to do, and we need to do it together on a bipartisan basis. The American people are going to count on us to do it.

I also might say a word about the nominations that Senator MCCONNELL referred to earlier. It is true that some of these nominees are getting votes that indicate a strong majority in support, and that does evidence Republican cooperation, and I want to thank them for joining us in that bipartisan spirit. But it evidences something else as well. These are good nominees. These are good men and women who can serve this country effectively. Given the chance, they will, and the votes that have been cast in support of them indicate that as well.

I won't go into the experience 4 years ago with the Trump nominees, but many of them had troubled records, and some of them didn't even file the necessary disclosures before their names were submitted to us for consideration. So there are a lot of things that have changed in the 4-year period of time. Now we have a chance to approve a team for President Biden and to fill out his national security team.

NOMINATION OF MERRICK BRIAN GARLAND

Madam President, the last person up is Merrick Garland, nominee for Attorney General. He is, simply put, the right nominee to lead the Justice Department. I believe that is true for three primary reasons: one, his integrity; two, his experience; and three, his humility.

Let me begin with integrity.

The Attorney General occupies a unique role in the Cabinet. Although serving at the pleasure of the President and responsible for implementing his policy initiatives, the Attorney General is also the Nation's law enforcement officer.

The AG oversees a Department that must remain impartial, unbiased, and independent. To balance these two roles requires a nominee who is beyond reproach, who understands the need to separate personal preference from constitutional principles, and who has the courage to stand steadfast in the face of political pressure. Merrick Garland is such a nominee.

As a judge of the DC Circuit for more than 20 years, he has been guided by an abiding faith in the rule of law and a firm commitment to make equal justice for all a reality. It is no surprise, then, that more than 60 former Federal judges and more than 150 former Justice Department officials, appointed by Presidents of both parties, have expressed their strong support for Judge Garland's nomination. They know that Judge Garland will carry his integrity and his independence with him in his new role, and the public will soon see the same integrity and independence in the new Department of Justice, a welcome change from the past 4 years.

Judge Garland also has the experience needed to lead the Department from the first day on the job. Before he served on the DC Circuit, Judge Garland served with distinction in multiple Justice Department roles—as a special assistant to the Attorney General, assistant U.S. Attorney, a deputy in the Criminal Division, and top adviser to the Deputy Attorney General.

We know, of course, it was Judge Merrick Garland who ably and admirably led the investigation and prosecution of the Oklahoma City bombing—the worst domestic terrorism attack, to date, in modern American history—and he will, no doubt, draw upon that experience as the Department brings to justice those who perpetrated the hideous January 6 Capitol insurrection and works to prevent further attacks.

But as Judge Garland highlighted at his hearing, his prior tenure at the Department of Justice has also given him insight into what is vital for the Department's success, from the importance of career prosecutors and agents to the breadth of the Department's responsibilities.

Finally, Judge Garland has what I believe to be a characteristic that is often overlooked when we evaluate nominees: humility. He is mindful of the Department's history, a founding rooted in protecting the civil rights enshrined in the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments—and he is mindful of just how much work remains in the fight for civil rights.

He is mindful of the enormous power that prosecutors hold and the need to wield that power responsibly. In fact, he told us as much at the hearing when he quoted Robert Jackson, the Attorney General and later Supreme Court Justice, in saying:

> The citizen's safety lies in the prosecutor who tempers zeal with human kindness, who seeks truth and not victims, who serves the law and not factional purposes, and who approaches the task with humility.

He is mindful of the opportunities that this country has provided him yet remain elusive for far too many. President Biden nominated Judge Garland to serve with a team of senior Justice Department leaders.

Today, we had a hearing with Lisa Monaco, who is aspiring to be his Deputy Attorney General; Vanita Gupta, who is aspiring to be his Associate Attorney General; and, later, we will have a hearing with Kristen Clarke, who wishes to be Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

This is an exceptionally well-qualified team of DOJ veterans eager to serve. When the committee reported Judge Garland's nomination, I am happy to report that four Republicans joined all the Democrats, making it a bipartisan rollcall. I think it is worth quoting again. Here is what Judge Garland said:

> I come from a family where my grandparents fled anti-Semitism and persecution. The country took us in and protected us.

And I feel an obligation to the country to pay back, and this is the highest, best use of my own set of skills to pay back.

Judge Garland's motivation for serving as the Nation's next Attorney General is powerful, it is honest, and it is humble.

I want to close by coming full circle, so to speak. At Judge Garland's hearing, I noted that, if confirmed, he would be standing on the shoulders of predecessors like Robert Kennedy, who called on Congress to enact sweeping civil rights legislation. Well after that hearing, the committee received a letter from over 30 members of the Kennedy family, and they likened what faces Judge Garland to what faced the young Robert Kennedy as he took up his position as Attorney General. They wrote—the Kennedy family—and I quote:

> We are confronted by the same challenges today, particularly in voting rights, in the actions of some of our police officers, and in great disparities in housing, health, and jobs. Merrick Garland's record shows he is dedicated to the kind of justice that does not simply punish but lifts people up so their best selves can be fulfilled.

That is precisely the kind of Attorney General America needs and the kind of Attorney General Merrick Garland will be. I look forward to voting for him, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Ohio.

NOMINATION OF MARCIA LOUISE FUDGE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting another dedicated and talented public servant and a great Ohioan—my Congresswoman for the last 12 years—MARSHA FUDGE, to be our next Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Congresswoman FUDGE is a proud daughter of Ohio. She was born in Cleveland, grew up in Ohio, and graduated from the Ohio State University and Cleveland-Marshall College of Law. Congresswoman FUDGE has a long and distinguished career serving our State in the Cleveland and Cuyahoga County courts and Cuyahoga County prosecutors' office, as chief of staff to the trailblazing Stephanie Tubbs Jones, and as mayor of Warrensville Heights, OH.

At HUD, Congresswoman FUDGE will work to help protect our kids from lead poisoning, to restore the promise of fair housing, and to give communities the help and the resources that they need. It is a tall order. It is one she is poised to meet.

She brings to the job the unique and critical experience of serving as mayor for the kind of community that is either overlooked or outright preyed upon by Wall Street and by big investors. She understands we can't write off entire swaths of the country—whether it is a coal town in southeast Ohio or a historic industrial city like the one I grew up in, in Mansfield, or whether it is farm country around Lexington, OH, or whether it is an urban neighborhood on the East Side of Cleveland.

This champion of Cleveland understands that. She saw up close how lenders preyed on families and the foreclosure crisis that followed. My colleagues have heard me talk about ZIP code 44105, where Connie and I live, which had more foreclosures in the first half of 2007 than any ZIP code in the United States.

At the time, Congresswoman FUDGE was serving as mayor of a city fewer than 20 miles away. Today, she represents this ZIP code in the United States Congress. Those families are more than just a statistic to her. They are her constituents. They are her neighbors. They are her friends. She knows their story. She knows how, for decades, communities have watched as factories closed, investment dried up, and storefronts were boarded over. She knows how many neighborhoods and towns have never had the investment they should—from Black codes to Jim Crow, to red lining, to the discrimination that President Trump's regulators locked into place. She understands how decades of policy funneled resources and jobs away from Black and Brown communities.

A few years ago, I was talking with local health department officials in Cleveland. I asked them what percentage of the older homes that make up the bulk of Cleveland housing have dangerous levels of lead, those homes built right after World War II or before that. They said 99 percent of those homes have high levels of lead—dangerously high levels of lead.

The families in those homes are Congresswoman FUDGE's constituents. She knows what lead poison does to kids. She knows the local efforts that Ohioans are leading in Cleveland to take this on. She lifts up their voices, which have been drowned out or silenced for too long. She will be a champion for families all over the country who want to be able to afford a home without crippling stress every single month and to be able to build wealth through home ownership to pass on to their children and grandchildren.

Congresswoman FUDGE has dedicated her career to fighting for Ohioans. I am excited she is now going to use all that talent and all that passion and all that empathy to fight for her whole country. I ask my colleagues to support her confirmation to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Mr. President, this weekend, on Saturday, we passed the American Rescue Plan that will put shots in people's arms, kids back in school, money in people's pockets, and workers in jobs. Tens of millions Americans, including more than 5 million Ohioans, are going to see money in their pockets from stimulus checks and the dramatic expansion of the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit.

This comes back to, as it always does in politics—the Presiding Officer knows—as it does in government, and it comes down to ''whose side are you on?'' as this illustrates pretty well. The American Rescue Plan. We all remember—most of us remember—4 years ago, the Trump tax cut for the rich, and the blue here is the American Rescue Plan, which we just passed on Saturday, which the House will probably pass tomorrow, and President Biden will probably sign it this weekend. The lowest numbers—the lowest 20 percent—saw their income go up by 20 percent under our plan. It is barely perceptible how much it went up under the Trump tax plan. But if you go to the top of 1 percent, you can see how much their income went up, and this is to the tune of millions and millions of dollars, and the lowest earners essentially got nothing from the Trump tax plan.

So you can see here in the blue is how our tax bill will put money in the pockets of middle-income people, all the way up—middle-income people, working-class people, the lowest income people—while the Trump tax plan, of course, was helping the richest people in the country.

We see that middle-class and working-class and low-income families are all going to benefit from the American Rescue Plan. This is a broad investment in a whole country—in the vast majority of people, who get their income not from a stock portfolio but from a paycheck. Contrast that with those who benefitted from the McConnell-Trump tax scam. The vast majority of benefits, as we all know, went to those at the top. Again, look at the top 1 percent. They got more from the Washington Republican tax giveaway than anyone else.

At the time, I remember—the Presiding Officer, I think, remembers this; he opposed that bill vigorously, too—Republicans claimed it just wasn't possible—to do their tax bill, it wasn't possible—to avoid giving tax cuts to the richest 1 percent. They just had to. We knew they were wrong then. This has proved they are wrong.

Again, look at the blue and the purple—the benefits that go to the lowest, to middle-class families, working families, and low-income families. Our rescue plan gave literally zero to the top 1 percent. They are doing just fine. The value of their stock portfolio has soared during the pandemic. We invested in everyone else, in the people who were promised more money in their paychecks from the Republican tax scam but never got those raises.

As I said, 4 million Ohioans will get a stimulus check. That is out of 12 million people in the State. Two million Ohio families will get at least a $3,000 child tax credit. They will get a check—$250 every month year round. More than half a million Ohio workers will get an expanded earned income tax credit. Those childless families—single people, childless people, some old, a

number of older Ohioans not yet quite 65—will get their enhanced earned income tax credit. Over a million delivery drivers and more than a million cashiers will get an income boost, and 800,000 home health aides get more money back in their pockets.

These are the workers on the frontlines of the pandemic. These are the people who go to work every day and expose themselves to people whom they don't know, in the course of their job. They go home at night anxious that they might be infecting their families. This is what making hard work pay off looks like. This is what investing in the country looks like. This is what a government on the side of workers and their families look like. It is about the dignity of work. It is about rewarding people that work hard. It is what we did on Saturday. It is what I said, as I was walking out of this building on the way home on Saturday, was the best day of my Senate career because we helped tens of millions of Americans. We helped millions of people in my State. We will make a difference in their lives. That is what we did on Saturday. That is what we will continue to do.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, this past Saturday, Senate Democrats signed off on the largest and most partisan transfer of wealth in the history of the U.S. Congress.

In the weeks leading up to that vote, they insisted that their $1.9 trillion giveaway would bring the relief the American people were seeking. They quoted suspect polling and anecdotes to support their ridiculous claims that the bill was bipartisan, even though they never even tried to secure bipartisan support. In fact, I would argue that Democrats threw away the idea of bipartisanship the moment they chose to use the reconciliation process to force their hand. After almost 30 hours of debate, they did just that on a party-line vote. Then the cracks in their claims of bipartisanship and necessity began to show.

Almost immediately after the final vote, the majority leader called it—and I am quoting—''one of the most progressive pieces of legislation—if not the most progressive—in decades.'' But we all know that his definition of ''progressive'' isn't compatible with the kind of targeted relief everyone here would probably agree that this country needs, had my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not seen an opportunity to fulfill the radical campaign promises that had put them into power. They chose—they chose—that power over dealing with the needs that people have.

They did what they set out to do. A fraction of the American Rescue Plan's $2 trillion pricetag would go toward that—and I am quoting again—''big, bold, urgent'' relief that Democrats spent all weekend long bragging about. I am sure you heard them as you turned on the TV. Here is the truth: Only 9 percent—9 percent—will go toward vaccines, testing, healthcare jobs; 9 percent of a nearly $2 trillion bill goes for COVID relief.

But if we want to talk about big, bold spending plans, let's talk about all those special earmarks and sweetheart deals that Democrats used to take advantage of the situation and seize even more power—again, after the power, using people as pawns to get their liberal wish list, get the money in the pipeline. Of course, you can forget that we had $1 trillion already in the pipeline that had not been spent, also putting their desired power ahead of our children and grandchildren who are going to have to pay that debt. Immoral.

In my office, we call this bill the blue State bailout. We do it for a reason. You can look at this chart. Along with that laughable 9 percent of actual COVID relief, the American people took on $350 billion in debt to cover a bailout for some of the highest spending and most poorly managed State and local governments in the country. The number is astronomically higher than even the most extreme estimates of need conjured up by leftwing think tanks. It is more than the $31 billion loss in expected tax revenue that experts forecasted. And it doesn't even take into consideration that many States don't need a bailout. Many States had success putting those five previous bipartisan COVID relief packages to work. They caught up on their tax revenue with time to spare.

But, still, that $350 billion, it served a purpose. You can see it right here. The blue States, they are getting more money. The red States, they are losing money. It created yet another expectation of dependency that mismanaged States and local governments can lean on when their out-of-control spending policies come back to bite them.

And we have learned today that the majority leader had a staff member who tweeted out that the money from this bill, it would tend to New York State's deficit—pretty much the same thing we are hearing from California and from some of the big blue cities. If you can't control your spending habits, crank up the printing presses.

The payday continued with an $85 billion no-strings-attached pension bailout that everyone from the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget to the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal, to the editorial board of the Washington Post agree had nothing to do with COVID relief—nothing. It was a gift to an embattled constituency and another pernicious assertion that when the going gets tough and the money in those mismanaged funds evaporates, just call on the Federal Government and crank up the printing presses one more time. Why? Oh, we need the money. We cannot manage our budgets. We are running low on fulfilling our obligation to the pension fund. Oh, my goodness, we have so many needs.

Everybody has needs. Our children and our grandchildren have needs. They need freedom. They need Members of the Senate, Members of the House to act like adults and address the problems that are right in front of us.

When President Biden asked, back in February, what would they have me cut from this spending bill, I would have told him, let's start with this money. Let's start with the money that is going to the States to bail them out because yes, indeed, this is now the Biden blue State bailout.

Democrats' desire for a lawless and open border shone through in their unanimous refusal to accept an amendment that would have kept billions of dollars in direct payments out of the hands of illegal immigrants. This was more than just a handout; it was a signal to every person who is trying to jump the line and break the rules that we will not only tolerate it, but now we are encouraging it. Think about that. Think about that.

The rule of law is out the window. We are willing to chip away at our own security—the Democrats are—and ignore the growing crisis at our southern border—the Democrats are. And if it means we can slap a bandaid on what has become a gaping wound and call it a win in the war against poverty, the Democrats are OK with doing that. It is called spin. But it does not address the underlying issues. It doesn't address the fact that they are doing this at the expense of schools, small businesses, and families.

Democrats certainly followed through on their campaign promise to empower teachers unions. In fact, they went so far as to approve a provision that would pay schools to stay closed. All 50 Democrats voted against an amendment that would have sent new funding only to schools that have followed the science and have reopened safely.

You know, you would have thought that the Democrats would have at least done that for the children. But, no. In addition to saddling them with debt—another $2 trillion worth of debt—they encouraged the teachers unions to not go back to school. That vote put the power right where the Democrats want it—in the hands of the unions. And millions of students and teachers out there will continue to pay the mental and emotional price for this action.

This bill took so much from people who have absolutely nothing to give. Think of all those billions of dollars wasted on unnecessary State bailouts, pension rescues, and union appeasement. We had the opportunity to spend that money on vaccine distribution and

small business relief and a light at the end of the tunnel for rural healthcare systems that are hanging on by a thread.

So why did Democrats throw so much money at their pet projects? Do they really owe that many favors and paybacks? They certainly didn't pour their time and energy into those 600 pages to provide relief but to shamelessly advance their own agenda and throw aside struggling families and workers. Struggling families and workers were simply the price for getting the power that the Democrats wanted.

When I talk to Tennesseans about what happened in this Chamber last week, I tell them: You are right about what you were seeing as you watched the proceedings. You are right. Democrats took advantage of you, of your desperation and your exhaustion. They used slick messaging and wordy phrases to sell a bill of goods that treats every pet project they have and every liberal wish list agenda item as essential.

They like changing the rules. They change the meaning of words like ''essential'' because they knew that if they could make everything that they wanted essential, they could take all the power away from local, responsible governments. They could take it away from school districts and small businesses. And do you know what they are doing with it? They are going to centralize it.

See, here is the thing: You were essential to their greedy power grab. They had to have you.

They had to give their bill a nice-sounding name. They had to say certain things were essential, but you—small businesses, families, people who are playing by the rules, you were not essential to them.

See, that is what ''progressive'' means to Senate Democrats, and if we continue along this road, you are right; it will be an absolute unmitigated disaster for every single person that my colleagues across the aisle have used as leverage against responsible policy that will actually bring us out of this pandemic.

No, it is not about getting out of the pandemic. It is about power, the power that they want.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

FREE SPEECH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have spoken on the Senate floor recently on the subject of free speech as it applies to the world of digital media. The principles of free speech are timeless and are applicable to new forms of communication. Still, it is natural that new questions will arise and new mechanisms might be needed to apply those principles across new modes of communication.

What shouldn't be in question is the need for open dialogue and freedom of speech in academia. Otherwise, what does the principle of academic freedom mean if it isn't involved with freedom of speech?

All of the progress that has made modern life possible has been the result of individuals who have been able to think of things in new ways, even if that challenged an old orthodoxy. A healthy and vibrant academic environment is not afraid of those challenges.

Only stagnant, defensive, and unconfident regimes suppress speech. Think about the recent protests in Russia, Belarus, or Burma. China's restrictions on the internet and suppression of minorities show that it is threatened by contrary ways of thinking.

Which would you describe as an advanced, stable, and dynamic society: North Korea or South Korea? Obviously, that describes South Korea well. It does not at all describe that part of the Korean Peninsula north of the 38th parallel.

So what does it say about so many American academic institutions that the notion of free thought and free speech has now become controversial? What purpose do universities serve if one of the purposes is not to discuss controversial subjects? I often say my definition of a university is where controversy runs rampant.

We hear lots of rationales about why the current generation of college students needs to be protected from hearing speech that could be offensive, hateful, or just plain wrong. Of course, none of us support hateful speech. I don't support it, but I do support freedom.

If you empower those in authority to limit hate speech, whether they be college administrators or government officials, that power will eventually be abused to limit dissenting points of view of all kinds, and that is where some universities are right now.

Even in Iowa's three public universities, we have seen recent efforts to shut down mainstream, center-right views. For instance, a dean at the University of Iowa sent an email across a university platform criticizing a Trump administrative Executive order, but at that same university, when a student challenged the position of the dean using the very same medium, the student was threatened with disciplinary action.

Well, the dean has since apologized for his initial handling of the subject, so I don't raise that to pick on him. In fact, that very dean has befriended me in very many ways and in thoughtful ways as well. But it just makes you wonder if it is part of a broader cultural trend in academia, what went on in that instance at the University of Iowa.

Then there was an English professor at Iowa State University who had to be reprimanded for banning her students from writing papers expressing certain viewpoints such as opposition to abortion or same-sex marriage. The president of my alma mater, the University of Northern Iowa, had to step in to reverse a decision by the student senate denying a group of pro-life students student organization status purely because of their political views.

In each case, the university administrations of these three universities ultimately resolved these incidents well and properly so. I mention them not to pick on my State of Iowa's universities and not to criticize any university, for that matter, but because they seem to be examples of a broader trend on campuses across the country of a knee-jerk reaction to shut down speech some find disagreeable.

The best response to the expression of views that you find repugnant is speech that points out the errors of that particular way of thinking. Now, I think that is best expressed by the University of Chicago's policy, which has become kind of a gold standard for free speech advocacy on university campuses. The University of Chicago expressly prohibits obstructing or otherwise interfering with freedom of others to express views they reject or even loathe.

If you are confident in the rightness of your views and you have an environment that allows free expression of those views, you need not fear speech you find wrong. Of course, that assumes that human beings are all gifted with the power of reason and can discern what is right.

Now, if it happens that that is not the case, if people cannot be trusted to listen to different views and come to the right conclusion, then there is no basis for democracy and our system of self-government, then, is fundamentally flawed.

You can shield students from hearing challenging and uncomfortable views while in college but not when they get out in the real world. Just think of these college students who are on campus. What if they had left high school for the world of work? They would be faced with all these things every day.

So what is special about a college campus? In fact, it is so special that you ought to have a discussion of all these subjects. Academic institutions that do not allow for student views to be challenged, to be tested, to be refined through rigorous debate are doing those very same students a very great disservice. These students' knowledge will be limited, then, and their views unsophisticated. Their ability to deal with different ways of thinking, which they will inevitably encounter throughout their lifetime, will be greatly diminished.

I feel sorry for students who graduate from colleges that cocoon them from controversy. Let me repeat what I said at the beginning. I have always thought of a university as a place where controversy should run rampant.

The notion that the voices students hear must be curated for their own good is concerning, not just because it has a totalitarian ring but because it is harming students in the long run, when they have to deal with the real world.

If students are showing up on campus unable to cope emotionally with hearing conflicting viewpoints, that is a problem of their upbringing and education to that point, before they go to that university. It is something colleges need to confront head-on for their students' well-being. Further shielding students from having their views challenged and then sending them out in the world thinking they are prepared is a recipe for failure.

Americans seem to be losing the ability to understand the point of view of those with whom they disagree. That is an unrealistic point of view for Americans to have. It is a failure to teach about freedom. Questioning of motives has replaced principled argument. Shouting insults has displaced logical debate.

Don't you see, this is a societal trend that increasingly is reflected in the Halls of Congress—right here. Those who have attended institutions of higher education should have to be exposed to the great thinkers of the past and the present, be able to argue points logically, and, more importantly, understand the points of those whom they are trying to persuade or refute.

College graduates should be models of civil discourse. Instead, they are too often the vanguard of the closing of the American mind. For the sake of their students and for the benefit of society, I urge college administrators, trustees, alumni, and all Americans who value the free exchange of ideas to work toward reversing this trend.

Open debate may seem contentious at times, but it is the only path toward mutual understanding, which is so needed right now in American society, our less-than-civil American society, which that less-than-civil American society tends to show up in a democracy that has representative government where, if you are really going to have representative government, wouldn't you expect some of what is happening at the grassroots to show up here in the Halls of Congress? And we do see it all the time, to our shame.

NOMINATION OF MERRICK BRIAN GARLAND

Mr. President, on another subject, today the Senate will start consideration of Judge Merrick Garland's nomination to be Attorney General of the United States.

