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

---

**PRAYER**

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

*Eternal and loving God, we pray Your blessing on us this day. In our duties, give us courage to press on with hearts open to emulating the forbearance and sacrifice You have demonstrated in Your steadfast love for us and for this world.

As brothers and sisters of Your creation, we pray the faith to leave behind all that has kept us from living into this Your gracious plan. And as we strain toward what is ahead, toward the goal of a higher calling, we pray Your favor.

May all who trust in You receive this Your benediction on today’s journey:

May the raindrops fall lightly on your brow.

May the soft winds freshen your spirit.

May the sunshine brighten your heart.

May the burdens of the day rest lightly upon you.

And may God enfold you in the mantle of His love.

We offer ourselves to You, praying in the strength of Your name.

Amen.

---

**THE JOURNAL**

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day’s proceedings is approved.

---

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**GUARANTEE WOMEN EQUALITY**

(Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I stand in favor of reauthorizing the abandoned mine land fund, or the AML fund.

My district, Pennsylvania 15, has the most abandoned coal mines in the country, and reauthorizing the AML fund will provide opportunities and funding to clean up the abandoned land, not just in my district, but across the Nation.

Coal mining built America. It powered us onto the world’s stage. It helped us win two world wars and brought our Nation into the modern era.

The AML is set to expire this year. While we continue to make progress on environmental restoration, reauthorizing the fund is crucial to support clean-up efforts and spur economic development.

Madam Speaker, Congress has a great opportunity to do right by Pennsylvania and other great coal mining States by reauthorizing the abandoned mine land fund, which is not funded by tax dollars but by a fee that has been placed on every ton of coal mined since 1977. Those moneys are sitting there in the Federal Treasury, and we need to reauthorize that abandoned mine land fund to further the redevelopment of the scars of the water and the land in those abandoned lands.

---

**REDEVELOPING ABANDONED MINE LAND**

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Mr. MATT CARTWRIGHT, once again as cosponsor on the RECLAIM Act. This bipartisan legislation focuses on reauthorizing the abandoned mine land fund.

My district, Pennsylvania 15, has the most abandoned coal mines in the country, and reauthorizing the AML fund will provide opportunities and funding to clean up the abandoned land, not just in my district, but across the Nation.

Coal mining built America. It powered us onto the world’s stage. It helped us win two world wars and brought our Nation into the modern era.

The AML is set to expire this year. While we continue to make progress on environmental restoration, reauthorizing the fund is crucial to support clean-up efforts and spur economic development.

Madam Speaker, Congress has a great opportunity to do right by Pennsylvania and other great coal mining States by reauthorizing the abandoned mine land fund, which is not funded by tax dollars but by a fee that has been placed on every ton of coal mined since 1977. Those moneys are sitting there in the Federal Treasury, and we need to reauthorize that abandoned mine land fund to further the redevelopment of the scars of the water and the land in those abandoned lands.

---

**ENSURING EQUALITY FOR WOMEN**

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, every single constitution in the world...
drafted since 1950 has the equivalent of the equal rights amendment, except the United States of America.

Though some might say otherwise, it is clear that women need the equal rights amendment, and we need it now. We need the ERA to strengthen the movement women have been building to achieve paycheck fairness and paid family leave, to prevent discrimination against women who are pregnant in the workplace, and to fight for comprehensive reproductive health for all women and girls.

Today, I will vote for the equal rights amendment to assure that my granddaughters, that women and girls throughout the world and throughout the country, are not only strong, powerful, and resilient, but also equal here in the United States under the Constitution.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor Indiana Secretary of State Connie Lawson.

Since 2012, Connie has overseen Indiana’s elections and modernized how Hoosiers and businesses interact with the State. Connie championed comprehensive election reforms that included election security and expanded our voting access for Hoosiers.

Connie is a fierce advocate for Hoosiers to be financially literate and has advocated for high schools offer a free financial class to all students.

Connie modernized State government departments by implementing an efficient one-stop portal for businesses to register, file, report, and make payments to State agencies.

Prior to being secretary of state, Connie served 16 years in the Indiana State Senate and, before that, was clerk of the Hendricks County Circuit Court.

I congratulate Connie on her retirement. On behalf of all Hoosiers, we will miss your 33 years of dedicated public service.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of our Nation’s immigrants, the farmworkers who toil in our fields to feed us, and our Dreamers, the exceptional young people who are the promise and future of America.