I will be supporting his nomination, but, as I said at Garland's hearing before the Judiciary Committee, I have concerns, and I am here now to repeat those concerns so all of my colleagues can hear them.

I hope he will take these concerns seriously, and I will work with members of the Judiciary Committee to conduct thorough oversight of the Department of Justice in order to make sure the Department is being run independently and free from political influence.

On paper, I don't think anyone would doubt Judge Garland is a good pick to lead the Department of Justice.

His credentials are excellent, and he has a distinguished career of public service, including all of those long years he has been on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. Of all the possibilities to be President Biden's Attorney General, it is hard to come up with a better pick.

The top law enforcement officer of the United States must be committed to enforcing the rule of law, and he made it very clear that that is what he was going to do. As our former colleague John Ashcroft said—and he was Attorney General, you know, early in the George W. Bush administration—the Department of Justice is the only Cabinet Agency whose name is an ideal. It is not the Department of Law Enforcement but the Department of Justice. Justice is equality under the law. There is one law for all Americans regardless of race, color, creed, or political affiliation.

It is our founding principle that all people are created equal. My hope is that Judge Garland agrees with that principle, and he does, but he has got to be careful to make sure the Justice Department runs accordingly.

That is not how it has always been, however. And I don't want to say that is how it has always been under just Democrat Presidents; it probably has been that way under Republican Presidents too. But I don't think it is how it was run more recently during the Obama years.

Here is what I don't want to see Judge Garland do—and all of my colleagues at the time heard this: The Attorney General then, Eric Holder, famously said that he was a ''wingman'' to the President. I don't want an Attorney General who takes tarmac meetings with President Clinton while she is investigating his wife. I don't want consent decrees that federalize law enforcement and cause murder rates to soar. I don't want the Civil Rights Division trying to stop school choice in Louisiana. I don't want a return to catch and release. I don't want Operation Choke Point, where the Department of Justice decides that gun stores don't get access to banking services.

I am concerned about the Justice Department's direction before Judge Garland is even confirmed. These are some of the directions. They changed litigation positions on a number of high-profile cases in court, including on immigration, affirmative action, ObamaCare, and other issues.

This is what a very famous Solicitor General, Paul Clement, said: ''It has been the long-term position of the Justice Department to defend the constitutionality of statutes whenever reasonable arguments can be made.''

It appears that our new President and his administration are going to flout that tradition. I just stated how Paul Clement felt about it. I hope that Judge Garland brings that point of view in line and preserves the credibility of the Justice Department.

I hope he also preserves his credibility with the Durham investigation. During the Trump administration, I supported the Mueller investigation. I even supported legislation to protect his investigation in 2018 when it looked like President Trump might fire him. That bill got out of the committee that I chaired at that time.

In 2019, when Bill Barr was before the Judiciary Committee, he was required to commit to not interfere with the Mueller investigation. And I thought that was appropriate.

Now we have another special counsel investigation, this one run by John Durham, a respected career prosecutor who is investigating the Crossfire Hurricane investigation, in which members of the Obama administration spied on and prosecuted members of the Trump campaign.

As a Republican who supported Mueller, I think it is obvious that Judge Garland should have made that same commitment at the hearing about Durham that Bill Barr made about Mueller when he was before the same committee for confirmation. Judge Garland was given multiple opportunities to do so during his hearing and had written questions for the record, but every time he declined to do so unequivocally. He has implied that he won't interfere with the Durham investigation, and I take him at his word. But it would have been better if he had been very clear about it before the committee.

So, further clarification, it is Judge Garland's credibility that is on the line. If Durham is fired for anything other than cause, we will know why Judge Garland refused to give us a commitment like Barr gave us a commitment when we asked for it.

Lastly, I want to make a point about how Judge Garland's nomination went through the Judiciary Committee. Republicans called two witnesses, two of whom supported Judge Garland's confirmation. Republicans also decided not to do the usual holdover of one week of Judge Garland's nomination, allowing him to be reported to the floor a week early. Judge Garland also received bipartisan support in the committee.

It happens that none of these courtesies were extended to either of President Trump's nominees to be Attorney General, one of whom was a colleague of ours here in the Senate and one of whom had already held the job before.

I say all of this to make a point more to the media than to my colleagues because the media seemingly refuses to cover these points of bipartisanship that we didn't get from the Democrats in the previous administration. After the last 4 years of unprecedented obstruction of nominees, I think Republicans would have been justified to make this confirmation a drawn-out process. But we did not do that.

I don't plan on opposing nominees just because of the person who nominated them like many of my colleagues, unfortunately, did in the last 4 years.

So even though I still have some concerns, I believe Judge Garland is a good

person, particularly a good person for this job, to lead the Department of Justice. So I will vote for his confirmation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it doesn't seem like that long ago—it wasn't; it was only January 20 of this year—that we heard President Biden talk about healing the divisions in our country and promoting unity. He promised to restore respectful, bipartisan communication and cooperation. He spoke eloquently, saying:

Without unity there is no peace, only bitterness and fury.

No progress, only exhausting outrage.

No nation, only a state of chaos.

It really was a fine speech. But here we are, 7 weeks into the Biden administration with a lot of bitterness and fury and outrage over the President's first big, broken promise. On Saturday afternoon, following an all-night voting marathon, our Democratic colleagues passed, by themselves, their so-called COVID–19 relief bill.

Sadly, the lack of bipartisan support was not a surprise. After all, our Democratic colleagues decided to abuse the reconciliation process for this very reason. They wanted to pass a bill they knew would not generate any support among Republicans because it really is a Trojan horse for their liberal wish list. And the only way they could make that happen would be to exclude Republicans, turn down offers of bipartisanship, as the President did when 10 Republicans visited him at the White House just a few weeks ago and decided to go it alone, which is what our Democratic colleagues did.

Since Republicans had no say in the drafting of the bill and because our Democratic friends chose to skip the normal committee consideration, our only opportunity to make any changes to the bill came through the amendment process on the floor. From roughly 11 a.m. on Friday until 12:30 p.m. on Saturday, the Senate voted on more than 30 amendments, largely from folks on our side of the aisle, almost all of which were rejected in a party-line vote.

Outside of Washington, DC, not many people stay up for 24 hours straight to watch Congress vote on budget amendments, so I think it is important that we recap what the American people missed while they were sleeping.

The first amendment vote last Friday was a good barometer of what was happening on the other side of the aisle. The first vote, teed up by the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator SANDERS, would have more than doubled the minimum wage at $15 an hour. The Congressional Budget Office said that this would kill 1.4 million jobs, and then the Senate Parliamentarian said that this was an improper use of the budget reconciliation process.

But our Democratic colleagues wanted to take this shot anyway, so they voted to waive a budget point of order, but it did not go well. Eight Democrats voted alongside all Republicans to prevent this abuse of the budget reconciliation process and prevent this job-killing minimum wage mandate from becoming part of this bill.

As it turns out, there is bipartisan opposition to killing jobs at a time when our economy is already on a fragile footing. Who would have thought otherwise?

And once Senators cast their votes, our Democratic friends held the vote open for a recordbreaking 12 hours as they tried to whip their caucus into shape on the most critical amendment, which was next in line.

I am not one to tell our friends across the aisle how to do their job, but normally, when you have a vote, you know ahead of time how that vote is going to come out. That is just legislation 101. But when you are trying to rush, at warp speed, a nearly $2 trillion wish list to the President's desk, I guess you don't have the time to do things the right way, and you certainly don't have an interest in getting them done in a bipartisan fashion.

But on the rest of the votes we held, over and over again, our Democratic colleagues held together and blocked commonsense amendments offered by this side of the aisle. For example, there were amendments to stop blue States from receiving more than their fair share of the State and local funding. The Democratic proposal includes a jaw-dropping $350 billion for State and local aid—more than double what was spent in the CARES Act last March when the economic picture was far more dire.

Unlike the CARES Act funding that was distributed based on population, this proposal separated the funds into two pots of money—one to be distributed based on a population formula while the second is based on the unemployment rate.

Senator GRAHAM from South Carolina offered an amendment which would have required this funding to follow the same formula that we did in March, in a bipartisan way, rather than this new formula that favors blue States.

Since the primary argument for the bill was that States needed this funding because of lost tax revenues, it made sense that the largest population States should receive the most funding, a per capita formula. This would eliminate a big windfall for blue States that have largely kept their economies on ice and shuttered, even as COVID–19 cases decreased.

Then there was an amendment from the Senator from Utah, Senator ROMNEY, which would have ensured State and local funding was only going to those States that actually need it. What a concept. His amendment would require States to apply for aid through the Treasury Department. They could then receive funds to help recover pandemic-related expenses, revenue losses, or unexpected Medicaid costs. But, of course, in a party-line vote, our Democratic colleagues blocked that amendment as well.

And it is not just State and local funding that folks on my side of the aisle wanted us to use more responsibly. I offered an amendment to improve the quality of care for unaccompanied migrant children who arrived along the U.S.-Mexico border. We know that these children are especially vulnerable and their health and safety should have been addressed in this COVID package.

Well, President Biden's border crisis is shaping up to be one of epic proportions. Border agents reportedly detained nearly 100,000 migrants along the southern border last month alone. That marks the highest total for the month of February since 2006. The numbers have now climbed so high that the administration is allowing facilities to house children to operate at 100 percent capacity, when our kids aren't even going back to school in many school districts around the country because of concerns for their safety. Forget that. The Biden administration is now allowing these facilities that house children to operate at 100 percent despite the COVID risk.

An amendment I offered would redirect unnecessary funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities and instead send it to the Office of Refugee Resettlement. This office is part of the Department of Health and Human Services, and this extra funding would help keep these children safe and healthy. Unfortunately, for these children, many of whom have endured long and dangerous journeys in the hands of human smugglers, our Democratic colleagues chose the National Endowment for the Humanities instead of these children in distress.

Well, the list of rejected amendments goes on and on.

Senator SCOTT of South Carolina offered an amendment to ensure States weren't fudging on the nursing home death count totals, like the disastrous situation developing in New York that we are just now learning about the magnitude of nursing home deaths that were covered up by the Cuomo administration. This amendment would have required States to certify the accuracy of COVID–19 deaths in nursing homes in order to assess funding for nursing home facility strike teams. Once again, a party-line vote blocked that amendment.

One of the highlights of this long and drawn-out process, which just left me scratching my head, was an amendment from Senator CASSIDY, the Senator from Louisiana, that would have prevented stimulus checks being sent

to people in prison and one from Senator CRUZ, my colleague from Texas, that would have stopped payments from going to people who are not even legally present in the United States. Both amendments were blocked in a party-line vote by Democrats.

Our colleague from Florida, Senator RUBIO, offered an amendment to incentivize a safe return to in-person learning at our Nation's schools. The crux of it was simple: If schools wanted Federal funding, they should actually educate children in the classroom and do so safely, according to CDC guidelines; otherwise, why do they need this huge amount of extra money if they are not actually going to use it to educate our children? Well, our Democratic colleagues blocked that amendment too.

While Americans were sleeping, Senate Democrats stood in the way of numerous commonsense reforms to this behemoth of a partisan bill. They have proven, once again, this so-called COVID–19 relief bill has next to nothing to do with what is best for the country and everything to do with what is best for their liberal partisan agenda.

This bill includes a long list of liberal priorities that are completely unrelated to the crisis at hand. I think roughly 90 percent of it is unrelated to COVID–19. Blank checks for mismanaged union pension funds, funding for climate justice—whatever that is—backdoor money for Planned Parenthood, an exclusive paid leave program for bureaucrats, those are just some of the greatest hits in the vote-arama.

Even the portions of the bill that are related to the pandemic are completely out of proportion. The legislation provides $130 billion for schools when tens of billions of dollars that we have already appropriated last December remain to be spent.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, only $6.4 billion will be distributed through September of this year. The remaining $122 billion would trickle out the door through not just 2021 but through 2028.

Of course, there is the blue State bailout. Despite the fact that tax revenues have largely rebounded and many States are still sitting on piles of cash from previous COVID–19 relief bills, our Democratic friends want to send another $350 billion to State and local governments but not just on an equitable population-based formula. They rigged the formula to make sure blue States reap the biggest cash benefits.

We know this wasn't the only path forward. We worked, time and time again, this last year on five different occasions to show we can unite to provide COVID–19 relief to the American people.

We could have built on that record this year, which after listening to President Biden's inaugural speech, I had hoped we might do. The first legislation to pass during the Biden administration could have been a bipartisan pandemic relief bill with overwhelming support. We wouldn't have needed to go through the vote-arama or the abuse of the budget reconciliation process. We could have had a bill that supported the hardest hit families, got kids back at school, and helped expedite vaccination.

But those types of policies, obviously, weren't top of mind for our Democratic friends. They wanted to have a payday for the most radical element of their party at an absurdly high pricetag, which our children and grandchildren are going to be saddled with.

They assembled a laundry list of unrelated wasteful and downright partisan provisions and rejected even the most commonsense amendments offered by this side of the aisle.

Sadly, this legislation passed the House without a single Republican vote. It passed the Senate without a single Republican vote. And now, our Democratic friends are on track to write a $2 trillion check completely funded by deficit spending without even a trace of bipartisanship.

They don't have a figleaf to hide behind. This was a partisan bill intentionally. Either the President sold snake oil on Inauguration Day or he has already caved into the most radical elements of his own political party. Either way, it is bad news for the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, today I am going to talk about the growing crisis on our southern border and how we need urgent action to address the degrading situation there, but before I begin, I want to say a quick word about the reconciliation bill we passed last week.

The massive $1.9 trillion bill was not COVID–19 relief; it was liberal relief. Everybody and everyone needs to understand what this was. It was not a rescue plan. It was a heist of taxpayers' money. We don't have $1.9 trillion to be spending. When we have to borrow this much money, we are digging our country deeper into debt. And with this massive spending bill, we are borrowing against our grandkids' future and are going to owe more and more countries like China.

To keep up, the money supply will have to increase at such a rapid rate, it could potentially spark inflation. That means we could see the value of Americans' hard-earned dollars plummet.

To further underscore that point, that means your money doesn't go as far. For the items you buy, it is very expensive. All of this bogs down our economy and hinders future growth.

What is more, this entire sham of a process was partisan. It was not about helping Americans, businesses, and communities recover from the pandemic. That much is clear because only 9 percent of the bill is going to COVID and health-related pressures and less than 1 percent is going to vaccines. The remaining 90 percent went to progressive wish list items for bailouts for poorly run States.

Instead of ramming through non-COVID-related spending, Democrats should have worked together with Republicans as a team to pass a bipartisan bill that actually makes lives better as we recover from this pandemic.

We share a goal of helping the American people, but the bill that was ultimately put forward failed to do just that. It is a shame. This is not how our country should be run.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, we started to see headlines bubbling up about the building crisis at the southern border that is threatening to boil over. Americans back home are paying attention. They are watching what is going on and seeing how it is getting worse by the day. The saddest thing is that this was predictable and preventable.

Protecting our border and cutting down illegal immigration matters to the people of Alabama and the rest of the country. Alabamians are law-abiding people. We play by the rules, and we expect others to follow them too. When people break the rules, they have to face the consequences, plain and simple. That is how our country should operate, by law and order.

Enforcing the laws on our books cannot be an option. Sadly, this type of selected enforcement is exactly what President Biden has done during his short time in office. President Biden has put forward an immigration proposal that would completely upend our existing immigration policy and give out American citizenship like it is candy.

But before that, he made sure to lay the groundwork with Executive orders. President Biden quickly reversed many of President Trump's most successful border control policies with the stroke of his pen. And his Secretary of Homeland Security, whose Department oversees immigration policy and border security, has made it clear he is not interested in enforcing existing laws. We have seen the dangerous effects of President Biden's policies already, and it has barely been 2 months.

But we have also seen some mixed messaging. The same day President Biden issued an order that said building a border wall is a ''waste of money that diverts attention from genuine threats to our homeland security,'' his Department of Homeland Security released official data that tells otherwise. In January 2021, U.S. Customs and Border Patrol Protection encountered approximately 78,000 illegal immigrants, a 6-percent increase from December 2020. Within that number, roughly, 64,800 were single adults, a 157-percent increase compared to January of last year. For unaccompanied children, there has been a 91-percent increase in apprehensions compared to last January.

The data shows the number of illegal immigrants trying to cross the southern border is going up during a month when, historically, apprehensions are low. In fact, the staggering number of people arrested crossing the border illegally this January is the most any January has seen in more than a decade.

In March 2020, President Trump invoked title 42 along the southern border. That means that, in the interest of public health, only essential travelers are permitted to enter the United States. President Biden has maintained title 42 for this purpose, with one exception: Unaccompanied children can still come in.

News outlets reported that border officials told President Biden they ''anticipate 117,000 children will arrive at the U.S.-Mexico border without a parent or guardian in 2021.'' Why? Because President Biden has given them a free pass to enter the United States. This number is on pace to exceed the all-time record that was set under the Obama administration by 45 percent.

The greater problem here is that the administration doesn't have enough space to put these children. President Biden was recently briefed on a plan to add 20,000 more beds to meet the needs. Yet, yesterday, news reports showed a record number of unaccompanied children—more than 3,200—are in Border Patrol's custody. Almost half of these children have been held beyond the 3-day legal limit. The facilities are overwhelmed and bursting at the seams. Folks in the Southwest are already referring to this increase as the ''Biden effect.''

Now Secretary of Homeland Security Mayorkas has the gall to blame the current border crisis on the Trump administration. So why, then, does the Secretary think that new records are being set during the typical off months of January and February? I will tell you why. It is a direct result of President Biden ditching border security measures and sending a ''come one, come all'' signal. President Biden decided to message to the world that our border is open. We shouldn't be surprised that people showed up. We all saw this coming, and we warned that reversing President Trump's policies would lead to national security and humanitarian crises.

On top of all of this, President Biden's administration is subjecting American citizens to more stringent standards to enter our country than it is with illegal immigrants. On January 26, the CDC began requiring anyone flying to the United States, including American citizens, to provide evidence of a negative COVID test taken within 3 days of their flight. That makes sense. Migrants crossing our border are not subject to the same requirement.

I sent a letter to Secretary Mayorkas about this issue, and I have not yet received a response, but media reports out of Texas seem to have already found the answer. As FoxNews.com reported, more than 100 illegal immigrants released by Border Patrol agents in Brownsville, TX, in the last few weeks have tested positive for the coronavirus. So these folks can cross the border illegally and get tested by the city at the bus stop where the agents let them off, but the city has no authority to prevent them from traveling elsewhere even if they test positive for COVID. How does that fit into President Biden's plan to bring our country out of this pandemic? American citizens have to prove they have negative tests to enter the country, but illegal immigrants do not.

At a time when the virus is on the retreat, thanks in large part to the vaccine developed by President Trump's Operation Warp Speed, we cannot now afford to allow thousands and thousands of illegal immigrants into the country, especially without screening them for COVID. It is not only a reckless security policy; it is a reckless health policy. We just spent $1.9 trillion because that is supposedly what the country needs to help get us past this pandemic. Yet we are going to let people into the country, unchecked, to potentially spread the virus.

President Biden's policies at the border are reckless. The American people can see it for themselves, and the data prove how bad the situation has become in such a quick timeframe.

We can and should take positive, proactive, concrete steps to secure our border and strengthen our national security. There are two big items to address right away.

No. 1, we should maintain the Migrant Protection Protocols Program. This system was put in place during the Trump administration to process migrant asylum claims at the border without releasing people into the United States. It requires that migrants remain in Mexico pending the completion of their cases. It was successful—hugely successful. The number of apprehensions along the border went down when people realized they couldn't just come walking into the United States. It was exactly the kind of message we want to send: Our borders are not wide open. You must follow the rules. You must get in line.

Since taking office, President Biden has dismantled the program and is bringing in nearly 30,000 people who are waiting in Mexico.

No. 2, we should continue to build the wall. My constituents expect me to hammer this point home every day. A strong wall will help prevent illegal migrants from crossing over our border between ports of entry to avoid law enforcement.

Just recently, there were reports of a car crash in California that left 13 illegal migrants dead who were stuffed and stacked in the back of a truck. Border Patrol officers believe these migrants entered through a ''dilapidated border fence'' in Southern California. Weaknesses in our border allow human trafficking efforts like this to continue. This has to stop. Without needed fixes, President Biden offers false hope, and that is a dangerous signal for desperate people.

Today, I am only mentioning two ways to address the border surge. There are plenty more, and I plan to advocate for them in the weeks and months to come because, unlike this President and his administration, I am fighting for the safety and security of the American people.

I understand our immigration system is not perfect, and I understand President Biden has a different view on what our immigration system should look like, and he has made no secret about where he stands. But any immigration reform proposed must include policies that strengthen our lawful immigration system and protect our Nation's borders. So far, President Biden's policies do neither.

I can respect different visions for the future even though I may strongly disagree with them, but what I and the people of Alabama will not stand for is a refusal to enforce the laws of today. It puts our country at risk and encourages migrants to seek dangerous paths to enter our country instead of the legal paths our laws provide. Allowing illegal immigration to go unchecked fundamentally undermines the rule of law in this country. Without laws and without borders where those laws apply, a sovereign nation ceases to exist.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 12, MARCIA LOUISE FUDGE, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Charles E. Schumer, Sherrod Brown, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Patty Murray, Chris Van Hollen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Brian Schatz, Cory A. Booker, Amy Klobuchar, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Tim Kaine, Tammy Baldwin.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of MARCIA LOUISE FUDGE, of Ohio, to be

Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 111 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Portman
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Reed
Blunt	Inhofe	Romney
Booker	Johnson	Rosen
Braun	Kaine	Rounds
Brown	Kelly	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Capito	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Scott (SC)
Carper	Luján	Shaheen
Casey	Manchin	Sinema
Collins	Markey	Smith
Coons	Marshall	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Sullivan
Duckworth	Menendez	Tester
Durbin	Merkley	Van Hollen
Feinstein	Moran	Warner
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Warnock
Graham	Murphy	Warren
Grassley	Murray	Whitehouse
Hassan	Ossoff	Wyden
Heinrich	Padilla	Young

NAYS—30

Barrasso	Ernst	Risch
Blackburn	Fischer	Rubio
Boozman	Hagerty	Sasse
Burr	Hawley	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Lummis	Tuberville
Daines	Paul	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Cramer	S0634

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The yeas are 69, the nays are 30.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 27, Merrick Brian Garland, of Maryland, to be Attorney General.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Patty Murray, Chris Van Hollen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Brian Schatz, Cory A. Booker, Debbie Stabenow, Amy Klobuchar, Jon Ossoff, Alex Padilla, Benjamin L. Cardin, Sherrod Brown, Angus S. King, Jr., Tim Kaine.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Merrick Brian Garland, of Maryland, to be Attorney General, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 70, nays 29, as follows;

[Rollcall Vote No. 112 Ex.]

YEAS—70

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Portman
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blunt	Hirono	Romney
Booker	Inhofe	Rosen
Brown	Johnson	Rounds
Burr	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Lankford	Sinema
Casey	Leahy	Smith
Cassidy	Luján	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Thune
Cornyn	McConnell	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Warnock
Ernst	Murkowski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Graham	Ossoff	
Grassley	Padilla	

NAYS—29

Barrasso	Hawley	Sasse
Blackburn	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Braun	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Toomey
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Risch	Young
Hagerty	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—1

Cramer	S0634

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). On this vote, the yeas are 70, the nays are 29.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Merrick Brian Garland, of Maryland, to be Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL D. ROACH

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate and honor the retirement of one of my senior staff members and friend who has served in my home State of Idaho for the last 12 years as the State director of natural resources, Michael ''Mike'' D. Roach.

After retiring from the banking industry, Mike came to my staff after my first election to the U.S. Senate in 2009 as the regional director of my Lewiston office. However, with a bachelor's degree in wildlife-fisheries resources from the University of Idaho, I knew he was a perfect fit for the State director of natural resources position stationed in my Boise office. Shortly after starting in Lewiston, Mike helped to find his replacement in north Idaho and moved to southwestern Idaho to lead my State offices in natural resources.

Mike was born in Twin Falls and grew up in southwestern Idaho where his father worked in the cattle and banking industry. This afforded him the opportunity to work and associate with the cattle and sheep industry in Idaho and develop a deep understanding of the history, traditions, and issues of Idaho. While in college at the U of I, he worked for Idaho Fish and Game and served as a Wildlife and Range Sciences Guidance Council member for the U of I's College of Forestry. He was also appointed to the district advisory council for the Bureau of Land Management—Boise District by former Secretary of the Interior Manuel Lujan. With his deep roots in Idaho, he was the perfect ambassador to the diverse natural resource and conservation groups of the State like the Idaho Cattle Association, Idaho Farm Bureau, Trout Unlimited, and the Nature Conservancy.

During his 12 years of service as my natural resources director, he advised and guided my office through many complicated issues like the sage grouse recovery plan, Idaho Roadless Rule implementation, salmon and steelhead management plans, Columbia River Treaty, Good Neighbor Authority, and many other resource issues. Due to his experience and knowledge, in 2015, the University of Idaho College of Natural Resources awarded Mike Roach the Alumni Award, recognizing his career achievements in natural resources.

Another significant milestone came to pass while serving on staff; he became engaged and married to Cally Grindstaff in 2019. They now make their home in Fairfield, ID.

It is always difficult to lose a trusted staff member of Mike's caliber, but I want to wish him and Cally nothing but best wishes in their future endeavors and look forward to our continued friendship in the years ahead.

Congratulations and thank you for your outstanding service to my staff and the citizens of Idaho.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND KEVIN COX

● Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, on March 15, 2021, having served the Louisiana District United Pentecostal Church in the role of district secretary, 1998–2005, and district superintendent, 2005–Present, Reverend Kevin Cox will retire from his current role, though remaining active in ministry.

Kevin was born in St. Paul, MN—spent his early years in Missouri—before moving to Bogalusa in 1974, when his father became pastor there. He is a graduate of Southeastern Louisiana University, where he earned a BS in accounting. In addition to his ministerial license, he holds CPA credentials. He married the love of his life, Delisa, in 1979. She passed away in the spring of 2012. Kevin and Delisa served as pastor in Wewahitchka, FL, from 1980–1986 before returning to Bogalusa where they joined Kevin's parents and assumed the pastorate of First Pentecostal Church of Bogalusa for 12 years. With his election as district secretary, the Cox Family—Kevin and Delisa, along with their two sons, Andrew and Stephen—relocated to the Campground in Tioga.

As district superintendent, in addition to being responsible for the oversight of the ministers and churches of Louisiana, Reverend Cox has continued to coordinate the Louisiana United Pentecostal Camp Meeting. This annual Camp Meeting event has convened for over 100 years here in Louisiana and consists of a week of worship, fellowship, and fun. The Bible speaks of laying up crowns in heaven as a reward for good works on earth. I hope it is many years before Kevin Cox ascends to heaven. When he does, he will have many crowns.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Office laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1280. An act to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. LEE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 618. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend the deduction for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 619. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make the murder of a Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer a crime punishable by life in prison or death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 620. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, and the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission to conduct studies and report to Congress on actions taken to expand access to telehealth services under the Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP programs during the COVID–19 emergency; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. SASSE):

S. 621. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to add membership in a significant transnational criminal organization to the list of grounds of inadmissibility and to prohibit the provision of material support or resources to such organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the qualifying advanced energy project credit; to the Committee on Finance .

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 623. A bill to make daylight saving time permanent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 624. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to increase certain royalty rates, minimum bid amounts, and rental rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 625. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the enrollment fee requirement for TRICARE Select for members of the Armed Forces who retired before January 1, 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 626. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections against the importation, and transport between States, of injurious species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SMITH, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. KING):

S. 627. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 628. A bill to increase access to agency guidance documents; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 629. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to require Federal agencies to submit to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on rules that are revoked, suspended, replaced, amended, or otherwise made ineffective; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 630. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include individuals receiving Social Security Disability Insurance benefits under the work opportunity credit, increase the work opportunity credit for vocational rehabilitation referrals, qualified SSI recipients, and qualified SSDI recipients, expand the disabled access credit, and enhance the deduction for expenditures to remove architectural and transportation barriers to the handicapped and elderly; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 631. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, to conduct or support research on the mental health consequences of SARS–CoV–2 or COVID–19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COONS, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 632. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, to require the voluntary collection of demographic information for patent inventors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 633. A bill to transfer antitrust enforcement functions from the Federal Trade Commission to the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 634. A bill to support and expand civic engagement and political leadership of adolescent girls around the world, and other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 635. A bill to reauthorize The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor and the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 636. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to submit to Congress an annual report on projects that are over budget and behind schedule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 637. A bill to forestall the loss of research talent by establishing a temporary early career research fellowship program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 638. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to include a payment and performance security requirement for certain infrastructure financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 639. A bill to establish a National Technical Assistance Center on Grandfamilies and Kinship Families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 640. A bill to provide grants to support continuing education in election administration or cybersecurity for election officials and employees; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 641. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to consider certain factors in issuing certificates of public convenience and necessity under that Act, to modify the requirements for the right to exercise eminent domain in construction of pipelines under that Act, to provide that the right of eminent domain may not be exercised under that Act for projects for the exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 642. A bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 643. A bill to reduce child poverty in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 644. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore State authority to waive for certain facilities the 35-mile rule for designating critical access hospitals under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 645. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to levy a fee on methane emissions from oil and natural gas facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 646. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for 12-month continuous enrollment under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 647. A bill to improve the process for awarding grants under certain programs of the Department of Agriculture to certain counties in which the majority of land is owned or managed by the Federal Government and to other units of local government and Tribal governments in those counties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 648. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make a technical correction to the water rights settlement for Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 649. A bill to improve the process for awarding grants under certain programs of the Department of Transportation to certain counties in which the majority of land is owned or managed by the Federal Government and to other units of local government and Tribal governments in those counties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 650. A bill to enable the payment of certain officers and employees of the United States whose employment is authorized pursuant to a grant of deferred action, deferred enforced departure, or temporary protected status; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 651. A bill to amend SAFETEA–LU to improve the Intelligent Transportation System Program Advisory Committee, to require information and resources for the development of local smart communities, to help establish a 21st century transportation workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. BURR, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 652. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish the Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) Challenge Grant Program to promote technological innovation in our Nation's communities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 97. A resolution calling on the Government of Ethiopia, the Tigray People's Liberation Front, and other belligerents to cease all hostilities, protect human rights, allow unfettered humanitarian access, and cooperate with independent investigations of credible atrocity allegations pertaining to the conflict in the Tigray Region of Ethiopia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 98. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 99. A resolution observing the 10th anniversary of the uprising in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 100. A resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 101. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that, while the United States finds value and usefulness in the World Trade Organization in fulfilling the needs of the United States and other free and open economies in the 21st century, significant reforms at the World Trade Organization are needed and the United States must therefore continue to demonstrate leadership to achieve those reforms; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 44

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 44, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit kindergarten through grade 12 educational expenses to be paid from a 529 account.

S. 140

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 140, a bill to improve data collection and monitoring of the Great Lakes, oceans, bays, estuaries, and coasts, and for other purposes.

S. 258

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 258, a bill to help small businesses access capital and create jobs by reauthorizing the successful State Small Business Credit Initiative.

S. 271

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of

S. 271, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable.

S. 278

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 278, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide assistance for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and socially disadvantaged groups, and for other purposes.

S. 307

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 307, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make grants for travel promotion, and for other purposes.

S. 333

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 333, a bill to amend title XI and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide funding for State strike teams, technical assistance, and infection control for resident and worker safety in skilled nursing facilities and nursing facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 374

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 374, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the submission by issuers of data relating to diversity, and for other purposes.

S. 437

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 437, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety rule for free-standing clothing storage units to protect children from tip-over related death or injury, and for other purposes.

S. 456

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 456, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to extend the authority for Federal contractors to reimburse employees unable to perform work due to the COVID–19 pandemic from March 31, 2021, to September 30, 2021.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) were added as cosponsors of S. 488, a bill to provide for congressional review of actions to terminate or waive sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.

S. 519

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 519, a bill to review the use of election security grants in the 2020 presidential election and to prohibit future election security grants to States with unconstitutional election procedures.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule.

S. 530

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 530, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes.

S. 535

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to authorize the location of a memorial on the National Mall to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces that served on active duty in support of the Global War on Terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 560

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 560, a bill to improve coverage of maternal oral health care, and for other purposes.

S. 583

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 583, a bill to promote innovative acquisition techniques and procurement strategies, and for other purposes.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 586, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to combat the opioid crisis by promoting access to non-opioid treatments in the hospital outpatient setting.

S. 591

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 591, a bill to prohibit firearms dealers from selling a firearm prior to the completion of a background check.

S. RES. 13

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 13, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the International Olympic Committee should rebid the 2022 Winter Olympic Games to be hosted by a country that recognizes and respects human rights.

S. RES. 96

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 96, a resolution designating March 8 through March 14, 2021, as ''Women of the Aviation Workforce Week'' .

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 617

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Death Tax Repeal Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF ESTATE AND GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAXES.

(a) ESTATE TAX REPEAL.—Subchapter C of chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 2210. TERMINATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this chapter shall not apply to the estates of decedents dying on or after the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2021.

''(b) CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS FROM QUALIFIED DOMESTIC TRUSTS.—In applying section 2056A with respect to the surviving spouse of a decedent dying before the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2021—

''(1) section 2056A(b)(1)(A) shall not apply to distributions made after the 10-year period beginning on such date, and

''(2) section 2056A(b)(1)(B) shall not apply on or after such date.''.

(b) GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAX REPEAL.—Subchapter G of chapter 13 of subtitle B of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 2664. TERMINATION.

''This chapter shall not apply to generation-skipping transfers on or after the date of the enactment of the Death Tax Repeal Act of 2021.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subchapter C of chapter 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 2210. Termination.''.

(2) The table of sections for subchapter G of chapter 13 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 2664. Termination.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to the estates of decedents dying, and generation-skipping transfers, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. MODIFICATIONS OF GIFT TAX.

(a) COMPUTATION OF GIFT TAX.—Subsection (a) of section 2502 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) COMPUTATION OF TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by section 2501 for each calendar year shall be an amount equal to the excess of—

''(A) a tentative tax, computed under paragraph (2), on the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for such calendar year and for each of the preceding calendar periods, over

''(B) a tentative tax, computed under paragraph (2), on the aggregate sum of the taxable gifts for each of the preceding calendar periods.

''(2) RATE SCHEDULE.—

''If the amount with respect to which the tentative tax to be computed is:	**The tentative tax is:**
Not over $10,000	18% of such amount.
Over $10,000 but not over $20,000	$1,800, plus 20% of the excess over $10,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $40,000	$3,800, plus 22% of the excess over $20,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $60,000	$8,200, plus 24% of the excess over $40,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $80,000	$13,000, plus 26% of the excess over $60,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $100,000	$18,200, plus 28% of the excess over $80,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	$23,800, plus 30% of the excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $250,000	$38,800, plus 32% of the excess over $150,000.
Over $250,000 but not over $500,000	$70,800, plus 34% of the excess over $250,000.
Over $500,000	$155,800, plus 35% of the excess over $500,000.''.

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—Section 2511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS IN TRUST.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and except as provided in regulations, a transfer in trust shall be treated as a taxable gift under section 2503, unless the trust is treated as wholly owned by the donor or the donor's spouse under subpart E of part I of subchapter J of chapter 1.''.

(c) LIFETIME GIFT EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 2505(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) the amount of the tentative tax which would be determined under the rate schedule set forth in section 2502(a)(2) if the amount with respect to which such tentative tax is to be computed were $10,000,000, reduced by''.

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 2505 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any calendar year after 2011, the dollar amount in subsection (a)(1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year by substituting 'calendar year 2010' for 'calendar year 2016' in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of $10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $10,000.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 2505(a) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(2) The heading for section 2505 of such Code is amended by striking ''**UNIFIED**''.

(3) The item in the table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 12 of such Code relating to section 2505 is amended to read as follows:

''Sec. 2505. Credit against gift tax.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to gifts made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying sections 1015(d), 2502, and 2505 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the calendar year in which this Act is enacted shall be treated as 2 separate calendar years one of which ends on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act and the other of which begins on such date of enactment.

(2) APPLICATION OF SECTION 2504(b).—For purposes of applying section 2504(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the calendar year in which this Act is enacted shall be treated as one preceding calendar period.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COONS, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 632. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, to require the voluntary collection of demographic information for patent inventors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Inventor Diversity for Economic Advancement Act of 2021. I thank my colleague from North Carolina, Senator TILLIS, for working with me on this important piece of legislation, which serves as a first step to closing the diversity gap in our patent system by collecting demographic data on patent applicants.

Women and racial minorities have made some of the most significant inventions in this Nation's history. The $75 billion home security industry grew from an initial home security system invented by Marie Van Brittan Brown. The computer would never have become the multimedia device it is today without the microcomputer system invented by Mark Dean. The genetic revolution would still be science fiction if not for the CRISPR gene-editing tool discovered by Jennifer Doudna—raised on Hawaii's Big Island.

We should celebrate these inventors and the many others like them who have contributed to innovation in this Nation. But we must also recognize the hard truth that women, racial minorities, and many other groups are greatly underrepresented in the U.S. patent system.

The Patent and Trademark Office's recent report on women inventors shines a spotlight on one part of this problem. The PTO found that only 22 percent of U.S. patents list a woman as an inventor and that women make up only 13 percent of all inventors. This is true even though women held 43 percent of all full-time jobs in 2016 and 28 percent of STEM jobs in 2015.

Other reports highlight racial patent gaps. For example, a report by the Institute for Women's Policy Research found that the percentage of African American and Hispanic college graduates who hold patents is approximately half that of their white counterparts.

Closing these gaps would turbocharge our economy. According to a study by Michigan State University Professor Lisa Cook, including more women and African Americans in the ''initial stage of the process of innovation'' could increase GDP by as much as $640 billion.

Another study by the National Bureau of Economic Research found that eliminating the patent gap for women with science and engineering degrees alone would increase GDP by over $500 billion.

It's simply good policy and good business to want to fully integrate people of all types into our innovation economy. But if we have any hope of closing the various patent gaps, we must first get a firm grasp on the scope of the problem.

Studies of the demographic makeup of patentees, like the ones I described, are few and far between. The reason is a simple one. A lack of data. The PTO does not collect any data on applicants beyond their first and last names and city, State, and country of residence. As a result, those wishing to study patent gaps between different demographic groups are forced to guess the gender of an applicant based on his or her name, determine the race of an applicant by cross-referencing census data, or explore a number of other options that are time-consuming, unreliable, or both.

The IDEA Act solves this problem. It would require the PTO to collect demographic data—including gender, race, and military or veteran status—from patent applicants on a voluntary basis. It would further require the PTO to issue reports on the data collected and, perhaps more importantly, make the data available to the public with appropriate protections for personally identifiable information. Outside researchers could therefore conduct their own analyses and offer insights into the various patent gaps in our society.

Let me be clear. Closing the information gap facing researchers alone will not solve the patent gap facing women, racial minorities, and so many others. But it is a critical first step. I therefore encourage my colleagues to support the IDEA Act.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 644. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore State authority to waive for certain facilities the 35-mile rule for designating critical access hospitals under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 644

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Rural Hospital Closure Relief Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. RESTORING STATE AUTHORITY TO WAIVE THE 35–MILE RULE FOR CERTAIN MEDICARE CRITICAL ACCESS HOSPITAL DESIGNATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1820 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i–4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(i)—

(i) in subclause (I), by striking at the end ''or'';

(ii) in subclause (II), by inserting at the end ''or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

''(III) subject to subparagraph (G), is a hospital described in subparagraph (F) and is certified on or after the date of the enactment of the Rural Hospital Closure Relief Act of 2021 by the State as being a necessary provider of health care services to residents in the area;''; and

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

''(F) HOSPITAL DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(i)(III), a hospital described in this subparagraph is a hospital that—

''(i) is a sole community hospital (as defined in section 1886(d)(5)(D)(iii)), a medicare dependent, small rural hospital (as defined in section 1886(d)(5)(G)(iv)), a low-volume hospital that in 2021 receives a payment adjustment under section 1886(d)(12), a subsection (d) hospital (as defined in section 1886(d)(1)(B)) that has fewer than 50 beds, or, subject to the limitation under subparagraph (G)(i)(I), is a facility described in subparagraph (G)(ii);

''(ii) is located in a rural area, as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D);

''(iii)(I) is located—

''(aa) in a county that has a percentage of individuals with income that is below 150 percent of the poverty line that is higher than the national or statewide average in 2020;

''(bb) in a health professional shortage area (as defined in section 332(a)(1)(A) of the Public Health Service Act); or

''(II) has a percentage of inpatient days of individuals entitled to benefits under part A of this title, enrolled under part B of this title, or enrolled under a State plan under title XIX that is higher than the national or statewide average in 2019 or 2020;

''(iv) subject to subparagraph (G)(ii)(II), has attested to the Secretary two consecutive years of negative operating margins preceding the date of certification described in subparagraph (B)(i)(III); and

''(v) submits to the Secretary—

''(I) at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, an attestation outlining the good governance qualifications and strategic plan for multi-year financial solvency of the hospital; and

''(II) not later than 120 days after the date on which the Secretary issues final regulations pursuant to section 2(b) of the Rural Hospital Closure Relief Act of 2021, an application for certification of the facility as a critical access hospital.

''(G) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN DESIGNATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not under subsection (e) certify pursuant to a certification by a State under subparagraph (B)(i)(III)—

''(I) more than a total of 175 facilities as critical access hospitals, of which not more than 20 percent may be facilities described in clause (ii); and

''(II) within any one State, more than 10 facilities as critical access hospitals.

''(ii) FACILITY DESCRIBED.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—A facility described in this clause is a facility that as of the date of enactment of this subparagraph met the criteria for designation as a critical access hospital under subparagraph (B)(i)(I).

''(II) NONAPPLICATION OF CERTAIN CRITERIA.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(i)(III), the criteria described in subparagraph (F)(iv) shall not apply with respect to the designation of a facility described in subclause (I).''; and

(2) in subsection (e), by inserting '', subject to subsection (c)(2)(G),'' after ''The Secretary shall''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue final regulations to carry out this section.

(c) CLARIFICATION REGARDING FACILITIES THAT MEET DISTANCE OR OTHER CERTIFICATION CRITERIA.—Nothing in this section shall affect the application of criteria for designation as a critical access hospital described in subclause (I) or (II) section 1820(c)(2)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i–4(c)(2)(B)(i)).

SEC. 3. CMI TESTING OF NEW RURAL HOSPITAL DELIVERY AND PAYMENT MODEL.

Section 1115A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The models selected under this subparagraph shall include the testing of a new rural hospital delivery and payment model (or models), as described in subsection (h).''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) TESTING OF NEW RURAL HOSPITAL DELIVERY AND PAYMENT MODEL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) TESTING.—The Secretary shall test the implementation of a new rural hospital delivery and payment model (or models) that the Secretary determines would promote financially sustainable ways to ensure patient access to care in rural communities, which may include models under which such hospitals furnish outpatient emergency care services 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for which payment is made under title XVIII based on the amount determined under the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services under section 1833(t), plus a fixed rate for the cost of furnishing the emergency services.

''(B) PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to test a new rural hospital delivery and payment model (or models) described in subparagraph (A), unless Congress enacts legislation that establishes such a payment model (or models) prior to the promulgation of regulations pursuant to this subparagraph.