Our immigration laws should reflect our shared values as a Nation, especially the importance of keeping families and communities together.

In my district in Ventura County, California, agriculture is a cornerstone of our regional economy. Immigrant farmworkers are essential to putting food on America’s table.

Because of the essential role farmworkers play in our economy and our communities, I support the creation of an earned pathway to citizenship.

I also stand with our Dreamers, many of whom have known no other home than the United States. Dreamers are the embodiment of the American Dream. Dreamers represent the very best of our country, and they are realizing their fullest potential. Their success is America’s success.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Farm Workforce Modernization Act and the American Dream and Promise Act.

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

Mr. CAWTHORN. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor a great leader within my hometown community in western North Carolina, a proven entrepreneur and a great business leader who is about to open a second quick-service restaurant in my district, which will employ over 100 people.

Not only will this restaurant employ 100 people, this restaurant will also feed 100 families. This restaurant will help house 100 families.

Not only will these employees get to have the honor of being able to earn a living to help their families, but they will also be under the careful tutelage of their new employer, Joel Benson, who everyone in my community will recognize is one of the most influential people in my district. Joel is excellent at maximizing the potential in everyone in his care and in his sphere of influence.

Today, I rise to honor a great mentor of mine and a great business leader who is providing jobs and a strong economy to North Carolina, Joel Benson.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. Benson for his service to our community.

HONORING WOMEN OF STEEL
(Mr. MRVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in observance of Women’s History Month to honor Women of Steel, an advocacy arm of the United Steelworkers.

Throughout the years, women from diverse backgrounds have played an instrumental role in paving the way for women in the steel industry.

Among these remarkable leaders was Ola Kennedy, a resident of Gary, Indiana, who worked for 28 years at Hammond Valve. A devoted community leader, Ola was involved in many union and civic organizations and was one of the founding members of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists.

I also want to celebrate Roberta Wood who, along with Ola, cofounded the steelworker women’s caucus in the Chicago-Gary district of the Steelworkers union.

In 1976, Roberta was elected the first female member of the USWA Local 65’s executive board and is currently a member of the Steelworkers’ Organization of Active Retirees.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to celebrate Women’s History Month and recognize the role Women of Steel have played to organize, unionize, rally, and inspire workers to fight for justice.

These extraordinary women continue to be fearless, strong, and vocal advocates for more women in leadership and carry on the march to fight for full gender equality in the workplace. I commend these women.

PROTECTING SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT
(Ms. ROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say how honored I am to be able to file two amendments to the critical reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

My first amendment aims to protect the safety and privacy of survivors by creating a statutory mandate that a victim’s safety should be central to housing decisions made by covered housing providers. This amendment will ensure that housing providers do not evict survivors, provide information confidential, and prioritize their safety when considering admissions, assistance, transfers, and more.

My second amendment is a direct response to an issue in my home State of North Carolina. Sexual assault nurse examiners, or SANE nurses, play a critical role in providing medical care to sexual assault survivors and collecting evidence for criminal prosecution.

Unfortunately, in North Carolina, SANE nurses can be difficult to locate, and some survivors travel to multiple hospitals and have to wait hours to see a SANE nurse. My amendment allows certain grants in the bill to be used to create databases.

ST. PATRICK’S DAY IN SAVANNAH
(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize St. Patrick’s Day in Savannah, Georgia.

The first St. Patrick’s Day parade in Savannah began in 1824, and it is now a parade that gathers hundreds of thousands of visitors from all over the world.

The second-largest St. Patrick’s Day in the United States is important for everyone in Savannah, but it is especially important for the Savannah
Moving the deadline for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 233, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 17) removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reads the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRATTY) Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. Res. 17

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any time limit contained in House Joint Resolution 236, 92d Congress, as agreed to in the Senate on March 22, 1972, the article of amendment proposed to the States in that joint resolution shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the United States Constitution whenever ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

General Leave

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 17.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, H.J. Res. 17 is long-overdue legislation to ensure that the equal rights amendment can finally become the 28th Amendment to the United States Constitution. The House passed identical legislation last Congress on a bipartisan basis, and I hope it will do so again today.

Madam Speaker, in 1923, Alice Paul first introduced an amendment to the Constitution to guarantee full equal protection for women. The text of the amendment is clear: “Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.”