''(2) TRANSITION.—Effective beginning on the date on which the testing of a new rural hospital delivery and payment model (or models) described in paragraph (1)(A) is implemented under this subsection or such a payment model (or models) is established through the enactment of legislation described in paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall provide a process under which—

''(A) all critical access hospitals may transition to such new model or models under this subsection; and

''(B) any facility that was designated as a critical access hospital pursuant to a certification by a State under section 1820(c)(2)(B)(i)(III) may revert to the prospective payment model (or models) under which the facility received payment under title XVIII prior to being so designated.''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 97—CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF ETHIOPIA, THE TIGRAY PEOPLE'S LIBERATION FRONT, AND OTHER BELLIGERENTS TO CEASE ALL HOSTILITIES, PROTECT HUMAN RIGHTS, ALLOW UNFETTERED HUMANITARIAN ACCESS, AND COOPERATE WITH INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIONS OF CREDIBLE ATROCITY ALLEGATIONS PERTAINING TO THE CONFLICT IN THE TIGRAY REGION OF ETHIOPIA

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 97

Whereas the United States and the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia share an important relationship and more than a century of diplomatic relations;

Whereas Ethiopia is the second most populous country in Africa and plays a key role in advancing security and stability across sub-Saharan Africa, including as a top contributor of uniformed personnel to United Nations peacekeeping missions;

Whereas tensions between Prime Minister Abiy Ahmed's Prosperity Party and the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF), which was part of the ruling coalition in Ethiopia until late 2019, escalated when the TPLF held elections in the Tigray Region of Ethiopia on September 9, 2020, despite the decision by the Federal Government of Ethiopia to postpone general elections due to the COVID–19 pandemic;

Whereas the TPLF rejected the postponement of general elections and considered the extension of the term of the Federal Government to be unconstitutional, and the Federal Government subsequently deemed the Tigray regional elections illegitimate;

Whereas, in the early hours of November 4, 2020, Prime Minister Abiy ordered a military offensive in response to an attack by the TPLF on the Northern Command of the Ethiopian National Defense Forces (ENDF), which evolved into an armed conflict between the ENDF and allied forces on one side and the TPLF on the other side, with thousands of deaths reported;

Whereas the Government of Ethiopia rejected all offers, including one extended by African Union Chairman Cyril Ramaphosa in November 2020, to mediate talks with the TPLF;

Whereas, on November 28, 2020, the Government of Ethiopia claimed victory in the conflict after taking Mekelle, the capital city of the Tigray Region, with Prime Minister Abiy announcing that his forces had ''completed and ceased the military operations'' and would shift focus to rebuilding the region and providing humanitarian assistance while Federal police attempt to apprehend leaders of the TPLF;

Whereas clashes have continued in the Tigray Region and Ethiopian soldiers and allied forces have pursued prominent TPLF leaders, notably killing former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia Seyoum Mesfin as part of a ''stabilizing mission . . . to bring to justice perpetrators'';

Whereas, in 2020, prior to the outbreak of fighting in the Tigray Region, there were more than 1,800,000 people internally displaced in Ethiopia and approximately 2,000,000 people in the Tigray Region were already in need of humanitarian assistance;

Whereas the conflict in the Tigray Region has prompted more than 61,000 Ethiopians to seek refuge in Sudan, has displaced as many as 500,000 people internally, and has caused severe shortages of food, water, medical supplies, and other necessary goods for those who remain in the region;

Whereas the conflict has disrupted harvests, livelihoods, markets, and supply chains, food and medical supplies have been looted, and restrictions and bureaucratic impediments continue to constrain the humanitarian response, with nearly 4,000,000 people in the Tigray Region estimated to require urgent food assistance, including 100,000 Eritrean refugees;

Whereas, during the first few weeks of the conflict, there was a complete shutdown of electricity, banking, internet, and telephone services throughout the Tigray Region by the Government of Ethiopia, with government reports of TPLF forces also destroying communications infrastructure, and subsequent service restorations have been limited;

Whereas, in addition to the shutdown of telephone and internet services, which has severely limited the flow of information on the conflict and the humanitarian situation, journalists have been restricted from accessing much of the Tigray Region, several journalists have been arrested in connection to their coverage of the conflict, and one journalist working for the Tigray Mass Media Agency was killed;

Whereas, although the Government of Ethiopia entered into an agreement with the United Nations on November 29, 2020, to facilitate humanitarian access to the Tigray Region, that access remains limited;

Whereas, on February 1, 2021, the Secretary General of the Norwegian Refugee Council stated, ''Twelve weeks since the fighting began, the basic elements of a response on the scale needed are still not in place. It is false to say that aid is increasingly getting through. Aid has only gone to the places with little conflict and more limited needs and is not keeping pace with the humanitarian crisis as it inevitably grows over time.'';

Whereas, on February 6, 2021, the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP) announced a new agreement with the Government of Ethiopia to rapidly scale up the deployment of emergency food assistance while improving the process for reviewing and approving requests from United Nations and humanitarian partner agencies;

Whereas humanitarian access to the refugee camps that were home to almost 100,000 Eritrean refugees at the start of the conflict has been especially restricted, with the Hitsats and Shimelba camps still completely inaccessible, and the United Nations Refugee Agency estimates that 20,000 Eritrean refugees displaced from those camps remain unaccounted for;

Whereas United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Filippo Grandi has expressed alarm about the ''overwhelming number of disturbing reports of Eritrean refugees in Tigray being killed, abducted and forcibly returned to Eritrea'';

Whereas, in November 2020, four humanitarian workers, including one employee of the International Rescue Committee and three employees of the Danish Refugee Council, were killed at Hitsats refugee camp;

Whereas challenges to access have significantly restricted the reporting and documentation of atrocities, but survivor and eye-witness testimony and satellite imagery have enabled reports to emerge of targeted violence or indiscriminate attacks against civilians committed by multiple parties to the conflict;

Whereas examples of reported atrocities committed in the Tigray Region include the massacre in the town of Mai Kadra on November 9, 2020, in which, according to estimates from the Ethiopian Human Rights Commission (EHRC), more than 600 civilians died from what the EHRC Chief Commissioner concluded was ''for no reason other than their ethnicity,'' and a mass killing in the city of Axum on November 28 through 29, 2020, which involved, according to reports from Amnesty International, the systematic killing of ''hundreds of unarmed civilians'' after Ethiopian and Eritrean troops retook the city;

Whereas United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict Pramila Patten has highlighted reports of sexual and gender-based violence, including a high number of alleged rapes in Mekelle;

Whereas, on January 27, 2021, the United States Government publicly confirmed that Eritrean Defense Forces (EDF) are participating in the conflict in alliance with the ENDF and called for the immediate withdrawal of all EDF soldiers from the Tigray Region, and credible reports have emerged that EDF soldiers participating in the conflict have attacked civilians, including Eritrean refugees, and looted and destroyed homes and religious institutions;

Whereas Ethiopia has been beset in recent years by multiple human rights and humanitarian challenges, including targeted ethnic violence, intercommunal conflict, natural disasters, and political unrest;

Whereas, since mid-2020, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Amnesty International, and the Ethiopian Human Rights Commission have reported atrocities and a rise in ethnic and intercommunal violence in other parts of Ethiopia, including in the Amhara, Benishangul-Gumuz, Somali, Afar, and Oromia regions;

Whereas, according to international human rights organizations, during the conflict in the Tigray Region, ethnic Tigrayans throughout Ethiopia have been suspended from their jobs and prevented from leaving the country, and there are reports of surveillance and mass arrests of citizens of Ethiopia based on their ethnicity;

Whereas Ethiopia is undergoing a fragile democratic transition, with the postponed 2020 general elections rescheduled for June 2021, except in the Tigray Region, where elections have not yet been scheduled;

Whereas the Government of Ethiopia has restricted the right of several opposition political parties to peacefully assemble, and a number of opposition leaders have been jailed since the summer of 2020, with varying degrees of due process violations and procedural delays in their trials; and

Whereas the conflict in the Tigray Region occurs within the context of complicated regional and global dynamics featuring ongoing negotiations between Ethiopia, Egypt, and Sudan over the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam, Ethiopia's rapprochement with Eritrea, threats posed by the violent extremist organization Al-Shabaab, a struggle for influence and power among regional and global actors, increasingly hostile border disputes between Ethiopia and Sudan, and the fragile democratic transition and peace process in Sudan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) strongly disapproves of the escalation of political tensions between the Government of Ethiopia and the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF) into armed conflict and condemns in the strongest terms all violence against civilians;

(2) appreciates the willingness of Sudan to welcome refugees fleeing the conflict in the Tigray Region of Ethiopia;

(3) calls on the Government of Eritrea to immediately and fully withdraw its military forces from Ethiopia;

(4) calls for the swift and complete restoration of electricity, banking, telephone, and internet services throughout the Tigray Region and other parts of Ethiopia where communications have been restricted;

(5) calls on the Government of Ethiopia to—

(A) ensure that any apprehensions of TPLF members are carried out with the least possible use of force and that the rights to which those detained are entitled under Ethiopian and international law are fully respected;

(B) release opposition leaders detained on the basis of their political activity as well as journalists detained on the basis of their reporting, and respect the rights of all Ethiopians to free expression and political participation, without discrimination based on ethnicity, ideology, or political affiliation; and

(C) convene a national dialogue inclusive of all nonviolent political parties, ethnic communities, religious groups, and civil society organizations in Ethiopia to work toward the sustainable resolution of grievances and chart a democratic and peaceful path forward for the country;

(6) urges all parties to the conflict to—

(A) cease all hostilities, fully comply with international humanitarian law, and refrain from actions that could spread or escalate the conflict, particularly attacks on civilian targets;

(B) make demonstrable progress to guarantee unfettered and immediate humanitarian access, for personnel and supplies, to areas affected by the conflict, and take all possible steps to protect the safety of civilians, including refugees, displaced persons, and humanitarian aid workers; and

(C) allow for, and cooperate with, independent and transparent investigations of any alleged human rights abuses committed in the course of the conflict and hold perpetrators to account; and

(7) urges the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to—

(A) engage at the highest levels with leaders of the Government of Ethiopia, the Government of Eritrea, and the TPLF to encourage the full cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of Eritrean forces, mitigate the humanitarian crisis that has emerged from the conflict, and support an inclusive process of national dialogue and reconciliation;

(B) immediately establish criteria to end the pause of all non-life-sustaining assistance to Ethiopia and support programming to meet immediate humanitarian needs, including of refugees and internally displaced persons, advance nonviolent conflict resolution and reconciliation, and aid a democratic transition in Ethiopia;

(C) ensure that the call made by Secretary of State Blinken on February 27, 2021, for a ''full, independent, international investigation into all reports of human rights violations, abuses, and atrocities'' committed in the course of the conflict is realized and impose strict accountability measures on those found responsible;

(D) take all possible diplomatic steps to prevent further ethnic-based violence and mass atrocities, including by non-state armed groups, in Ethiopia; and

(E) maintain close coordination with international allies and multilateral organizations regarding efforts to address the conflict in the Tigray Region and bring attention to the conflict in international fora, including the United Nations Security Council.

SENATE RESOLUTION 98—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI AND AMERICORPS SENIORS VOLUNTEERS TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 98

Whereas, since their inceptions, each of the AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors national service programs have proven to be a highly effective way—

(1) to engage the people of the United States in meeting a wide range of local and national needs; and

(2) to promote the ethics of service and volunteerism;

Whereas, each year, nearly 270,000 individuals serve in AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors at 40,000 locations across the United States to give back in an intensive way to communities, States, Tribal nations, and the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors funds have been invested in nonprofit, community, educational, and faith-based groups, and those funds leverage hundreds of millions of dollars in outside funding and in-kind donations each year;

Whereas AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers have provided millions of hours of service nationwide, helping—

(1) to improve the lives of the most vulnerable people of the United States;

(2) to protect the environment;

(3) to contribute to public safety;

(4) to respond to disasters;

(5) to strengthen the educational system of the United States; and

(6) to expand economic opportunity;

Whereas AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers recruit and supervise millions of community volunteers, demonstrating the value of AmeriCorps as a powerful force for encouraging people to become involved in volunteering and community service;

Whereas, for more than 5 decades, AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers in the RSVP, Foster Grandparent, and Senior Companion programs have played an important role in strengthening communities by sharing their experience, knowledge, and accomplishments with the individuals they serve;

Whereas, since 1994, more than 1,200,000 individuals have taken the AmeriCorps pledge to ''get things done for America'' by becoming AmeriCorps members through the AmeriCorps State and National, AmeriCorps VISTA, and AmeriCorps NCCC programs;

Whereas AmeriCorps members nationwide, in return for the service of those members, have earned more than $4,000,000,000 to use to further their own educational advancement at colleges and universities across the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps is a proven pathway to employment, providing members with valuable career skills, experience, and contacts to prepare them for the 21st century workforce and to help close the skills gap in the United States;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed the bipartisan Serve America Act (Public Law 111–13; 123 Stat. 1460), which authorized the expansion of national service, expanded opportunities to serve, increased efficiency and accountability, and strengthened the capacity of organizations and communities to solve problems;

Whereas national service programs have engaged millions of people in the United States in results-driven service in the most vulnerable communities of the United States, providing hope and help to individuals with economic and social needs;

Whereas national service and volunteerism demonstrate the best of the spirit of the United States, with people turning toward problems and working together to find community solutions; and

Whereas AmeriCorps Week, observed in 2021 from March 7 through March 13, is an appropriate time for the people of the United States—

(1) to salute current and former AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers for their positive impact on the lives of people in the United States;

(2) to thank the community partners of AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors for making the programs possible; and

(3) to encourage more people in the United States to become involved in service and volunteering: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) encourages the people of the United States to join in a national effort—

(A) to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers; and

(B) to raise awareness about the importance of national and community service;

(2) acknowledges the significant accomplishments of the members, alumni, and community partners of AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors;

(3) recognizes the important contributions made by AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States; and

(4) encourages individuals of all ages to consider opportunities to serve in AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 99—OBSERVING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UPRISING IN SYRIA

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 99

Whereas 10 years ago, on March 15th, 2011, in the midst of the Arab Spring, hundreds of Syrians peacefully assembled to call on their leadership for democratic reforms and respect for their fundamental freedoms, sparking a nationwide movement;

Whereas in response to the predominantly peaceful protests, Syrian President Bashar al-Assad ordered unyielding violence against the people of Syria, including arbitrary detentions, torture, killing, and attacks on civilians and civilian infrastructure, often under the false premise of combating terrorism;

Whereas over the course of this conflict, the Assad regime has exhibited unrelenting depravity in its use of chemical weapons and barrel bombs, deliberately targeting civilian infrastructure, including hospitals and schools, and committing gross violations of international humanitarian law;

Whereas the former Syrian military photographer ''Caesar'' meticulously photographed the Assad regime's widespread system of arrest, detention, torture and murder of tens of thousands of Syrian protesters and dissidents, and then courageously smuggled 55,000 of those photographs out of Syria, exposing the regime's barbarity for the world to witness;

Whereas the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019 (22 U.S.C. 8791 note), which became law on December 20, 2019—

(1) seeks accountability for the Assad regime and its international enablers for atrocities against the Syrian people;

(2) denies the Assad regime the resources to fuel its war machine; and

(3) sends a clear signal to the international community against normalizing, rehabilitating, or legitimizing Assad and his backers.

Whereas Iran and Russia intervened militarily in support of the Assad regime, enabling and actively participating in the Assad regime's horrific brutalities against civilians in favor of advancing their narrow interests and in some cases empowered extremist groups;

Whereas in pursuit of its narrow self-interest, Russia, backed by China, has blunted United Nations' efforts to preserve vital border crossings that serve as a critical humanitarian lifeline to the beleaguered Syrian population.

Whereas the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria exacerbated the suffering of the Syrian people through the violent and hostile seizure of territory, misapplication of Islamic law, destruction and smuggling of antiquities, and oil smuggling, turning Syria into a global hub for terrorist activity;

Whereas the Assad regime, and its Russian and Iranian backers, are largely responsible for the death of more than 500,000 Syrian civilians, and the displacement of more than 12,000,000 men, women, and children within and outside of Syria's borders, imposing irreversible trauma and loss for a whole generation;

Whereas millions of Syrians are struggling to survive, with more than 13,000,000 Syrians who are in need of humanitarian assistance and more than 9,000,000 Syrians who are facing food insecurity;

Whereas international efforts to secure a peaceful political transition of power in Syria, in accordance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 2254, adopted on December 18, 2015, remain stymied, due almost entirely to the intransigence of Russia and the Assad regime, holding the people of Syria hostage;

Whereas the people and Government of the United States support the people of Syria in their aspirations for peace, stability, dignity, and accountability:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) solemnly observes the 10th anniversary of the Syrian uprising;

(2) affirms that it is the policy of the United States—

(A) to seek a political solution to the Syrian conflict;

(B) to continue to stand with the people of Syria;

(C) to further efforts to secure a permanent ceasefire;

(D) to continue work on the constitutional committee free from regime intransigence; and

(E) to foster conditions for free and fair elections in accordance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 2254;

(3) affirms that it is the policy of the United States to promote adherence to the laws of war by all parties engaging in hostilities in Syria;

(4) affirms that it is the policy of the United States to support international humanitarian efforts to assist innocent civilians, including through support for displaced populations and the promotion of accountability for perpetrators of human rights abuses;

(5) commits to continuing efforts to hold the Assad regime and its Russian and Iranian backers accountable for war crimes and crimes against humanity; including through implementation of the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019;

(6) commends the bravery of Syrian human rights defenders who, in the service of justice and accountability, have courageously documented the atrocities committed by the Assad regime and its Russian and Iranian backers over the course of this conflict;

(7) condemns the indiscriminate use of force by all actors in Syria, including the Assad regime, its proponents, its opponents, and extremist groups;

(8) calls on the United States Government to reinvigorate diplomatic efforts to resolve the conflict as outlined under United Nations Security Council Resolution 2254, and to expand humanitarian aid to the Syrian people so they may—

(A) be free from violence, whether from the state or other armed groups;

(B) return to their communities of their own free will and in an informed manner;

(C) participate in transitional justice; and

(D) decide their own futures through free and fair elections that result in a legitimate representative government that serves all Syrians.

SENATE RESOLUTION 100—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 100

Whereas, as of March 2021, there are approximately 3,803,000,000 women and girls in the world;

Whereas women and girls around the world—

(1) have fundamental human rights;

(2) play a critical role in providing and caring for their families and driving positive change in their communities;

(3) contribute substantially to food security, economic growth, the prevention and resolution of conflict, and the sustainability of peace and stability; and

(4) must have meaningful opportunities to more fully participate in and lead the political, social, and economic lives of their communities;

Whereas the advancement and empowerment of women and girls around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States and is critical to the achievement of global peace and prosperity;

Whereas the National Security Strategy of the United States, published in December 2017—

(1) declares that ''[s]ocieties that empower women to participate fully in civic and economic life are more prosperous and peaceful'';

(2) supports ''efforts to advance women's equality, protect the rights of women and girls, and promote women and youth empowerment programs''; and

(3) recognizes that ''governments that fail to treat women equally do not allow their societies to reach their potential'';

Whereas, on October 6, 2017, the Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 2152j et seq.) was enacted into law, which includes requirements for a government-wide ''Women, Peace, and Security Strategy'' to promote and strengthen the participation of women in peace negotiations and conflict prevention overseas, enhanced training for relevant United States Government personnel, and follow-up evaluations of the effectiveness of the strategy;

Whereas the United States Strategy on Women, Peace, and Security, dated June 2019, recognizes that—

(1) the ''[s]ocial and political marginalization of women strongly correlates with the likelihood that a country will experience conflict'';

(2) there is a ''tremendous amount of untapped potential among the world's women and girls to identify, recommend, and implement effective solutions to conflict'', and there are ''benefits derived from creating opportunities for women and girls to serve as agents of peace via political, economic, and social empowerment''; and

(3) barriers to the meaningful participation of women and girls in conflict prevention and resolution efforts ''include under-representation in political leadership, pervasive violence against women and girls, and persistent inequality in many societies'';

Whereas, according to the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (commonly referred to as ''UN Women''), peace negotiations are more likely to end in a peace agreement when women and women's groups play a meaningful role in the negotiation process;

Whereas, according to a study by the International Peace Institute, a peace agreement is 35 percent more likely to last at least 15 years if women participate in the development of the peace agreement;

Whereas the joint strategy of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) entitled ''Department of State & USAID Joint Strategy on Countering Violent Extremism'' and dated May 2016—

(1) notes that women can play a critical role in identifying and addressing drivers of violent extremism in their families, communities, and broader society; and

(2) commits to supporting programs that engage women ''as key stakeholders in preventing and countering violent extremism in their communities'';

Whereas, according to the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State, the full and meaningful participation of women in criminal justice professions and security forces vastly enhances the effectiveness of the security forces;

Whereas, despite the contributions of women to society, hundreds of millions of women and girls around the world continue to be denied the right to participate freely in civic and economic life, lack fundamental legal protections, and remain vulnerable to exploitation and abuse;

Whereas, every year, approximately 12,000,000 girls are married before they reach the age of 18, which means that—

(1) nearly 33,000 girls are married every day; or

(2) nearly 23 girls are married every minute;

Whereas, despite global progress, it is predicted that by 2030 more than 150,000,000 more girls will marry before reaching the age of 18, and approximately 2,400,000 girls who are married before reaching the age of 18 are under the age of 15;

Whereas girls living in countries affected by conflict or other humanitarian crises are often the most vulnerable to child marriage,

and 9 of the 10 countries with the highest rates of child marriage are considered fragile or extremely fragile;

Whereas, according to the International Labour Organization, 71 percent of the estimated 40,300,000 victims of modern slavery in 2016 were women or girls;

Whereas, according to the United Nation's Children's Fund (commonly referred to as ''UNICEF'')—

(1) approximately ¼ of girls between the ages of 15 and 19 have been victims of some form of physical violence;

(2) approximately 120,000,000 girls worldwide, slightly more than 1 in 10, have experienced forced sexual acts; and

(3) an estimated 1 in 3 women around the world has experienced some form of physical or sexual violence;

Whereas, according to the 2018 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime entitled ''Global Report on Trafficking in Persons'', from 2003 to 2018, 72 percent of all detected trafficking victims were women or girls;

Whereas, on August 10, 2012, the United States Government launched a strategy entitled ''United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally'', which is the first interagency strategy that—

(1) addresses gender-based violence around the world;

(2) advances the rights and status of women and girls;

(3) promotes gender equality in United States foreign policy; and

(4) works to bring about a world in which all individuals can pursue their aspirations without the threat of violence;

Whereas, in June 2016, the Department of State released an update to that strategy, underscoring that ''[p]reventing and responding to gender-based violence is a cornerstone of the U.S. Government's commitment to advancing human rights and promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls'';

Whereas, despite the achievements of individual female leaders and evidence that democracy and equality under the law form a mutually reinforcing relationship in which higher levels of equality are strongly correlated with the relative state of peace of a country, a healthier domestic security environment, and lower levels of aggression toward other countries—

(1) women around the world remain vastly underrepresented in—

(A) national and local legislatures and governments; and

(B) other high-level positions; and

(2) according to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, women account for only 25 percent of national parliamentarians and 21 percent of government ministers;

Whereas the ability of women and girls to realize their full potential is critical to the ability of a country to achieve strong and lasting economic growth, self-reliance, and political and social stability;

Whereas the overall level of violence against women is a better predictor of the peacefulness of a country, the compliance of a country with international treaty obligations, and the relations of a country with neighboring countries than indicators measuring the level of democracy, level of wealth, or level of institutionalization of the country;

Whereas, although the United Nations Millennium Project reached the goal of achieving gender parity in primary education in most countries in 2015, more work remains to be done to achieve gender equality in primary and secondary education, and particularly in secondary education worldwide as gender gaps persist and widen, by addressing—

(1) discriminatory practices;

(2) harmful cultural and social norms;

(3) inadequate sanitation facilities, including facilities to manage menstruation;

(4) child, early, and forced marriage;

(5) poverty;

(6) early pregnancy and motherhood;

(7) conflict and insecurity; and

(8) other factors that favor boys or devalue girls' education;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization—

(1) approximately 132,000,000 girls between the ages of 6 and 17 remain out of school;

(2) girls living in countries affected by conflict are 2.5 times more likely to be out of primary school than boys;

(3) girls are twice as likely as boys to never set foot in a classroom; and

(4) up to 30 percent of girls who drop out of school do so because of adolescent pregnancy or child marriage;

Whereas women around the world face a variety of constraints that severely limit their economic participation and productivity and remain underrepresented in the labor force;

Whereas the economic empowerment of women is inextricably linked to a myriad of other human rights that are essential to the ability of women to thrive as economic actors, including—

(1) living lives free of violence and exploitation;

(2) achieving the highest possible standard of health and well-being;

(3) enjoying full legal and human rights, such as access to registration, identification, and citizenship documents, and freedom of movement;

(4) access to formal and informal education;

(5) access to, and equal protection under, land and property rights;

(6) access to fundamental labor rights;

(7) the implementation of policies to address disproportionate care burdens; and

(8) receiving business and management skills and leadership opportunities;

Whereas closing the global gender gap in labor markets could increase worldwide gross domestic product by as much as $28,000,000,000,000 by 2025;

Whereas, pursuant to section 3(b) of the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act of 2018 (22 U.S.C. 2151–2(b)), it is the international development cooperation policy of the United States—

(1) to reduce gender disparities with respect to economic, social, political, educational, and cultural resources, as well as wealth, opportunities, and services;

(2) to strive to eliminate gender-based violence and mitigate its harmful effects on individuals and communities, including through efforts to develop standards and capacity to reduce gender-based violence in the workplace and other places where women work;

(3) to support activities that secure private property rights and land tenure for women in developing countries, including—

(A) supporting legal frameworks that give women equal rights to own, register, use, profit from, and inherit land and property;

(B) improving legal literacy to enable women to exercise the rights described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) improving the capacity of law enforcement and community leaders to enforce such rights;

(4) to increase the capability of women and girls to fully exercise their rights, determine their life outcomes, assume leadership roles, and influence decision making in households, communities, and societies; and

(5) to improve the access of women and girls to education, particularly higher education opportunities in business, finance, and management, in order to enhance financial literacy and business development, management, and strategy skills;

Whereas, according to the World Health Organization, global maternal mortality decreased by approximately 44 percent between 1990 and 2015, yet approximately 830 women and girls continue to die from preventable causes relating to pregnancy or childbirth each day, and 99 percent of all maternal deaths occur in developing countries;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, of the 830 women and adolescent girls who die every day from preventable causes relating to pregnancy and childbirth, 507 die each day in countries that are considered fragile because of conflict or disaster, accounting for approximately ⅗ of all maternal deaths worldwide;

Whereas the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reports that women and girls comprise approximately ½ of the 67,200,000 refugees and internally displaced or stateless individuals in the world;

Whereas women and girls in humanitarian emergencies, including those subject to forced displacement, face increased and exacerbated vulnerabilities to—

(1) gender-based violence, including rape, child marriage, domestic violence, human trafficking, and sexual exploitation and assault;

(2) disruptions in education and livelihood;

(3) lack of access to health services; and

(4) food insecurity and malnutrition;

Whereas malnutrition poses a variety of threats to women and girls specifically, as malnutrition can weaken their immune systems, making them more susceptible to infections, and affects their capacity to survive childbirth, and children born of malnourished women and girls are more likely to have cognitive impairments and higher risk of disease throughout their lives;

Whereas it is imperative—

(1) to alleviate violence and discrimination against women and girls; and

(2) to afford women and girls every opportunity to be full and productive members of their communities; and

Whereas March 8, 2021, is recognized as International Women's Day, a global day—

(1) to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women in the past, present, and future; and

(2) to recognize the obstacles that women face in the struggle for equal rights and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of International Women's Day;

(2) recognizes that the fundamental human rights of women and girls have intrinsic value that affect the quality of life of women and girls;

(3) recognizes that the empowerment of women and girls is inextricably linked to the potential of a country to generate—

(A) economic growth and self-reliance;

(B) sustainable peace and democracy; and

(C) inclusive security;

(4) recognizes and honors individuals in the United States and around the world, including women human rights defenders, activists, and civil society leaders, who have worked throughout history to ensure that women and girls are guaranteed equality and fundamental human rights;

(5) recognizes the unique cultural, historical, and religious differences throughout the world and urges the United States Government to act with respect and understanding toward legitimate differences when promoting any policies;

(6) reaffirms the commitment—

(A) to end discrimination and violence against women and girls;

(B) to ensure the safety, health, and welfare of women and girls;

(C) to pursue policies that guarantee the fundamental human rights of women and girls worldwide; and

(D) to promote meaningful and significant participation of women in every aspect of society and community, including conflict prevention, protection, peacemaking, and peacebuilding;

(7) supports sustainable, measurable, and global development that seeks to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls; and

(8) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women's Day with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 101—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT, WHILE THE UNITED STATES FINDS VALUE AND USEFULNESS IN THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION IN FULFILLING THE NEEDS OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER FREE AND OPEN ECONOMIES IN THE 21ST CENTURY, SIGNIFICANT REFORMS AT THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION ARE NEEDED AND THE UNITED STATES MUST THEREFORE CONTINUE TO DEMONSTRATE LEADERSHIP TO ACHIEVE THOSE REFORMS

Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 101

Whereas the United States had led the formation, as well as reform, of rules governing the multilateral trading system since World War II;

Whereas the United States is a founding member of the World Trade Organization (in this preamble referred to as the ''WTO'') and a key architect of the organization;

Whereas the United States secured important commitments in the WTO to facilitate trade in goods and services, to prevent the application of non-scientific restrictions on United States agriculture, and to protect United States intellectual property;

Whereas the United States uses the rules of the WTO to benefit workers, farmers, and businesses in the United States by facilitating access to the 90 percent of the world's consumers who live outside the borders of the United States;

Whereas the fundamental purpose of the WTO is to create space for members to negotiate with each other, and the WTO reserves to those members exclusively the right to negotiate and adopt rules that reduce and eliminate trade barriers and discriminatory treatment;

Whereas the prompt settlement of disputes in which a member of the WTO considers that its rights are being impaired by the actions of another member is essential to the functioning of the WTO and the maintenance of a proper balance between the rights and obligations of members;

Whereas the WTO's dispute settlement function, including in particular the Appellate Body, has increasingly failed to enforce the rules of the WTO in a timely manner, and has usurped the negotiating prerogative of members by creating new obligations and rights that are inconsistent with the rules negotiated by members;

Whereas the creation of those obligations and rights undermines—

(1) the WTO's negotiating function by discouraging members from making concessions; and

(2) the WTO's dispute settlement function by encouraging overuse of the process and undermining its legitimacy, including by preventing free market economies from responding to globally trade distortive practices by nonmarket economies;

Whereas the WTO does not have sufficient rules to discipline the distortive economic policies of nonmarket economies, such as policies relating to excess capacity and forced technology transfer, the special treatment those economies afford to state-owned enterprises, and their massive and opaque industrial subsidies;

Whereas there is long-standing bipartisan support in the United States Congress to reform the WTO to address those failings;

Whereas the current presidential administration, as well as prior administrations, raised concerns about the failings described in this preamble and have made reform of the WTO a top priority of United States trade policy;

Whereas the United States urges WTO members to work constructively with the United States to assess the reasons why the existing WTO rules have proven inadequate in order to create an atmosphere within the WTO that is conducive to the development of new rules less subject to jurisprudential drift;

Whereas the guiding principle for reform of the WTO, and the lens through which WTO members should consider specific reform proposals, is the restoration of the WTO's capability and capacity for negotiation between members; and

Whereas, given that the United States has achieved its trade policy objectives through active leadership at the WTO, and that an absence of that leadership would be filled by nonmarket economies that are hostile to a host of United States interests: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) while the United States finds value and usefulness in the World Trade Organization (in this resolution referred to as the ''WTO'') in order to fulfill the needs of the United States and other free and open economies in the 21st century, significant reforms are needed;

(2) the United States must therefore continue to demonstrate leadership to achieve reforms that restore the effectiveness of the WTO's—

(A) negotiating function;

(B) dispute settlement function so that it transparently, efficiently, and fully enforces outcomes negotiated by members rather than usurping their primacy by creating new rights or obligations; and

(C) rules for special and differential treatment to ensure those rules promote development for truly disadvantaged countries, rather than becoming tools for globally competitive countries to engage in protectionism and market distortions;

(3) the efforts to reform the negotiating function of the WTO should revitalize the negotiating function by providing confidence to members that the WTO operates according to the rules as negotiated and adopted by members;

(4) a revitalized negotiating function must include new rules that reflect the 21st century economy, further combat anticompetitive and protectionist barriers, and ensure disputes are efficiently resolved;

(5) the United States Trade Representative should continue to lead efforts to work with WTO members to pursue reforms at the WTO that—

(A) ensure the dispute settlement mechanism faithfully applies the rules adopted by members, including by undertaking measures to ensure the WTO's Appellate Body does not create new rights and obligations;

(B) improve public confidence in dispute settlement by promoting greater transparency and efficiency in the conduct of proceedings;

(C) redress the consistent failure by certain members to satisfy their notification obligations under various WTO agreements, including through measures that strengthen accountability;

(D) ensures rules for special and differential treatment are appropriately reserved for countries whose state of development and global competitiveness actually warrants such flexibility;

(E) create new rules and structures that can serve the interests of the United States while promoting peace, prosperity, good governance, transparency, effective operation of legal regimes, the rule of law, and free enterprise; and

(F) expand upon the trilateral negotiations currently underway with Japan and the European Union; and

(6) the United States Trade Representative should explore and assess specific reform proposals, including—

(A) pursuing plurilateral agreements that further the interests of the United States while limiting the benefits accruing to countries that are not parties to those agreements;

(B) efforts to ensure that incorrect interpretations by the Appellate Body, including with respect to the Agreement on Safeguards, the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, and the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, are corrected, and not to be deemed precedential;

(C) new rules and norms to address practices of nonmarket economies, such as practices relating to state-owned enterprises, which certain countries often utilize for objectives that cause severe trade distortions; and

(D) better implementation of existing rules, such as the prohibition in paragraph 4 of Article XIV of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade on currency manipulation, to ensure that those rules are effective to preserve the rights of free market economies.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have a request for one committee to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 9, 2021, at 6 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 116–283, on behalf of the Majority Leader of the Senate and the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, appoints the following individual as a member of the Commission on the Naming of Items of the Department of Defense that Commemorate the Confederate States of America or Any Person Who Served Voluntarily with the Confederate States of America: LTG Thomas P. Bostick (ret.) of Virginia.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, March 10; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Fudge nomination as provided under the previous order; finally, that the Senate recess following the confirmation vote on the Fudge nomination until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will be four rollcall votes during Wednesday's session of the Senate in relation to the Fudge, Garland, and Regan nominations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:01 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 10, 2021, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

UZRA ZEYA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, AND HUMAN RIGHTS), VICE SARAH SEWALL, RESIGNED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MR. RICHARD MORRIS BIGGS

HON. PAT FALLON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorable life and work of a beloved Texan, Mr. Richard Morris Biggs. Mr. Biggs passed away on February 14, 2021, after a full life of almost 77 years.

Richard Biggs was born in Garden City, Michigan on February 15, 1944 to the late Albert and Mae Smallwood Biggs. One of Mr. Biggs' proudest moments was playing basketball for Weatherford College and East Texas State University. He was the owner of Autumn Homes, and held an office with the Realtor Association. Richard is survived by his wife, Helen Biggs; children, Brenna Smith and husband Dave Jr., Brian Biggs and wife Karen and Anissa Smith and husband James; 10 grandchildren and 10 great-grandchildren. He will be dearly missed.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Mr. Richard Biggs. His life was one of service and love for his family and friends. He will be missed by all he came across, and his legacy will be remembered for years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I was unexpectedly detained during vote proceedings. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 61, and NAY on Roll Call No. 62.

RECOGNIZING BART WEISMAN AND HIS SERVICE TO THE SOUTH FLORIDA COMMUNITY

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor Barton David Weisman for his years of service to our country and the South Florida community. Barton, known by most as Bart, was born in 1927 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and moved to South Florida in 1976 where he currently resides with his wife Shirley. They have two children and five grandchildren who keep them busy in addition to their successful business and philanthropic activities.

In the midst of World War II, Bart enrolled in the ROTC program at Lehigh University and later joined the New York National Guard. Bart was deployed to Korea as part of a medical unit with Company K, 47th Infantry Regiment which saw extensive combat. Bart was promoted to 1st Lieutenant and received numerous awards for his military service, including the Army of Occupation Medal for service in Japan, the Korean Service Medal, the UN Service Ribbon, and the Combat Medical Badge.

Following his military career, Bart started a company providing long term health care services to children and seniors. The company grew from what was originally one nursing home in Bristol, Pennsylvania to operating facilities in New Jersey and Florida. Bart's company continues to be a family-run business with both his son and grandson working there.

Bart and Shirley have dedicated themselves to sharing their success with their community through various philanthropic activities. They focus much of their efforts with Jewish Family Services and their most recent endeavor is the Shirley and Barton Weisman Delray Community and Senior Center in Delray Beach, Florida which provides an array of vital services and resources to the area's seniors.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Bart Weisman, and his service to the South Florida community and Florida's 22nd Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING THE FRONTLINE HEALTHCARE WORKERS OF SOUTH DAKOTA

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize, celebrate and honor the frontline healthcare workers of the great state of South Dakota. Some of these South Dakota heroes are: Thomas McKellar McCloy, MD, Todd Deloyce McCluskey, DO, Donna K. McCluskey, DO, Tabb D. McCluskey, DO, Keith Bruce McCollister, MD, Steven Todd McCormack, MD, Chere Elizabeth McCormick, DO, Brian McCrary, DO, Sarah McDonald, MD, Philip Brandeis McDonald, MD, Kevin Michael McDonnell, MD, Heather Elizabeth McDougall, MD, Matthew Alexander McDougall, MD, Richard McDowell, MD, Patrick Edward McElaney, MD, Emmett Terrance McEleney, MD, Michelle L. McElroy, MD, Michael Justin McFall, DO, John L. McFee, MD, James R. McGrann, MD, Sean Patrick McGrann, MD, Steven C. McGraw, MD, Katherine Elizabeth McGraw, MD, Patrick S. McGreevy, MD, Michael P. McGuire, MD, Michael McHale, MD, Matthew Justin McHale, DO, Lindsey Rapp Smith McIlvena, MD, Elizabeth A. McInerney, MD, Jennifer Marie McKay, MD, Julie A. McKay, MD, Kimberlee Ann McKay, MD, Heidi Ann McKean, MD.

Janice McKenney, MD, Matthew McKenzie, MD, Scott W. McKercher, MD, Wallace Blake McKinney, MD, Ruth M. McLaughlin, MD, Julie McLaughlin, MD, Anna Marie McLuen, MD, Amanda Marie McMahon, MD, Kandi R. McMenamy, MD, Brian Patrick McNally, MD, Megan Duffy McNally, DO, Michael F. McNamara, DO, Clifford Allen McNaughton, MD, Laura Doshier McNaughton, MD, Michael Fielden McNeeley, MD, Scott Alan McPherson, MD, Kevin James McQuaid, MD, Philip Elijah McRill, MD, Marc McSherry, MD, Robert E. McWhirter, MD, Robert Root McWilliams, MD, David Ti Meadows, MD, Trevor A. Meaney, MD, Marisa C. Medina, MD, Daniel J. Megard, MD, Denise Mehia, MD, Prashant Mehta, MD, Dharmesh Mehta, MD, Melissa Marie Meier, MD, Mary E. Meierhenry, MD.

Ryan Meis, MD, Tina G. Melanson, MD, Jonathan Wade Mellema, MD, Daniel Louis Meltzer, MD, David S. Mendelowitz, MD, Matthew Ryan Mendlick, MD, Aarika Leslie Menees, MD, Spencer Hardy Menees, MD, Ernest Mensah, MD, Thomas Edward Menzel, MD, Rowena Cabigon Mercado, MD, Aron Bradley Merchen, MD, Courtney Elizabeth Merkwan, MD, Tricia Lawrence Merrigan, MD, Heather Rae Merrill, MD, William Henry Merry III, MD, Mackenzie Mertz, DO, Olga Merunko, MD, Alexey Merunko, MD, Stephen Elliott Messier, MD, Frank David Messner, MD, Katherine Sue Messner, DO, Timothy Metz, MD, Steven J. Meyer, MD, Philip F. Meyer, DO, Larry Alan Meyer, MD, Robert David Meyer, MD, Angela M. Meyer, MD, Jason Lars Meyer, MD, Lauritz Raymond Meyer, MD, Jeffry D. Meyer, MD, Paul E. Meyer, MD, Brittany Joelle Meyer, MD, Peter Christopher Meyer, MD, Mark Herman Meyer, MD, Benjamin Meyerink, MD.

Sarah Elisabeth Meyers, MD, Eduardo E. Meza, MD, Farukh Saeed Mian, MD, Connie S. Micek, MD, Jeffrey P. Michalak, DO, Paul Oskar Michels, MD, Mark A. Midthun, MD, Anthony M. Migura, MD, Beth A. Mikkelsen, MD, Samuel Jacob Milanovich, MD, Taylor Morgan Miles, MD, Allen L. Millard, MD, Elaine Miller, MD, L. Patrick Miller, MD, Steven Eric Miller, MD, Robert Earl Miller, MD, Andrea N. Miller, DO, Nathan James Miller, MD, Patrick James Miller, MD, Tara Nikole Miller, MD, Stephan James Miller, MD, Lisa Anne Miller, MD, Matthew Walter Miller, MD, Jeremy Scott Miller, MD, Ross Allen Miller, MD, Paul Richard Miller, MD, Jacob James Miller, MD, Ryan Jacob Miller, MD, Elizabeth Jayne Nail Miller, MD, Andrew Tyler Miller, MD, David John Mills, MD, Craig Mills, MD, Mary Milroy, MD, Jim L. Minder, MD, William J. Miner, MD, Brendan Maney Miner, MD, Jaron Jed Miner, DO, Kelly Ann Ming, MD, Thomas Andrew Minor, MD, Timothy P. Minton, MD, Sam Andrew Miotke, MD, Kristen Miranda, MD, John Saratial Misdary, MD, Richard Alexander Misiaszek, MD.

Bhargav Mistry, MD, Catherine Marie Mitchel, MD, Steven L. Mitchell, MD, Jolene Mitchell, DO, Mark Anthony Mitchell, DO, Paul Everett Mittelstadt, MD, Eric Vincent Mittelstaedt, MD, Gary C. Mockli, MD, Michael Moeller, MD, Arthur Alfred Moeller, DO, Steffany Kate Moen, MD, Jerry L. Moench,

MD, Victoria LaVonne Moffatt, MD, Lisa Michelle Mofle, MD, Mark P. Mogen, MD, Riyad Mohama, MD, Mohamed Wasef Mohamed, MD, Rehan Mohammed, MD, Kinila Thimmappaiah Mohan, MD, Nivedita Mohari, MD, Charles W. Mohler, MD, William John Mohr III, MD, Adham Mohsen, MD, Alex Shokouhi Mohseni, MD, Anna Marieta Moise, MD, Heather Ruth Moline, MD, Mark S. Monasky, MD, Latonia Jovita Moncur, MD, Barry Monfore, MD, Michael Salvatore Montileone, MD, Laura O. Moody, MD, Iris J. Moore, MD, Gary F. Moore, MD, Homer Jackson Moore, MD, Natasha Koff Moore, DO, Aaron Drew Moorhouse, DO, Yunus Ali Moosa, MD, Courtney Jo Moose, MD, Michelle Maria Mora, DO, Joshua Dennis Morais, MD.

Ramon Alejandro Morales Jr, DO, Michael J. Moran, MD, Allon Mordel, MD, Robert Mark Mordkin, MD, Snehal Ramkrishna More, MD, Kelly Ann Morgan, MD, Jonathan Baker Morgan, MD, Charles Henry Morgan, MD, Greg Warren Morgan, MD, David Matthew Yellin Morley, MD, Monica Leigh Morman, MD, David Scott Morrell, MD, Heidi Ann Morris, MD, Christopher Andrew Morrison, MD, Esther Elaine Morrison, MD, Shelley J. Morrison, MD, Peter H. Morse, MD, Andrew Ross Mortenson, MD, Sam L. Mortimer, MD, Samuel Lucas Mortimer, MD, Roy L. Mortinsen, MD, Terrence Dewitt Morton Jr., MD, Chuanpit Moser, MD, Amiel Parviz Moshfegh, MD, Ruth G. Mosqueda Lim, MD, Drew Justin Moss, MD, Uma Maheswara Rao Motapothula, MD, M Anas Moughrabieh, MD, Francine Louise Mousseau, MD, Melissa Mae Moutray, MD, Sudhir Babu Movva, MD, Joseph Michael Mowery, DO, Alan Brent Moy, MD, Peter Ming-Sue Moy, MD, Hunter Reid Moyer, MD, Kenneth A. Muckala, MD, David Wm Mueller, DO, Joy Anna Mueller, MD, DesiRae M. Muirhead, MD, Sanjay Mukerji, MD.

Barbara Ann Muller, MD, Matthew Henry Muller, DO, Michele Nicole Mulligan-Witt, MD, William J. Mullin, MD, Alex Mulmi, MD, Gregory Eric Mumm, MD, Raiko Munankarmi, MD, David Munce, MD, Jeffrey A. Mundhenke, MD, Charan Mungara, MD, David P. Munson, MD, Patrick David Munson, MD, Lauren Marie Murer, MD, Dona Kim Murphey, MD, Michael Nicholas Murphy, MD, Shannon Lynelle Murphy, MD, Charles William Murphy, MD, Mary Cathleen Murphy, DO, Mary F. Murphy, MD, Emily Elizabeth Kenefick Murphy, MD, Brianna Renay Murphy, DO, Katherine E. Murray, MD, Jeffrey A. Murray, MD, Scott Daniel Murray, MD, Alexandra Lydia Muschenheim, MD, Abdul Azim Mustapha, MD, Martin Sua Musumbi, MD, Scott Mutchler, MD, Sunil Anand Mutgi, MD, Krishnakumar Muthu, MD.

Venkataraman Muthusamy, MD, Jack Leon-Max Mutnick, MD, Saraswati Andanappa Muttal, MD, Mark Elmer Myers, MD, Timothy V. Myers, MD, Karla G. Myhra-Bloom, MD, Arlin M. Myrmoe, MD, Susana Kyung Myung, MD, Matthew Scott Naatjes, MD, James F. Nabwangu, MD, Nandita Ramananda Nadig, MD, Rup K. Nagala, MD, Venkatesh Narayan Nagaraddi, MD, David A. Nagelhout, MD, Myung Hee Nam, MD, Rachael Nambusi, MD, Stephen Nanton, MD, Balasubramanyan Napa, MD, Mubina Nasrin, MD, Malarvizhi Natarajan, MD, Audrey Rosa Nath, MD, Nausheen Naveed, MD, Ankit Nayyar, MD, Jawad Nazir, MD, Stephen R Neabore, MD, Bijal Patel Neal, MD, Gregory Mark Neely, MD, Kari Ann Neemann, MD, Joseph Philip Neglia, MD, Gary A. Neidich, MD, Douglas Neilson, MD, Donald Fisher Karl Neilson, MD, Marci Jeanne Neilson, MD, Tyler Michelle Neitlich, MD, Malleeswari Nellore, MD.

Marcia Kay Nelsen, MD, Patrick A. Nelson, MD, Richard A. Nelson, MD, Carol Beth Nelson, MD, David C. Nelson, MD, Stephen Neale Nelson, MD, Candice L. Nelson, MD, Jennifer Lea Nelson, DO, Brett Riley Nelson, MD, Damon Lee Nelson, MD, Amy L. Nelson, MD, Daniel Richard Nelson, MD, Jenny Lynn Nelson, MD, Robert William Nelson, DO, Craig Robert Nemechek, MD, Mazen Nemeh, MD, Raymond G. Nemer, MD, Michael Troy Nesbit, MD, Cynthia L Netherton, MD, Mary Dekker Nettleman, MD, Jo M. Neubauer, MD, Tzvi Yehuda Neuman, DO, Robert J. Neumayr, MD, Etta Kathryn Nevel, MD, Terry Dean Neville, MD, Christopher Ryan Newey, DO, Adam Paul Newman, MD, Kent Jordon Newsom, DO, Sarah Joan Newton, MD, Paul Waikuen Ng, MD, Su-Ann Ng, MD, Thuy-Trang Thi Ngo, MD, Bich-Thy Nguyen Ngo, MD, Nhat Nguyen Thi Nguyen, DO, Brian Nguyen, MD, Trung Nam Nguyen, DO, Anna Ngoc Nguyen, MD, Nha Phuc Nguyen, MD, Hoang Minh Lawrence Nguyen, MD, Loe Tan Nguyen, MD, PHD.