That amendment passed with overwhelming bipartisan majorities in the House and Senate in 1972.

Unfortunately, it fell just short of being ratified by the requisite number of States before the arbitrary deadline imposed by Congress ran out in 1982. In the 40 years since, we have made great strides in this country to ensure equality. Women have secured the right to vote, protection against workplace discrimination, and through case law decided under the Equal Protection Amendment, many other critical protections denied them for too long on the basis of sex.

Without the ERA, millions of women have still had to march in support of their rights, their healthcare, their reproductive freedom and abortion access, and their dignity as fellow citizens. Through the MeToo movement, we have had long-overdue, and sometimes painful, conversations about the violence and harassment that women and others experience—whether in the workplace, at home, or in schools and universities.

But still, to this day, the Constitution does not explicitly recognize and guarantee that no one can be denied equal protection of the laws on the basis of sex. The ERA is necessary to make clear those principles and take the final, critical step of ensuring that laws disadvantaging women and gender minorities are subject to the most rigorous form of scrutiny.

Last year, Virginia became the 38th and last necessary State to ratify the ERA, and, today, in passing H.J. Res. 17, we will be one step closer to enshrining it into law. This resolution removes a previous deadline Congress set in the amendment, proposing clause for enshrining the ERA, and will therefore, ensure that recent ratifications by Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia are given full effect.

We are on the brink of making history, and no deadline should stand in the way. The Constitution itself places no deadlines on the process for ratifying amendments. Congress, just as clearly, has the authority to extend or remove any deadlines that it previously chose to set in the first place. The recent ruling by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia refusing to recognize the recent State ratifications makes it even more imperative that Congress act now in removing this deadline. We must make it absolutely clear that Congress does not want language put in the proposing clause of a resolution 40 years ago to stand in the way of full equality now.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative Slotkin for introducing this resolution, which takes that important step. This resolution will ensure, at long last, that the equal rights amendment can take its rightful place as part of our Nation’s Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

H.J. Res. 17 is not a resolution to revive the equal rights amendment; it is
a messaging vehicle. That is why Democrats bypassed the Committee on the Judiciary and brought this resolution directly to the floor, a common theme for this majority. There was no process for this resolution, a process that Democrats claim is a priority. There are few, if any, legitimate deadlines the Democrats can say they supported the ERA when it was in the House.

But the fact is, Madam Speaker, that men and women in the United States are already equal under law. The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution require as much, guaranteeing equal protection for all under the laws of this country. To me, the ERA is unnecessary, redundant, and divisive. The only thing it will do is empower the far-left special interest groups and lead to activist litigation.

Just last year, the head of Planned Parenthood declared: ‘There is no equal rights for women without access to abortion, plain and simple.’

Or according to NARAL Pro-Choice America: ‘With its ratification, the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion.’

Madam Speaker, we should take them at their word and vote against this resolution.

For years, groups like Planned Parenthood and others have advocated for adoption of the ERA so they can use it to pursue their pro-abortion agendas. If the ERA became law, it would allow these organizations to advance the radical policies throughout the country without being in full view of the American people. These groups have hijacked the ERA and are seeking to use it as a tool to challenge States’ pro-life laws.

But the reality is that this resolution is unconstitutional. Article V of the Constitution empowers Congress to propose amendments to the Constitution by a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate. After Congress proposes an amendment, the amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Three-fourths of the States must ratify the amendment in order for it to become effective.

The equal rights amendment was proposed in 1972. The amendment set an explicit deadline. It gave the States 7 years, until 1979, for ratification. Setting a deadline for ratification is part of Congress’ authority to determine the mode of ratification under Article V.

In 1970, the Supreme Court held in Dillon v. Gloss that there was no doubt that Congress can set a date for ratifying an amendment. The deadline to ratify the ERA has long since passed, and the amendment fell short of the required number of States. When proposing a constitutional amendment, the deadline for ratification is just as important as the substance.

The District Court for D.C., less than 2 weeks ago, denied an effort by Virginia, Nevada, and Missouri to force the adoption of the ERA, despite the 1979 deadline. In denying the effort of those States, the courts said that a deadline for ratification still receives the assent of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, and putting it in the resolving clause does not evade Article V’s procedural requirements in any way.