Donald T. Nicell, MD, George A. Nicholas, MD, Stacey Rae Nieder, MD, Gregory George Niederauer, MD, Byron Scott Nielsen, MD, James L. Nielsen, MD, Mark Andrew Nielsen, MD, Shelley Nielson, MD, Peter Joachim Niemann, MD, David Mark Nierman, MD, Jesse Jacob Nieuwenhuis, MD, Rishi Alex Nigam, MD, Matthew Robert Nipe, MD, Hollis D. Nipe, MD, Jeffrey Henry John Nipper, MD, Nauman Nisar, MD, Gregory Kent Nissen, MD, Robert Brian Nixon, MD, Daniel Aboyawoh Njingeh, MD, Jason William Noble, MD, John Matthew Nobrega, MD, Jerry Noel, DO, Joan L. Nold, MD, Bryce William Noll, MD, Zachary Richard Nolz, MD, Ryan James Noonan, MD, Shani Kay Norberg, MD, Wesley John Nord, MD, Allen E. Nord, MD, Jordan Lee Nordquist, MD, Kayla Michelle Norenberg, MD, Valerie Norris, MD, Dennis L Noteboom, MD, Houman Nourkeyhani, MD, Tom F. Novacheck, MD, Michael Kevin Novick, MD, William Jacob Nowack, MD, Alexandria Marie Nowaczyk, DO, Raymond W. Nowaczyk, DO, Ryan Kenneth Nowak, MD, Bonnie Marie Nowakowski, DO, Randal Henry Noyes, DO.

Francis David Ntimba, MD, Tarik Nurkic, MD, Robert Floyd Nuss, MD, Georgiana Nuss, MD, David K Nussbaum, MD, Mohan Rao Nuthakki, MD, Ukamaka Nwakaife Nwadibia, MD, Obinna Emmanuel Nwadibia, MD, Nnamdi Arinze Nwafo, MD, Anthony Nwakama, MD, Ngozi Offiong Nwakamma-Okoro, MD, Chinyere Mgbahuru Nwosu, DO, Stanley J Nyarko, MD, Timothy Allen Nydam, MD, Verlyn Nykamp, MD, Kelsey Raye Nylander, DO, Dale Peter Nystrom, MD, Charles Patrick O'Brien, MD, Patrick John O'Brien, MD, Christopher Patrick O'Brien Jr., MD, Patrick Mark O'Brien, MD, Meghan Colleen O'Bryan, MD, Meghan Curry O'Connell, MD, Wyatt J. O'Day, MD, Cathy M O'Neil, MD, Noreen O'Shea, DO, Jeffrey Dean O'Tool, MD, Roslyn Elayne Oakley, MD, Robert G. Oatfield, MD, Stephen Kolawole Obaro, MD, Mina Fatimah Obbehat, MD, Augustine Uchechukwu Obi, MD, Clark Joseph Obr, MD, Jerry M. Obritsch, MD, Luis Alberto Ochoa Nunez, MD, Kirk M. Odden, MD, Thomas M. Odland, MD, Liem-Som Oei, MD, Theresa Dale Hong Gwat Oey, MD, Todd M. Officer, MD, Lewis Craig Ofstein, MD.

James Watson Ogletree, MD, Ayodele O. Ogunremi, MD, David W. Ohrt PhD, MD, Emuejevoke Orpheus Joseph Okoh, MD, Ebima Clifford Okundaye, MD, Scott Heitaka Okuno, MD, Jessica Leigh Olcott, MD, Timothy Frithjof Olderr, MD, Filemon E. Olegario, Jr., MD, Jonathan Caceres Olegario, MD, Gulsah Olgun, MD, Gokhan Olgun, MD, Jerry Patrick Oliaro, DO, John Rhodes Oliphant, MD, Elishia Mone Lintz Oliva, MD, Barry Durand Oliver, MD, Harvey Anthony Oliver III, MD, Donald E. Oliver, MD, Kevin Daniel Oliver, MD, Tony Iynas Oliver Elizabeth, MD, Michael L. Olivier, MD, Andrew James Ollerton, MD, Adam K. Olmsted, MD, Jamie Lund Olsen, DO, Amy Henry Olsen, MD, Lauren Elisabeth Olsen, MD, Nicholas Jay Olson, MD, Christina Marie Olson, DO, Elis Yngve Olson, MD, Jonathan James Olson, MD, David Edwin Olson Sr., MD, Lacey Ann Olson, MD, Jennifer Lea Olson, MD, Bretta May Olson, MD, Michael Lee Olson, MD, Thomas Harry Olson, MD, Paul J. Olson, MD, Brad L. Olson, MD, Mary Jo Olson, MD, James P. Olson, MD, Douglas J. Olson, MD, Hesham Rashad Omar, MD, Bonnie Belle (Brady) Omdahl, MD, Steve Ommen, MD, Francisca Ijeoma Onuoha, MD, Adam John Opbroek, MD.

Kathryn Debra Opheim, MD, Mark J. Oppenheimer, MD, Yvonne Seger Oppold, MD, Paul M. Orecchia, MD, Joseph Peter Oro, MD, Christopher Kevin Oros, DO, Keri Lynn Orstad, MD, Vanessa Ortiz-Diaz, MD, Gregory William Osmond, MD, Gregory Osmundson, MD, Alan Howard Ost, MD, Peter Ellwood Ostler, MD, Susan M. Ostrowski, MD, John C. Ottenbacher, MD, Steven Andrew Ovadia, MD, Benjamin David Owen, MD, Leycester Owens, Jr., MD, Matthew P. Owens, MD, Natalie Christina Owens-Sloan, MD, Donald C. Oxenhandler, MD, Christopher Paa, MD, Nyree Padilla, MD, Arnoldo Alejandro Padilla Vazquez, MD, Aimee Soyun Paik German, MD, Octavio Pajaro, MD, Sanjay Rajashekar Pallegar, MD, Christopher Robert Palmeiro, DO, Bradley Lane Palmer, MD, John Michael Palmer, DO, Alicia Marie Palmer Hooten, MD, Maria Palmquist, MD, Joseph Matthew Palumbo, DO, Robert J Pampin Jr., DO, Ram Prasad Paneru, MD, Giovanni Francesco Paoli, DO, Xenofon Papadopoulos, MD, Konstantina Athena Papathomas, MD, Lew W. Papendick, MD, Sandra Parada-Orrego, MD, Vinod Parameswaran, MD.

Richard Tan Lim Pardilla, MD, Paula K. Pardy, MD, Matthew T. Pardy, MD, Eugene Seh-Young Park, MD, Robin John Parker, MD, Trudi Parker, MD, Jeffrey Carl Parker, MD, Valerie Parker, MD, John Arlen Parker, MD, Rodney R. Parry, MD, Seth Parker Parsons, MD, Kenneth Charles Parsons, MD, Sirish Venkata Kumar Parvathaneni, MD, Stephen Charles Parys, MD, Ross Sanford Paskoff, MD, Alexander Wojciech Pastuszak, MD, Ravi Jaimini Patel, DO, Darshan Patel, MD, Niraj Chandrakant Patel, DO, Pravin-Kumar Patel, MD, Kartik Kailesh Patel, MD, Katan Yashavant Patel, DO, Jay Pravin Patel, MD, Anish Patel, MD, Hiren Nayan Patel, DO, Nikki Garg Patel, MD, Chirag Chandrakant Patel, MD, Niral Patel, MD, Jorge Enrique Patino Buelvas, MD, Michael Jay Patney, DO, Kunal Kumar Patra, MD.

Matthew Craig Patterson, MD, Marc H. Paul, MD, K-Lynn Paul, MD, Brad A Paulson, MD, Clay Joseph Pavlis, MD, Debra Lyn Paxton, DO, Yehuda Edo Paz, MD, Jon Alan Peacock, MD, Stephen Hilding Pearson, MD,

Shannon Ray Peck, MD, Heather Rae Peck, MD, Kim A. Pederson, MD, Eric John Pederson, DO, Curtis L. Peery, MD, Michael W. Pekas, MD, James Gordon Pelton, MD, Hillel Peltz, DO, Aaron Jennings Pemberton, MD, Michael Ray Pena, MD, Hong Qi Peng, MD, Andre Michael Pennardt, MD, Ian Joseph Penniston, DO, Patricia E. Penovich, MD, Brian Sabado Pepito, MD, Sara Lynn Pepper, MD, Alejandro Peralta Soler, MD, Kara Jean Perrelli, MD, Michael William Perry, MD, Michael Persaud, DO, John Joseph Pershing, MD, Michael Allen Person, MD, Justin Aren Charles Persson, MD, Maisha Laila Pesante Kokayi, MD, Ulises Pesce, MD, Daniel G. Petereit, MD, Stephen Ross Peters, MD, Patricia A. Peters, MD, Jane M. Peters, MD, Gregory Thomas Peters, MD, Megan Marie Petersen, MD, Kara L. Petersen, MD, Erik Douglas Peterson, MD, Paul Dennis Peterson, DO, Kent W. Peterson, MD, Judith R. Peterson, MD.

Scott N. Peterson, MD, Jeffrey Lee Peterson, MD, Linda R. Peterson, MD, Douglas Ray Peterson, MD; Kenneth Bradley Peterson, MD, Michael Evan Peterson, MD, Timothy Aaron Peterson, MD, Thomas Michael Peterson, MD, Adam Jeffrey Peterson, MD, Terri Peterson-Henry, DO, Marian S. Petrasko, MD, Travis J. Petree, MD, Linda M. Petrovich, MD, William Francis Pettit Jr., MD, Marina Petukoff, MD, Sandra M. Peynado Rojas, MD, Branden James Pfefferkorn, MD, John David Pflug, MD, Andrea Jo Pham, DO, Thong Q. Pham, MD, Scott Pham, MD, Parkpoom Phatharacharukul, MD, Jonathan Allen Phelan, DO, Jamie Michele Phifer, MD, Carson Christian Phillips, MD, Karen Gale Phillips, MD, Nancy F. Phipps, MD, Kelly Phommahaxay, MD, Abigail Grace Piazza, MD, Edward Joseph Silvio Picardi, MD, Jason Lewis Picconi, MD, PHD, Peter William Pick, MD, Michael Travis Pierce, MD, Raymond Pierce, MD, Bryant Watson Pierce, MD, Jessica Frances Pierobon, MD, Tracy J. Pierret, MD.

Jerome Pierson, MD, Michael Paul Pietila, MD, Russell Pietz, MD, Carrissa Mae Pietz, MD, Ashley Joel Pilgrim, MD, Edmund Pennington Pillsbury III, MD, Kinsey Rowe Pillsbury, MD, Ellen Mary Pinholt, MD, Jeffrey D. Pinter, MD, Ali Asim Pitafi, MD, Sapna Jugnu Pithwa, DO, Joanne Louise Pizzino, MD, Michael L. Place, MD, K. Barry Platnick, MD, Wayne A. Plooster, DO, James J. Plorde, MD, Darrell Plumage, MD, Richard Lee Plummer, MD, David Michael Plunkett, MD, Michael Bonner Plunkett, MD, Ronald Sol Pobiel, MD, Christine Pocha, MD, Cindi Jo Pochop, MD, Lee Norem Podoll, MD, Todd Kent Pogue, DO, Saurav Pokharel, MD, Robert E. Polcyn, MD, Tamara L. Poling, MD, Victor Fred Politi, MD, Tai Pollak, MD, Robert Alexander Pollock, MD, Abigail Lin Polzin, MD, Stephen Jory Pomeranz, MD.

Kelly Scott Pomerenke, MD, Nimal Joe Ponnezhan, MD, Thomas Lee Pope, Jr., MD, Nicole Marie Poppinga, MD, Douglas Ryan Porter, MD, Robert Charles Porter, MD, Ray-Bernard Portier, DO, Darin Arthur Portnoy, MD, Thomas Joel Posch, MD, Kevin J. Post, DO, David G. Potas, MD, Gorden David Potter III, MD, Troy Lane Potthoff, MD, Koreen Kay Potts, MD, Donald M. Potts, MD, Jeremy B. Poulsen, DO, Meredith Barbara Powell, MD, Audrey Ross Powell, MD, Michael Reed Powell, MD, Karen M. Powell, MD, Steven Francis Powell, MD, Janell Kay Powell, MD, Sarah P. Powell, MD, Steven Wayne Powell, MD, Robert E. Powers, MD, Jeffrey Kapler Powers, MD, John Bradford Pracyk, MD, Rajesh Pradhan, MD, Ami Prag, MD, Joseph P. Prasek, MD, Alan Goodale Pratt, MD, Babafemi Babawande Pratt, MD, Yong Huang Pratt, DO, Miranda Marie Pray-Dede, MD, Christopher Neil Premo, MD, Julia Ann Prescott-Focht, DO, Aaron A. Prestbo, MD, Leah L. Prestbo, MD, Mark P. Preston, MD, Robert C. Preston, MD, Kevin L. Preston, DO, Todd Michael Preszler, MD, Heather Lynne Walsh Preuss, MD.

Michele Andree Prevost, MD, Michael C. Preys, MD, Tyler Cole Price, MD, Christopher Edward Price, MD, Michael James Priola, DO, Brian Keith Privett, MD, Eric R. Promersberger, MD, Bruce R. Prouse, MD, Jessica Elaine Prusa Flores, MD, Tyler Anthony Ptacek, MD, Mark Ptacek, MD, Travis John Ptacek, MD, Michael Abraham Pudenz, MD, Laura Ellen Purdy, MD, Drew A. Purdy, MD, Scott J. Purintun, MD, Bhaskar Purushottam, MD, Wesley D. Putnam, MD, Adam Michael Putschoegl, DO, Kirk Puttlitz, MD, Michael Ricard Puumala, MD, Natasha Jai Pyzocha, DO, Askar A. Qalbani, MD, Fahima A. Qalbani, MD, Adnan Ali Qalbani, MD, Mohammad Zeeshan Qamar, MD, Nazia Nazir Qazi, MD, Jacob Frank Quail, MD, John Charles Querci, DO, James T. Quesenberry, MD, Erin Elizabeth Quist, MD, Mohammed Fareed Uddin Quraishi, MD, Mohammed Arshad Qureshi, MD, Furhan Rashid Qureshi, MD, Rita M. Rabenberg, MD, Veronica Elizabeth Radigan, MD, Kaikhushroo Behram Radmanesh, MD, Kelly R. Rafferty, MD.

Michael C. Rafferty, MD, Nathan Douglas Rahm, MD, Omar Ali Rahman, MD, Wijdan Mariha Rai, MD, Govarthanan Rajendiran, MD, Naveen Rajpurohit, MD, Nagarajan Nmn Ramakrishnan, MD, Dileep Raman, MD, Susan W. Ramig, MD, Dionisio R. Ramirez Jr., MD, Ramtin Thomas Ramsey, MD, Mohammed I. Ranavaya, MD, Elden Rand, MD, Bradley B. Randall, MD, Carrie Ann Kathleen Ranum, MD, Joshua Clarke Ranum, MD, Vijay Phooshkooru Rao, MD, Suprasad M Rao, MD, Zahir Alislam Rashid, MD, Daniel Ryan Rasmussen, DO, Jessica Sue Rasmussen, MD, Paul H. Rasmussen, MD, Clemencia Rasquinha, MD, Saleem Rasul, MD, George Daniel Rath, MD, Phillip Lee Rathousky, DO, Brian John Rau, MD, Namrata Abhishek Raut, MD, Daniel Young Rawson, MD, Louis C. Raymond, MD, Julie T. Raymond, MD, Rahul Suraj Razdan, MD, Bradley Norman Reames, MD, Mark A. Rector, MD.

Bruce Anthony Reddix, MD, Gaddum P. Reddy, MD, Steven T. Redmond, MD, Warren John Redmond, MD, Kayli Ann Henry Reece, MD, Jennifer Ann Reed, MD, Jonathan Grant Reed, MD, Richard H. Reed, MD, Anne Marie Reed, MD, Ralph F. Reeder, MD, Joseph Glendon Rees, DO, Robert Bradley Reeves, MD, Terry A. Reeves, MD, Eugene R. Regier, MD, Hafiz Jawad Rehman, MD, Russell Eugene Reichter, MD, Lucy M. Reifel, MD, Bruce H. Reifenrath, MD, Sarah A. Reiffenberger, MD, Dan H. Reiffenberger, MD, Alisa Lyn Reindl, MD, Bailey Alan Reindl, MD, Michael N. Reiners, MD, John Reinschmidt, MD, Justin Joseph Reisenauer, MD, Jessica Margaret Reissig, DO, Lisa A. Remer-Gillette, MD, Anita Marie Remerowski, MD, Yongsheng Ren, MD, Stewart Elvis Rendon, MD, Richard P. Renka, MD, Leonard Mark Renner, MD, Scott Robert Rennie, DO, Preston CC Renshaw, MD, Thomas B. Repas, DO, Rwoof Ahmed Reshi, MD, Patrick L. Retterath, MD, Peter Matthew Reuss, MD, Suzanne D. Reuter, MD, Paul D. Reynen, MD, and Matthew Reynen, MD, Peter Jay Reynen, MD, Glenn Thomas Reynolds, MD, Tommy R. Reynolds, MD, Andrew Y. Reynolds, MD, Abigail Mary Reynolds, MD, Ryan Douglas Reynolds, MD.

Leslie Denise Reynolds, MD, Ashley Elizabeth Reynolds, MD, Mackenzie Rae Reynolds, MD, Mohamed Mahdi Rezik, MD, Maher A. Rezkalla, MD, Richard Jinho Rhee, MD, Lisa Rho, MD, Kelly Ann Rhone, MD, Ali Khalil Riba, MD, Stuart Rice, MD, Michael T. Richardson, MD, James L. Richardson, MD, Tanya Richardson, MD, Brianna Jean Rick, MD, Christopher Eugene Rickman, MD, Shannelle Susanne Rico, MD, Andrew John Ridder, MD, Glenn A. Ridder, MD, Tim M. Ridgway, MD, Larry Wayne Ridings, MD, Gerald Michael Rieber, MD, D. Craig Rife, MD, Shaina Lynn Riggs, MD, Richard Rigmaiden, III, MD, Joseph Patrick Riley, DO, David Loren Ring, MD, Thomas J. Ripperda, MD, Sarah Jean Ristvedt, MD, Deborah Gess Ristvedt, DO, Nicolas Bravo Rivera Jr., MD, William Rizk, MD, Abrea Ann Roark, MD, Christopher James Robbins, MD, John K. Robbins, MD, Matthew Bruce Roberson, MD, Caroline Giorgiana Phippen Roberts, MD, John H. Roberts, MD, Richard Lowell Roberts, MD, Alison Marie Robinette, MD, John Wellington Robinson, MD, Jeffrey Alan Robinson, MD, Christopher Joe Robinson, MD.

Shannon Liane Robinson, MD, Asha Zakiya Robinson-Parks, MD, Bryce Allen Robison, MD, Joanna Mary Burns Robnik, MD, Fedja Alexander Roehling, MD, Hilary Rockwell, MD, Debra Jean Rodeghiero Johnston, MD, Rachel Leigh Rodel, MD, Deborah Black Rodes, DO, Elena Rose Rodgers-Rieger, MD, Mark D. Rodig, MD, Yvan Tran Rodrigues, MD, Dagoberto Jesus Rodriguez, MD, Manuel Alvarez Rodriguez, MD, Maria Margarita Rodriguez, MD, Francisco Bernardo Rodriguez IV, MD, Paul Alden Rodriguez, MD, Javier Rodriguez Kovacs, MD, George Herman Roepke III, MD, Scott Taggart Roethle, MD, Carol Lynn Roge, MD, Sean Michael Rogers, MD, Kenneth H. Rogotzke, DO, Christopher Rohde, MD, Karsten Jon Rohlfs, MD, Susan M. Rohr, DO, Luis Alexander Rojas-Espaillat, MD, Richard James Rolfes, MD, Eric Scott Rolfsmeyer, MD, Luke Benedict Roller, MD, Laura Elizabeth Romcevich, MD.

Eyal Ron, MD, Thom W. Rooke, MD, Sandra K. Rooks, MD, Rachel Harriet Wolfson Root, MD, Elmo J. Rosario, MD, Robert Edward Rosenbaum, MD, Eric Lee Rosenberg, MD, Danielle Davida Prince Rosenkrans, MD, Kurt Andre Rosenkrans, MD, Calvin A. Roseth, MD, David Rosinsky, MD, Steven M. Ross, MD, Allan Edward Ross, MD, Mark Alfred Ross, MD, Jaron Duane Ross, MD, Jennifer Katherine Rossi, MD, William R. Rossing, MD, David R. Rossing, MD, Nancy J. Rost, MD, Delford Mark Roth, DO, Cassie Applegate, Iva Bigge, Jennifer Bonner, Megan Burgers, Tammi Chaney, Brandi Craig, Shayla Daschle, Audra Degroot, Terry Engelmann, Theresa Friend, Debbie Hayden-Miller, Courtney Heynen, Rose Marie Hoiten, Chelsea Iversen, Mary Kelly, Janice Mangelsen, Gwen McCormick, Barbara Mellor, Vickie Reiff.

Sarah Roe, Susan Rooks, Hannah Sammons, Brenna Tate, Erin Vande Lune, Teresa VanderStouwe, Lisa VanGerpen, Dorinda Vojta, Mary Wallin, Abby Walton, Heather Abels, Carletta Aberle, Melissa Aberle, Kali

Aberle, Michelle Abraham, Beth Abrahamson, Kathryn Adams, Marybeth Adams, Cassandra Aesoph, Chelsey Ahlers, Holly Ahlers, Lauren Albers, Amy Albrecht, Leah Albrecht, Tabitha Ammann, Emily Andersen, Brenda Andersen, Judi Anderson, Alyssa Anderson, Amanda Anderson, Shanna Anderson, Jennifer Anderson, Brittany Anderson, Kelsey Anderson, Kyle Anderson, Patricia Annetts, Robin Arends, Afton Artz, Wendy Asher, Lisa Atnip, Stacy Auch White, Katie Augspurger.

Over the past year they have faced challenges most of us cannot even imagine. They have shown incredible resolve in the face of adversity. They have shown us all how to seek positivity and hope in each day as we weather the storms that come our way.

I couldn't be more thankful to represent the incredible people across South Dakota and all over the nation who work hard each day, not for fame, not for recognition or for money, but for the betterment of their communities. This is what makes America strong. I am grateful for the opportunity to recognize these hard-working individuals.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I apologize for missing these votes, I was unable to be present. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 63 and NAY on Roll Call No. 64.

WILLIAM (BILL) ALEXANDER McKEE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize William (Bill) Alexander McKee of Golden, Colorado who passed away on February 7, 2021.

Bill was born in Lake Forest, Illinois and grew up in Barrington, Illinois. He graduated from Barrington High School in 1970 and went on to graduate from the University of Denver in 1974 with a B.A. in Political Science. In 1977, he received a Masters of Urban Affairs with an emphasis in Budgeting and Administration from the University of Colorado.

In 1979, Bill began his career with the Colorado Department of Health and Environment in the Water Quality Division. During his 26 years at the department, he worked to protect the rivers, lakes and streams of Colorado. Whether working with grants, permits, regional planning, nonpoint source pollution or as the Upper Colorado Watershed coordinator, Bill realized water pollution was about all of us working together and influenced how various jurisdictions were expected to comply with the Clean Water Act.

Bill met his wife Suzy through common friends in 1978. They married in 1979 at Pine Valley Ranch in Pine, Colorado and moved to Golden, Colo. soon thereafter. During his 38 years in Golden, Bill was constantly working to improve his community. Bill embraced Golden, as he did water. He served from 1988 to 1996 on the Golden Planning Commission and was elected to the Golden City Council from 1996 to 2004. Bill's time on both city council and the planning commission coincided with important changes in the history of Golden. Alongside fellow city leaders, Bill worked to revitalize downtown and bring more business and tourism to Golden. Many of Bill's lasting contributions were to the boards and organizations where he served, such as his tenure as president of the Friends of the Golden History Museum and Park. Bill helped shepherd this organization from a volunteer organization to the professionally run museum it is today. For many years, Bill also volunteered for the Leadership Golden Alumni Association Board.

In 2003, Bill joined the board of the Colorado Watershed Assembly. He served on the board for 10 years and as the chair for four years. Bill helped grow the yearly Sustaining Colorado's Watershed Conference into a top-notch multi-day event. He was a guiding force, a natural leader, and he saw the value of a statewide conference for watershed groups, private and government sectors, and concerned citizens to gather and share their mission of ensuring clean water for all Coloradans.

Bill loved spending time with his family, gathering with close friends, hiking with his faithful dog Grace, attending local ribbon cuttings, attending meetings, attending more meetings, following our local sports teams, reading the Denver Post daily, skiing the steeps, golfing, biking, playing the guitar and occasionally his flute, making the best spaghetti sauce ever, enjoying quality scotch while smoking a cigar around the fire, whistling, singing to the radio, spending time in the mountains of Colorado, and traveling.

Bill was a devoted husband and loving father and grandfather. He is survived by his wife, Suzy McKee, their children Meredith McKee, Gregory (Kari Hogan McKee); and grandchildren, Frances, Ace, and Mac McKee. I appreciate and thank him for a lifetime of service to our community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL CHILDREN'S MUSEUM ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to introduce the National Children's Museum Act, which would require the General Services Administration (GSA) to enter into a cooperative agreement with the National Children's Museum (NCM), a congressionally designated museum, to allow the museum to remain in the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center, a federally owned building in the nation's capital, without charge for the duration of its existing lease. The National Building Museum operates under such an agreement. Last Congress, on November 17, 2020, the House passed this bill by voice vote.

This bill would allow the NCM, the nation's first combination children's museum and science center, to remain centrally located in the nation's capital for the benefit of the millions who visit and live in the District and the national capital region (NCR). Originally named the Capital Children's Museum, the NCM was a staple in D.C. for decades. The institution opened in 1974 in a former convent on H Street Northeast.

In 2003, Congress recognized the immense value in having a children's museum in D.C. and officially designated the museum as the NCM. Now, the museum is bringing new and innovative science, technology, engineering, arts and math (STEAM) exhibits to the nation's capital, building on more than 30 years of educating D.C. children and families. Despite the many benefits it brings to the nation's capital, the NCM is an outlier. It is the only congressionally designated museum expected to pay rent in a federal building.

Importantly, this bill would relieve concerns about the ability of the NCM to survive the coronavirus pandemic. When the museum reopened last year in the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center, it immediately attracted many visitors from throughout the NCR and the nation, but was forced by the coronavirus pandemic to close 18 days later. At this time, the museum remains closed until further notice. Still, the museum has continued to offer valuable STEAM resources to our children as they navigate these new challenging learning circumstances, including over 75 at-home experiment and project video programs, monthly podcasts, virtual field trips and a Climate Action Heroes Digital Exhibit, among other resources.

This bill would allow the NCM to remain centrally located in the nation's capital for the benefit of the millions who visit and live in the District and the NCR.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING CARLEY DEERY AS IOWAN OF THE WEEK

HON. CYNTHIA AXNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Carley Deery from Carlisle High School as Iowan of the Week. Carley is a senior at Carlisle High School with a passion for animals. Her father David Deery is a senior fire medic at Des Moines Fire Station No. 3. He told his daughter a story of resuscitating a dog from a house fire using a pet oxygen mask. Carley soon learned of the lack of resources in having these specialized masks available to first responders in Polk County. This story and her passion for animals inspired her to launch a campaign to purchase much-needed pet oxygen masks for area ambulances.

Carley immediately went to work with her family: baking and selling dog treats, creating an online fundraiser and ultimately teaming up with the ARL to meet her goal of every ambulance in the metro area having a pet oxygen mask. Recently, she was able to present a check for more than $2,000 to help make the goal a reality. Her work didn't stop there. Carley has continued her effort of not only masks, but assisting the ARL in providing housing, food and medical care to animals who need assistance after a disaster.

As an animal lover myself Carley's story is inspiring and a testament to how important our

animals and pets are to our community. I am so happy to hear that the 47 masks that Carley helped raise the funds for will benefit nine different agencies with 22 of them staying right here in Des Moines. I am proud to represent constituents like Carley who truly exemplify what it means to be an Iowan. I will continue to fight in Congress for communities like Carley's to ensure they have the support and voice they deserve.

HONORING ROBERT MEEK JR.

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert Meek Jr. who has served as my District Director since 2016.

To put it simply, Bob is a man of both conviction and courage. No matter the duty, he executes it with poise, a strong dedication to service, and with an abiding gratitude for those he works alongside.

As a retired Colonel of the U.S. Army Reserve, as the son of a Second Lieutenant who served as a B–25 Mitchell bomber copilot in World War II, and father of 3 military sons, Bob has dedicated his life not only to being an advocate for military families, but also serving as a strong voice for servicemembers both past and present.

From traveling thousands of miles across North Carolina's Fifth District with me to meeting with countless scores of proud North Carolinians who are proud to live there, Bob has always acted with a servant's heart, one of his many features that everyone admires.

I speak for both myself and the staff when I say working alongside Bob has been an honor. As he enters this new phase of his life, may God continue to bless him, his family, and the lives of everyone he will continue to serve.

IN GRATITUDE TO BLAIR BOWMAN

HON. HALEY M. STEVENS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exceptional constituent and community leader in Michigan's 11th District, Mr. Blair Bowman.

Mr. Bowman is a lifelong Michigander who graduated from Farmington High School in Farmington, Michigan, obtained his undergraduate degree from Michigan State University and law degree from University of Detroit School of Law.

In 2005, after following in his father's footsteps by entering the real estate brokerage and development field, he built a facility in Novi, Michigan, which operates today as the Suburban Collection Showplace. This is one of a few examples in the country of a truly privately owned and operated convention and exposition center, with nearly two million people passing through annually.

When the COVID–19 pandemic struck, Mr. Bowman wasted no time in offering his center to be transformed into an alternative care facility for COVID–19 patients. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit District led the 250,000 square foot conversion of the Suburban Collection Showplace convention center into a medical facility in 15 days, where they created a 250-bed space for patients from area hospitals.

Now, the previous regional field hospital is hosting one of Oakland County's COVID–19 vaccination clinics, helping to defeat this virus once and for all.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the outstanding contributions Mr. Bowman has made to his community, and to our country at large.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, due to previously scheduled travel, I was unable to vote in person in the House of Representatives on March 8, 2021. On that day, I missed two recorded votes. On Roll Call No. 63, had I been present, I would have voted ''Nay.'' On Roll Call No. 64, had I been present, I would have voted ''Nay.''

HONORING PAUL JEWELL

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I offer these remarks in honor of Paul Wesley Jewell of Salem, Virginia, who passed away on February 17, 2021 at the age of 79. Mr. Jewell was a photographer by profession who actively participated in Salem's community organizations.

Mr. Jewell was born on December 28, 1941 in Roanoke County to Curtis W. and Ethel Starkey Jewell. As a young man, he graduated from Andrew Lewis High School, excelled at athletics, and belonged to the Boy Scouts of America. He made the community he grew up in his lifelong home. As a professional photographer, he owned several studios, including the Deyerle Studio for over 25 years. After retiring from professional photography, Mr. Jewell remained active in the Salem area as a member of the First United Methodist Church of Salem and of Taylor Masonic Lodge No. 23 and as a funeral assistant at John M. Oakey & Son Funeral Home.

Mr. Jewell is survived by son Paul ''Matt'' Jewell and wife, Peggy; daughters Beth Kennedy and Susan Grimberg and her husband John; granddaughters Cierra McDaniel and husband Jared, Kristen Porter and husband Josh, Kaitlyn Duhon and husband Matt, Kyndsey Cook, Kendall Cook, Gracie Grimberg, and Olivia Grimberg; and great-grandchildren Aria McDaniel, James Duhon, Avery Duhon, and Mason Duhon. I would like to extend to them my condolences.

THANK YOU SKIP MARANEY

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I will always treasure the encouragement of Skip Maraney during my service in Congress.

For many years, he was the mainstay of the Breakfast Club on Wednesday at Longworth Cafeteria for members of Congress, Capitol Police officers, and staffers.

I appreciate him inviting me to co-perform with Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON in the Hexagon Theatre political satirical musical comedy revue.

Skip is recognized as an Honorary Resident of South Carolina from over twenty years of vacationing at Hilton Head Island.

The following is an official announcement of his upcoming retirement issued by the National Star Route Mail Contractors Association:

JOHN V. ''SKIP'' MARANEY

Skip Maraney is retiring after 52 years of employment as the executive director and lobbyist with the National Star Route Mail Contractors Association. The Association's office is located at 325 East Capitol Street Washington, D.C.

Skip will be honored for his steadfast and loyal service by the Board of Directors of the Association at a regional meeting of members on April 19, 2021, in Baltimore, Md.

Skip is the second executive director of the Association. The Association is made up of over 500 members across the United States and U.S. territories, and the Association represents approximately 1,800 contracts to the United Postal Service.

Members of the Association are independent business owners who contract with the United States Postal Service to haul mail/deliver mail in areas of the United States where the Postal Service doesn't deliver. In the rural areas of the county the Star Route contractors deliver what is referred to as the last mile.

Skip has outlasted 14 Postmaster Generals, nine Presidential Administrations, countless members of Congress, and countless Postal Service transportation managers. Skip has attended countless hearings on matters of postal reform legislation held by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and Committee on Ways and Means. Skip is known for expertise on all legislative matters relating to the Postal Service.

Skip is a true shoe-leather lobbyist. He believes meeting a member of Congress or a committee staffer in person instead of exchanging emails, texting, or talking over the phone. He claims it is always harder to say ''no'' to a person when talking face to face.

Skip's genuine smile and firm handshake made him distinguishable among the staff and visitors in the halls of Congress. Over the years Skip was often been mistaken as a former member of Congress.

HONORING IDA SHANOSKI COVUCCI

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize Ida Shanoski Covucci and her upcoming 100th birthday.

As a daughter of Polish immigrants, Mrs. Shanoski Covucci was born and raised in Scranton, PA. She was married to her husband George for more than 50 years and has three sons, 10 grandchildren, and 9 great-grandchildren. During her life, she served honorably in the Women's Army Corps during World War II. Though this past year she contracted COVID–19, being the strong woman she is, she recovered quickly.

Mrs. Shanoski Covucci, a remarkable woman, will be celebrating her 100th birthday on March 15th.

Please join me in honoring Ida Shanoski Covucci, may we learn from her experiences.

IN RECOGNITION REV. DR. BARBARA CAIN

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Rev. Dr. Barbara Cain for her service as the Moderator of the Northern Neck Baptist Association, Inc. Founded in 1877, the NNBA now serves 31 churches across the Northern Neck of Virginia. Dr. Cain has led this organization since 2018, and it has benefited greatly from her leadership.

As Moderator, Dr. Cain established NNBA Committees on Land Acquisition and Social Justice. Additionally, she worked tirelessly with the Baptist General Convention of Virginia and the Lott Carey Baptist Foreign Mission Convention. Under Dr. Cain's leadership, NNBA also received a grant for its Tutorial Advocacy Program. Dr. Cain's impressive dedication and leadership guided NNBA throughout both the COVID–19 pandemic and a time of unrest in the community.

A former teacher, Dr. Cain found her calling in ministry. She is the founder and pastor of Abiding Faith Baptist Church in Kilmarnock, VA. Previously, Dr. Cain served as president of both the Northumberland and the Lancaster Ministerial Associations. In her free time, Dr. Cain enjoys salt-water fishing and spending time with her eleven grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I am thankful for Dr. Cain's service to both the Northern Neck Baptist Association, Inc., and the entire Northern Neck community. Her sacrifice, commitment, and dedication are truly extraordinary, and it is my honor to recognize Rev. Dr. Barbara Cain today.

HONORING MR. CLYDE MOODY SIEBMAN

HON. PAT FALLON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, Clyde Moody Siebman—a purveyor of Texas history, self-anointed Cowboy, avid gun enthusiast, legendary lawyer, loving husband, father, grandfather, son, brother, uncle, cousin, and friend—died March 4, 2021. Though his sudden departure leaves a profound void across many spectrums, it was in keeping with Clyde's lifelong wish to ''break and not rust'' when his time came for the Lord to call him home.

Born November 26, 1958, in Sherman, Texas, Clyde spent his early years in the nearby town of Pottsboro. His family then moved to Plano, Texas, for his father's employment before Clyde graduated from Plano Senior High School in 1977. He attended Southern Methodist University (SMU), where he earned a dual undergraduate degree in Business Administration and Psychology in 3½ years and then a Juris Doctor in 1984 on a full scholarship. He earned many distinctions during college and law school, including a Departmental Distinction in Psychology for his work to address mental competency and the law.

While in law school, Clyde met Carol Ann Mumm, a fellow SMU law student. They married the year after graduation and were blessed with a beautiful 35-year marriage. They practiced law together before Carol became a judge and were the proud parents of beloved daughter, Elizabeth Forrest, who followed in their footsteps, became a lawyer, and is now a named partner in the firm her father co-founded—Siebman Forrest LLP. Clyde's niece, Becca Skupin, joined the firm in 2019.

Clyde's 35-year legal career earned him the well-deserved recognition of being one of the top lawyers in the state of Texas. Board Certified in Civil Trial Law by the Texas Board of Legal Specialization, Clyde had been included in the annual Texas Super Lawyers list published by Thomson Reuters legal division in Texas Monthly magazine since the list debuted in 2003. He maintained an ''AV'' Peer Reviewed ranking (very high to exemplary) by Martindale-Hubbell for over two decades, and he earned selection to The Best Lawyers in America based on his expertise in Patent, Trademark, Copyright and Commercial Litigation. Clyde was named the 2018 Lawyer of the Year for Patent Litigation and 2020 Lawyer of the Year for Copyright Litigation in Dallas-Fort Worth in The Best Lawyers in America.

Clyde began his federal practice serving as a law clerk to the late United States District Judge Paul Brown. He traveled throughout the district alongside Judge Brown while serving the Sherman, Texarkana, and Beaumont Divisions of the Eastern District of Texas. Clyde has appeared as counsel in more than 500 Eastern District of Texas cases. In addition to maintaining a robust state court practice throughout his career, he regularly represented clients in the Northern and Western Districts of Texas and before the Federal Circuit and 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

Clyde was a frequent lecturer on a variety of legal topics and regularly participated in prominent programs and initiatives, including the Eastern District of Texas Bar Association, New York Intellectual Property Law Association, the Sedona Conference, and the Leahy Institute of Advanced Patent Studies. He was also a member of the delegation of attorneys and judges that presented the first patent mock trial at Beijing University in China in 2012 where he delivered a presentation on U.S. trial practices at Southwestern University School of Law and Political Science in Chongqing, China. Clyde served as the current Chairman of the Bench Bar Conference of the Eastern District of Texas and as Chairman of the Advisory Committee for the Institute for Law and Technology of the Center for American and International Law in Plano (formerly Southwestern Legal Foundation).

As he did in the legal arena, Clyde made a profound impact in public affairs. He was a Texas Elector in 2000, serving as a member of the Presidential Electoral College in one of the closest presidential races in American history. Clyde also served by way of Gubernatorial appointment as Chairman of the Grayson County Regional Mobility Authority, Commissioner of the Red River Interstate Compact Commission, Member of the Board of Directors for the Red River Authority of Texas, and as Commissioner of the Red River Boundary Commission, where he played a key role in resolving the long-time boundary dispute between Texas and Oklahoma. Clyde also holds the unique distinction of being named as Conservator of the Riverbend Water Resources District by the 82nd Texas Legislature, helping to settle a decades-long legal battle over water issues in East Texas and Southwest Arkansas. He also played a pivotal role in the transition of both Grayson County and the state of Texas from Democrat to Republican-held majorities. Though a life-long conservative, Clyde was also respected for working across the political aisle when it served the public interest.

Despite his many prominent roles, Clyde is probably best known for his personal generosity, fun-loving spirit, and willingness to help others, both great and small. His greatest pleasures were hosting gatherings for family and friends, barbecuing, stomping around the woods, shooting guns, collecting Texas historical memorabilia, and travel adventures, whether planned or spontaneous. He and Carol gave generously to countless charitable organizations, including the Christian Global Missions, True Options Pregnancy Center, and Preston EMS, among others. They were also long-time members of the Church of Christ in Sherman and in Pottsboro.

Clyde is survived by his wife, Carol Siebman, daughter Elizabeth Siebman Forrest and her husband, John Forrest, and granddaughter Kendall Adele. He is also survived by his mother, Carol Sue Siebman, mother-in-law Florence Mumm, sister Annette Siebman Skupin, whom he loved very much, and her husband Jon Skupin, nieces and nephew Becca, Katie and Sam Skupin, nephews Joseph and Jake Mumm and their respective spouses Kristin and Jessi and children Parker and Joy, Aunt and Uncle James and Clydene Short, and a host of cousins who he remained close with through his life—CB Pippin, Jim Pippin, Robin Towery, Melanie Qualls, Randy Short, and a host of friends and colleagues who will miss him very much. He is preceded in death by his father Newell Siebman and brother-in-law John Mumm.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LATE RUSH LIMBAUGH SHARING JIM PATTERSON'S COLUMN ON AIR

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to bring attention to Jim Patterson's column being read by the late Rush Limbaugh.

When friends called to tell Alabamian Jim Patterson that Rush Limbaugh was reading

his column for The Hill to his radio audience, Patterson thought it was a joke.

Later, Patterson found the transcript and audio of the broadcast on Mr. Limbaugh's website. Patterson listened to the biggest name in Talk Radio read his work, ''Congress Must Lead on Security as Obama is Irrelevant.'' Jim Patterson remains greatly flattered that El Rushbo read his Alabama Dittohead's work to his 50 million listeners. I include in the RECORD the original column below:

CONGRESS MUST LEAD ON SECURITY AS OBAMA IS IRRELEVANT

(By Jim Patterson, Jan. 14, 2015)

THE VIEWS EXPRESSED BY CONTRIBUTORS ARE THEIR OWN AND NOT THE VIEW OF THE HILL

The utter failure of the Obama administration can be measures in so many ways, from the number of beheaded American journalists, to embarrassing heads of state by spying on German Chancellor Angela Merkle's personal mobile phone, to callously calling Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, a war hero, ''chicken shit'' and a ''coward.''

Secretary of State John F. Kerry, a longtime member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, suggests Israel is an apartheid state. By supporting Hamas and its ally the Palestinian Authority, Obama and Kerry have threatened the lives of Jews around the world in the name of human rights for terrorists.

He doesn't realize Gaza is occupied by terrorist Hamas intent on killing Israeli children until they destroy the Jewish state. Kerry thinks Tweeting will stop the Russian war on the Ukraine. America is without a foreign policy at a dangerous time.

Obama and Kerry sit on their hands as international cyberattacks proliferate raising security costs for U.S. corporations and small businesses, and prices for consumers. They allow cyberterrorists to steal national security data and threaten the White House, NATO, the National Security Agency, the Defense Department and other government agencies.

Due to Obama's total inaction, the U.S. is great risk of a crippling cyber doomsday, a day when there is no Internet. The president gets tough on nuclear enabled North Korea for hacking a worthless Hollywood film, while he does nothing to prevent such attacks on the national security of our nation and military, diplomatic and industrial assets abroad.

Our country is leaderless on security. Voters realized this in November and voted for change in Congress. Voters want Congress to reverse the leaderless Obama administration with strategies to prevent the continued decline of the United States that Obama is helpless to address.

Both Obama and Kerry refused to participate in the Paris rally for liberty in the wake of radical Islamic terror attacks on press freedom. What are their priorities? They won't participate with the civilized world by declaring war on radical Islam. What are their values? They are inviting more vicious killings of journalists and freedom loving people around the world by doing nothing.

Americans, including this writer, symbolically voted for an African American president in hopes he could lead our country nationally and internationally and that he could put to rest lingering racial issues.

Racial tensions are greater today than in the 1960's. The world is on the brink of disaster.

The Obama administration is asleep. The president doesn't want to wake up until his term is over so he can proclaim his great single accomplishment: Being the nation's first African American president.

His record is void of any substantive accomplishments.

Congress has considerable work to do bring our nation back from the brink of Obama's multiple leadership disasters. I am confident Senate Majority leader Mitch McConnell (R–Ky.), House Speaker John Boehner (R–Ohio), and the growing rank of Democrats disgusted by what Obama has done to our country and the globe can reverse course.

Congress must realize Obama is no longer relevant. He has wasted his opportunity to lead. He has lost the confidence of the American people and world leaders. It is Congress that must lead.

In 1980 presidential candidate Ronald Reagan debating President Jimmy Carter while the economy was in shambles with record unemployment, record interest rates, and with our nation seen as an international laughingstock, told America he was a leader who had a plan to bring the country back. Recovery, candidate Reagan told the American people, is when Jimmy Carter loses his job.

President Reagan delivered on his promises. Obama has failed.

Congress must act immediately to secure our country from further cyberattacks and threats to Americans and assets at home and abroad.

But real security will not be restored until Obama loses his security badge to enter the White House. That day cannot come too soon.

Patterson, a former Washington diplomat, is a San Francisco-based writer and speaker.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing Jim Patterson and his column being read on air by the late Rush Limbaugh.

INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION ON POSTAL SERVICE CONTRACT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce a resolution expressing deep concern with the U.S. Postal Service's misguided decision to issue a contract for new delivery vehicles that fails to meet our nation's economic and climate goals. The Postal Service owns and operates the largest civilian vehicle fleet with over 200,000 vehicles. Unfortunately, most of the fleet vehicles date back to 1994 and are fuel inefficient, unsafe, carbon emitting and aging.

Our nation owes a debt of gratitude to the letter carriers and all postal workers who must face down these challenges all while carrying out the herculean, constitutionally mandated task of delivering mail to all addresses.

Yet, major GOP donor, Postmaster General DeJoy recently announced that while the Postal Service will procure up to 165,000 vehicles, only ten percent will be electric powered. Instead of building up the Postal Service, DeJoy has taken a wrecking ball to the institution, including during the 2020 presidential elections.

I am thankful that President Biden has taken executive action to ensure our nation is meeting our climate goals by creating good paying green jobs here in the United States. Tragically, the USPS decision takes a major step backward.

That is why this resolution strongly urges the Postal Service to freeze the contract until a review can be undertaken to ensure there was no undue political influence and that the contract is consistent with President Biden's executive order and the Paris Climate Accord.

We cannot squander this opportunity to develop green supply chains here at home that will ensure a cleaner, more stable future for a burgeoning 21st century domestic vehicle industry.

I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE RESOLUTION 117–10

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, as Chairperson of the Committee on House Administration and pursuant to section 3 of Committee Resolution 117–10, a Resolution to Establish Procedures in Contested Election Cases Properly Filed Under the Federal Contested Election Act, I am hereby including in the RECORD a copy of the Committee Resolution.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

A Resolution

117TH CONGRESS

Committee Resolution 117–10

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH PROCEDURES IN CONTESTED ELECTION CASES PROPERLY FILED UNDER THE FEDERAL CONTESTED ELECTION ACT

Be it resolved, that the Committee on House Administration, under the authority of clause 1(k)(12) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and in accordance with the Federal Contested Election Act, 2 U.S.C. §§381–396, sets forth the following procedures to be followed by the Committee for contested election cases in which written notice of intention to contest an election has been properly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

PROCEDURES IN CONTESTED ELECTION CASES PROPERLY FILED UNDER THE FEDERAL CONTESTED ELECTION ACT

SECTION 1. FILINGS BY CONTESTANT AND CONTESTEE.

(a) Filing Authorization.—No pleading, motion (other than a motion for leave to file), brief, or other paper may be filed by either party unless expressly authorized or directed by the Federal Contested Election Act, or by the Committee, the Chairperson, or a task force of the Committee.

(b) Contestant's Response.—If a contestee files a motion under 2 U.S.C. §383(b), the contestant may file a response. The contestant shall file and serve the response as soon as practicable, and no later than 21 days after service of the contestee's motion or 21 days after issuance of these regulations, whichever is later. The response must not exceed 13,000 words. If filed and served before issuance of these regulations, a contestant's response that complies with this word limit shall be deemed authorized notwithstanding subsection (a).

(c) Contestee's Reply.—If a contestant files a response as described in subsection (b), the contestee may file a reply. The contestee shall file and serve the reply as soon as practicable, and no later than 7 days after service of the contestant's response or 7 days after issuance of these regulations, whichever is

later. The reply must not exceed 6,000 words. If filed and served before issuance of these regulations, a contestee's reply that complies with this word limit shall be deemed authorized notwithstanding subsection (a).

(d) Word Limits.—Except as expressly provided by the Committee, the Chairperson, or a task force of the Committee, a motion or brief must not exceed 13,000 words, except for a reply brief, which must not exceed 6,000 words: The word limits do not include any cover page, table of contents, table of authorities, certificate of counsel, signature block, proof of service, or affidavit. or other exhibit. The word limits do include headings, footnotes, and quotations.

(e) Hearing on Papers.—The Committee shall hear and decide any motion under 2 U.S.C. §383 on the papers, without conducting oral argument or a hearing.

SEC. 2. FURTHER BRIEFING BY CONTESTANT AND CONTESTEE.

(a) If the Committee denies a contestee's motion under 2 U.S.C. §383(b) or postpones its disposition, the Committee, the Chairperson (following consultation with the ranking minority member), a task force of the Committee, or the Chairperson of a task force (following consultation with its ranking minority member) may request that each party file and serve no later than 10 days after notice of that action a brief that:

(1) expresses the party's views and answers any specific questions asked by a request made under this subsection about specific procedures, legal principles, and timelines that should control the course of the contested election case and facilitate the case's disposition; and

(2) explains how the party's views and answers in paragraph (1) comport with the Constitution, the Federal Contested Election Act, precedents of the House of Representatives, and any other applicable authorities.

(b) A brief filed by a party under subsection (a) must comply with the limitations for a brief under section 1(d).

(c) No later than 7 days after service of a brief filed by a party under subsection (a), the opposing party may file a reply brief, which must comply with the limitations for a reply brief under section 1(d).

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION AND NOTIFICATION OF RESOLUTION.

Following adoption, these regulations shall be made available to the House and the public by publication in the Congressional Record and on the Committee's website, and transmitted to the contestants and contestees in any contested election case properly filed in the 117th Congress on or before the date of adoption, or their attorneys.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This resolution shall be effective upon adoption by the Committee.

Adopted February 19, 2021.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVID WOOLLEY

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today to mourn and recognize the passing of a bastion of the town of Old Lyme, Connecticut and a devoted family man, Mr. Dave Woolley. After living a rich life not with material possessions, but rather with friendship and compassion for all, Dave passed away peacefully on January 30, 2021.

Born and raised in Longmeadow, Massachusetts to Doris and Harry Woolley, he moved on from the state shortly after graduating from University of Massachusetts, Amherst with a bachelor's in business administration in 1955.

After enlisting in the Navy and honorably serving his nation, we in Connecticut became blessed with his giving nature when he began a new chapter in his life in Hartford, Connecticut. Employing his degree from UMass Amherst, David first started as a bank officer with Hartford National Bank & Trust Co. His intelligence and judgment made him a success administering business loans within the community first in Hartford and then to a new position at the Plainfield Bank & Trust Co. in eastern Connecticut and then Washington Trust in Westerly, Rhode Island. He retired in 2009.

While he was rightfully proud of his work—as demonstrated by more than 52 years of dedication to his profession—it was never meant to be his full purpose in life. Always the delightful extrovert, he employed his time outside of the job to establish the strongest of ties in his local community—which to Dave also meant expanding family ties. He moved permanently to his Old Lyme home in 1989 where he formed a loving connection to his constant friend and companion, Beverly Curry. The two of them together in this idyllic shoreline town were a constant presence in civic, political and charitable events. As a candidate for Congress, I was lucky enough to benefit from their popularity and community connections when they tirelessly supported my candidacy year in and year out.

Throughout and prior to his permanent residence in Old Lyme, David was heavily involved in numerous organizations throughout the region and state. Most notably, he served 11 years as a board member to the Connecticut Police Academy; 20 years as an affiliate of then State Chairman for the American Heart Association of Connecticut; and more than 45 years as a member across five different chapters in the Rotary Club. Ending his tenure as a member of the Niantic Rotary, it should not go without mentioning his service as President of two of the Clubs, partially leading him to earn the Paul Harris Award—the highest accolade presented by the Rotary Club.

Always a force of altruism, Dave's commitment to creating a stronger community truly took off once he connected his financial aptitude with the township of Old Lyme. Beginning in 1994, Dave joined a local party organization and was elected shortly thereafter to the Board of Finance in 1995. He served in the capacity as a finance specialist, helping to run the budgets for the town's essential services. His leadership in the town was clear and long lasting as he was also elected Chairman to the same local party in 2002. Dave led and constructed a strong party infrastructure that would become this fundamental part of the community, establishing hallmark fundraisers and further devoting his tenure to expanding the locality's electorate. He served in these roles until his latest days, staying active even after fully stepping down from leadership positions in 2019.

Having dedicated a life of spreading faith in the most local ties, the strength of Dave's interest in family and friends could not be emphasized enough. Dave was an incredible listener and always made time for people, making him destined from the start to bring a brand of dignity to his community and by extension, his family. His memory continues on through a long list of individuals: his partner Beverly; son and daughter-in-law Michael and Patricia Woolley and grandchildren Katherine and Alexander; stepchildren Laurie, James, David, Steven and their families; as well as his sister and brother-in-law Patricia and Michael Cronin.

Madam Speaker, it is an honor to represent constituents as honorable and impactful as David. While we all mourn his loss, we can at least find solace that his story, memory and purpose lives on through countless others. I ask that the entire House join me in recognizing the life of David Bronson Woolley, also never forgetting the importance of building our connections with others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN HERN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. HERN. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, due to the frequent changes to the Congressional schedule, I missed the votes on March 8, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 63, and NAY on Roll Call No. 64.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from votes on March 8, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 63, and NAY on Roll Call 64.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 2021

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I was unfortunately unable to attend votes on March 8, 2021, due to unavoidable personal obligations.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 63, and NAY on Roll Call No. 64.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1409–S1432

Measures Introduced: Thirty-six bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 617–652, and S. Res. 97–101. **Pages S1422–23**

Appointments:

Commission on the Naming of Items of the Department of Defense that Commemorate the Confederate States of America or Any Person Who Served Voluntarily with the Confederate States of America: The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 116–283, on behalf of the Majority Leader of the Senate and the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, appointed the following individual as a member of the Commission on the Naming of Items of the Department of Defense that Commemorate the Confederate States of America or Any Person Who Served Voluntarily with the Confederate States of America: LTG Thomas P. Bostick (ret.) of Virginia. **Page S1432**

Fudge Nomination—Cloture: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Marcia Louise Fudge, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. **Pages S1409–11, S1420–21**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 69 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. EX. 111), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1421**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, March 10, 2021, post-cloture, as provided under the order of March 6, 2021. **Page S1432**

Garland Nomination—Cloture: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Merrick Brian Garland, of Maryland, to be Attorney General. **Page S1421**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 70 yeas to 29 nays (Vote No. EX. 112), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1421**

Haaland Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Debra Anne Haaland, of New Mexico, to be Secretary of the Interior. **Pages S1411–20**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Michael Stanley Regan, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. **Pages S1411–12**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1411**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1411**

Nomination Received: Senate received the following nomination:

Uzra Zeya, of Virginia, to be an Under Secretary of State (Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights). **Page S1432**

Messages from the House: **Page S1422**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1423–24**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1424–31**

Additional Statements: **Page S1422**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1431**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—112) **Page S1421**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 7:01 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 10, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1432.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine United States Indo-Pacific Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2022 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Admiral Philip S. Davidson, USN, Commander, United States Indo-Pacific Command, Department of Defense.

GAMESTOP, ROBINHOOD, AND RETAIL INVESTING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine GameStop, Robinhood, and the state of retail investing, after receiving testimony from Gina-Gail S. Fletcher, Duke University School of Law, Durham, North Carolina; Rachel J. Robasciotti, Adasina Social Capital, San Francisco, California; Teresa Ghilarducci, The New School, Berkeley, California; Michael S. Piwowar, Milken Institute Center for Financial Markets, Washington, D.C.; and Andrew N. Vollmer, Mercatus Center, Arlington, Virginia.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments for the 117th Congress:

Subcommittee on Aviation Safety, Operations, and Innovation: Senators Sinema (Chair), Duckworth, Tester, Rosen, Hickenlooper, Warnock, Cruz, Thune, Blunt, Moran, Lee, and Capito.

Subcommittee on Communications, Media, and Broadband: Senators Luján (Chair), Klobuchar, Blumenthal, Schatz, Markey, Peters, Baldwin, Duckworth, Tester, Sinema, Rosen, Hickenlooper, Warnock, Thune, Blunt, Cruz, Fischer, Moran, Sullivan, Blackburn, Young, Lee, Johnson, Capito, Scott (FL), and Lummis.

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Data Security: Senators Blumenthal (Chair), Klobuchar, Schatz, Markey, Baldwin, Luján, Blackburn, Thune, Blunt, Moran, Young, and Lee.

Subcommittee on Oceans, Fisheries, Climate Change, and Manufacturing: Senators Baldwin (Chair), Blumenthal, Schatz, Markey, Peters, Luján, Sullivan, Cruz, Fischer, Blackburn, Young, and Johnson.

Subcommittee on Space and Science: Senators Hickenlooper (Chair), Blumenthal, Markey, Peters, Sinema, Luján, Warnock, Lummis, Cruz, Fischer, Moran, Young, Lee, and Scott (FL).

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, Maritime, Freight, and Ports: Senators Peters (Chair), Klobuchar, Blumenthal, Schatz, Markey, Baldwin, Duckworth, Tester, Warnock, Fischer, Thune, Blunt, Sullivan, Young, Johnson, Capito, Scott (FL), and Lummis.

Subcommittee on Tourism, Trade, and Export Promotion: Senator Rosen (Chair), Klobuchar, Duckworth, Tester, Sinema, Hickenlooper, Scott (FL), Sullivan, Blackburn, Johnson, Capito, and Lummis.

Senators Cantwell and Wicker are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments for the 117th Congress:

Subcommittee on State Department and USAID Management, International Operations, and Bilateral International Development: Senators Cardin (Chair), Kaine, Schatz, Murphy, Markey, Hagerty, Paul, Cruz, Johnson, and Rubio.

Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation: Senators Shaheen (Chair), Cardin, Murphy, Van Hollen, Coons, Johnson, Barrasso, Romney, Portman, and Young.

Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy, and Environmental Policy: Senators Coons (Chair), Schatz, Booker, Cardin, Shaheen, Portman, Young, Paul, Barrasso, and Rounds.

Subcommittee on Near East, South Asia, Central Asia, and Counterterrorism: Senators Murphy (Chair), Shaheen, Markey, Booker, Van Hollen, Young, Paul, Cruz, Romney, and Hagerty.

Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues: Senators Kaine (Chair), Merkley, Cardin, Shaheen, Markey, Rubio, Portman, Barrasso, Hagerty, and Cruz.

Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy: Senators Markey (Chair), Coons, Murphy, Schatz, Merkley, Romney, Cruz, Johnson, Rounds, and Hagerty.

Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy: Senators Van Hollen (Chair), Booker, Kaine, Merkley, Coons, Rounds, Rubio, Young, Barrasso, and Paul.

Senators Menendez and Risch are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

COVID–19 RESPONSE

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the COVID–19 response, focusing on an update from the frontlines, after receiving testimony from Umair A. Shah, State of Washington Secretary of Health,

Tumwater; Jerry P. Abraham, Kedren Health Vaccines, Los Angeles, California; Ashish K. Jha, Brown University School of Public Health, Providence, Rhode Island; and Mary Ann Fuchs, Duke University Health System, Durham, North Carolina.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General, and Vanita Gupta, of Virginia, to be Associate Attorney General, both of the Department of Justice, after the nominees, who were introduced by Senators Warner, Kaine, and Markey, testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 58 public bills, H.R. 1669–1726; and 16 resolutions, H.J. Res. 30; H. Con. Res. 23; and H. Res. 199–212 were introduced. **Pages H1186–89**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1191–92**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 198, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1319) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 5 (H. Rept. 117–11). **Pages H1185–86**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:41 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H1129**

American Rescue Plan Act of 2021—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 198, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1319) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of S. Con. Res. 5, by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 210 nays, Roll No. 66, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 206 nays, Roll No. 65. **Pages H1164–74**

Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021: The House passed H.R. 842, to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, by a yea-and-nay vote of 225 yeas to 206 nays, Roll No. 70. **Pages H1134–63, H1174–78**

Rejected the Banks motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor, by a yea-and-nay vote of 206 yeas to 218 nays, Roll No. 69. **Pages H1176–77**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 117–10 shall be considered as adopted. **Pages H1177–78**

Agreed to:

Scott (VA) en bloc amendment No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–10: Bourdeaux (No. 1) that clarifies that nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the jurisdictional standards of the NLRB with respect to small businesses, including any standards those that measure the size of a business with respect to revenues, that are used to determine whether an industry is affecting commerce for purposes of determining coverage under the National Labor Relations Act; Davids (KS) (No. 4) that clarifies that the amendments made under this Act shall not affect the privacy of employees with respect to voter lists provided to labor organizations by employers pursuant to elections directed by the Board; Jackson Lee (No. 9) that provides whistleblower protections to employees who report violations of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (LMRDA) with this amendment covering employees of employers as well as employees of labor unions; Levin (MI) (No. 11) that directs the National Labor Relations Board to develop a system and procedures to conduct union representation elections electronically, as allowed by the underlying legislation; McBath (No. 12) that clarifies that nothing in this Act shall affect the definitions of ''employer'' or ''employee'' under any state law for wage, hour, worker's compensation or unemployment insurance; Murphy (FL) (No. 13) that requires GAO, within one-and-a-half years from the date of enactment, to prepare a report on the impact—on workers and businesses across different sectors—of the changes made by the bill to the definition of ''employee'' (the ''ABC'' test) and the definition of ''joint employer'' under the National Labor Relations Act; the President is required to consider the report and, within 60 days, may recommend that Congress modify one or both of these definitions or

make no recommendation; expresses the Sense of the House that the House shall consider whether to accept, reject, or modify any recommendations received from the President; Newman (No. 14) that specifies the National Labor Relations Board's regulations regarding notices to inform workers of their rights must address requirements for posting notices in the languages spoken by the employees; Stevens (No. 15) that directs the GAO to conduct a report on sectoral bargaining in other countries; Tlaib (No. 16) that establishes a 120-day timeline for the tripartite arbitration process between the employees/labor organization and employer in order to ensure that the arbitration process is not indefinitely drawn out; and Torres (NY) (No. 17) that revises the Labor-Management and Disclosure Act of 1959 to require the Department of Labor to make disclosures under the persuader rule publicly available in an accessible and searchable electronic form, and through a secure software application for use on an electronic device (by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 196 nays, Roll No. 67). **Pages H1154–60, H1174–75**

Rejected:

Scott (VA) en bloc amendment No. 2 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–10: Allen (No. 2) that sought to strike Section 111 in the bill, which overturns state right-to-work laws; Comer (No. 3) that sought to strike Sec. 202 of the bill which codifies the Obama Administration's ''persuader rule'' requiring attorneys and consultants to disclose to DOL arrangements or agreements they have with employers regarding unionization where the attorney or consultant will not be communicating with employees; Fitzgerald (No. 5) that sought to require a labor organization to receive express consent from the employee before using his or her union dues for any purpose not directly related to the labor organization's collective bargaining or contract administration; Fulcher (No. 6) that sought to codify ''vote-and-impound'' process for blocking charges and 45-day decertification window for voluntary recognition as set forth in the NLRB's August 12, 2019, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking; Good (VA) (No. 7) that sought to amend section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act to prohibit ''neutrality agreements'', to allow for greater fairness and transparency for workers in their representation; Hern (No. 8) that sought to state that the Act may not take effect until the Secretary of Labor certifies that the bill will not have an adverse impact on rates of employment in the United States; Keller (No. 10) that sought to strike language in the bill banning employers from permanently replacing striking workers and language which permits intermittent striking; the NLRA currently protects the right of employees to replace striking workers permanently, and the NLRB has held that ''intermittent'' strikes are not protected activity under the NLRA; Walberg (No. 18) that sought to strike the language in the bill requiring that a pre-election hearing begin no later than eight days after a notice of such hearing is served and replaces the provision with language ensuring at least 14 days between the filing of an election petition and a hearing taking place; and Wilson (SC) (No. 19) that sought to amend Section 111 to strike current language and insert the national right-to-work language erasing automatic dues clauses (by a yea-and-nay vote of 185 yeas to 243 nays, Roll No. 68). **Pages H1160–63, H1175–76**

H. Res. 188, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 842), (H.R. 8), and (H.R. 1446) was agreed to yesterday, March 8th.

Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans' and Caregivers' COVID–19 Immunizations Now Expanded Act of 2021: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass H.R. 1276, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID–19 vaccines to certain individuals, as amended by Representative Takano. **Page H1178**

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis—Appointment: The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members to the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis: Representatives Palmer, Carter (GA), Miller (WV), Armstrong, Crenshaw, and Gonzalez (OH). **Page H1178**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1134.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1173–74, H1174, H1174–75, H1175–76, H1176–77, and H1177–78.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FDA'S FOREIGN DRUG INSPECTIONS PROGRAM

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled ''FDA's Foreign Drug Inspections Program''. Testimony was heard from Mary Denigan-Macauley, Director, Health Care, Public Health and Private Markets, Government Accountability Office.

CHALLENGES FACING VETERANS IN ACCESSING FERTILITY SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled ''Challenges Facing Veterans in Accessing Fertility Services''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MODERNIZING ENERGY DEVELOPMENT LAWS FOR THE BENEFIT OF TAXPAYERS, COMMUNITIES, AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Modernizing Energy Development Laws for the Benefit of Taxpayers, Communities, and the Environment''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Levin of California, Porter, and DeGette; Hilary Cooper, Commissioner, District 1, San Miguel County, Colorado; and public witnesses.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO THE AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on Senate Amendment to H.R. 1319, the ''American Rescue Plan Act of 2021''. The Committee granted, by record vote of 7–4, a rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1319, the ''American Rescue Plan Act of 2021''. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1319. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion and the Senate amendment. The rule provides that the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule provides two hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees. Testimony was heard from Chairman Yarmuth and Representative Smith of Missouri.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 144, the ''Supporting Early-Career Researchers Act''. H.R. 144 was ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold closed hearings to examine domestic and foreign threats and other challenges facing the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: business meeting to consider the subcommittee assignments for the 117th Congress, and the nominations of Gary Gensler, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and Rohit Chopra, of the District of Columbia, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, 2 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on the Budget: business meeting to consider the nomination of Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, 2:30 p.m., S–207, Capitol.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Donet Dominic Graves, Jr., of Ohio, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine climate change in the electricity sector and fostering economic growth, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the state of democracy around the world, 10 a.m., SD–106/VTC.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider the nomination of Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, 9:45 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 325, to amend the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act to extend the deadline for a report by the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, S. 314, to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act, S. 144, to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Indian Health Service, to acquire private land to facilitate access to the Desert Sage Youth Wellness Center in Hemet, California, S. 371, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain land located in Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, S. 108, to authorize the Seminole Tribe of Florida to lease or transfer certain land, S. 548, to convey land in Anchorage, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, S. 549, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, S. 550, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and S. 559, to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine Native communities and the climate crisis, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Judiciary: Subcommittee on Federal Courts, Oversight, Agency Action, and Federal Rights, to hold hearings to examine the Supreme Court and the Judiciary, 3 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine military toxic exposures, focusing on the human consequences of war, 3 p.m., SD–G50.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SVC–217.

House

Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Government Accountability Office and House of Representatives Officers, 10 a.m., Webex.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, hearing entitled "Modernizing the Federal Civilian Approach to Cybersecurity", 10 a.m., Webex.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Innovation and Investment in Water Resources Infrastructure", 2 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Armed Services Full Committee, hearing entitled "National Security Challenges and U.S. Military Activities in the Indo-Pacific", 11 a.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Subcommittee on Readiness; and Subcommittee on Military Personnel, joint hearing entitled "Privatized Military Family Housing: Update on Implementation of Housing Reforms", 4:45 p.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "The Path Forward: Restoring the Vital Mission of EPA", 10:30 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Financial Services Full Committee, hearing entitled "Justice for All: Achieving Racial Equity Through Fair Access to Housing and Financial Services", 10 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations, and Global Corporate Social Impact, hearing entitled "A Year into the Pandemic: The State of International Development", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Full Committee, hearing entitled "Secretary Blinken: The Biden Administration's Priorities for U.S. Foreign Policy", 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on House Administration Full Committee, business meeting on Contestee Mariannette Miller-Meeks's Motion to Dismiss Notice of Contest Regarding the Election for Representative in the 117th Congress from the Second Congressional District of Iowa, and for other purposes, 12 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Small Business Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Next Steps for the Paycheck Protection Program", 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing entitled "Full Steam Ahead for Rail: Why Rail is More Relevant Than Ever for Economic and Environmental Progress", 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Worker and Family Support, hearing entitled "Health Profession Opportunity Grants: Past Successes and Future Uses", 2 p.m., Webex.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Marcia Louise Fudge, of Ohio, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation thereon at 12 noon.

At 2:15 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Merrick Brian Garland, of Maryland, to be Attorney General, and on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Michael Stanley Regan, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(Senate will recess following disposition of the nomination of Marcia Louise Fudge until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Wednesday, March 10

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1319—American Rescue Plan Act of 2021. Begin Consideration of H.R. 8—Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2021. Begin Consideration of H.R. 1446—Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2021.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.