Because setting a deadline takes a two-thirds vote of Congress, it would be absurd to say that changing that deadline requires anything less. If a simple majority of Congress could alter a proposed amendment after it has been sent to the States, the two-thirds requirement of Article V would be meaningless.

A simple majority cannot rewrite a proposed amendment at will after there has been an agreement in Congress. However, that is just what H.J. Res. 17 and the Democrats propose to do.

The ERA expired in 1979, and this joint resolution is a legal fiction advanced for political purposes.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to oppose this resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman errs, the deadline for ratification is not part of the amendment, it is part of the resolution proposing the amendment. And if Congress can propose a deadline, it can revoke that proposal since it is not part of the amendment at all.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, this is a glorious day for women in America. With the passage of the ERA and the Violence Against Women Act, we are making great strides forward. This particular resolution does one thing. We want in the Constitution, plain and simple.

Antonin Scalia, the great jurist, said once: Does the Constitution require discrimination based on sex? The answer is no.

But if the question is: Does the Constitution prohibit discrimination based on sex?

The answer is also no.

That should send a chilling feeling in each of us that in the Constitution of the United States women are not protected.

In fact, we are the only country with a written Constitution that does not prohibit discrimination based on sex. Shame on us.

There can be no expiration date on equality. This is a bipartisan bill. We are proud to bring it to the floor.

My colleagues across the aisle may say we don’t need the ERA, women are already equal under the law, that it is redundant.

Well, tell that to Chrissy Brzozka, who was raped by two football players at Virginia Tech. She sought justice under VAWA, but the Supreme Court struck down the civil suit provision, claiming Congress lacked the power to pass it.

Or Tracy Rexroat, whose starting salary at the Arizona Department of Education was $17,000 less than her colleague. They based the salaries on what their prior salary was from whatever job they came, so she received $17,000 less than her colleague. She too filed an action under the Equal Pay Act, and the courts held that there was some reasonable expectation of.

Or as Tracy's estranged husband kidnapped and murdered their three young daughters after the police refused to enforce a restraining order.

If we had the ERA, these cases would have had different outcomes. The ERA will create stronger legal recourse against sex discrimination, it will empower Congress to better enforce and enact laws protecting women, and it will confirm the rightful place of gender equality in the Constitution where it belongs.

I believe most of us recognize that this is the right thing to do. The ERA is about building an America that we want. It is about forming a more perfect union, it is about equality, survival, dignity, and respect.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, some lawmakers continue to ignore, trivialize, or deny the fact that abortion activists plan to aggressively use the Federal ERA—as they have used State ERAs—in a litigation strategy designed to overturn pro-life laws and policies, including restrictions supported by huge majorities of Americans.

As the Marist Poll found recently in January: Seven in 10 Americans, including nearly half who identify as pro-choice, want significant restrictions on abortion. While I greatly disagree with abortion activists who refuse to recognize an unborn child’s inherent dignity, worth and value, many on both sides now agree that how abortion is written will be used in court to massively promote abortion.

NARAL Pro-Choice America said the ERA would “reinforce the constitutional right to abortion” and “require judges to strike down anti-abortion laws.”

The National Organization for Women said: “An ERA—properly interpreted—could negate the hundreds of laws that have been passed restricting access to abortion.

Those laws include the Hyde amendment, waiting periods, parental involvement statutes, women’s right-to-know laws, conscience rights, and late-term abortion ban, like the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act.

By now, my colleagues know that the Supreme Court of New Mexico ruled that the State was required—required to fund abortion, based solely on the State ERA.

In like manner, the Supreme Court of Connecticut invalidated its State ban on abortion funding based on its ERA.
Ensuring equal rights for women and serious protections against violence and exploitation requires laws, policies, and spending priorities to achieve those noble and necessary goals, without— I say again, without putting unborn baby girls and boys at risk of death.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am glad the gentleman recognizes that equality includes the right of each woman and man to make their own decisions, and that reproductive choices are fundamental to the personal and professional development of all Americans.

There can be no equality of the sexes when one class of people is denied the ability to control their own bodies.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MC BATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate this Women’s History Month by reflecting on the achievement of so many women who have blazed a trail for the generations that followed them; women who didn’t listen when they were told that they couldn’t, or that they shouldn’t, or that they were not qualified.

American women have fought for the right to vote, the right to equal education, the right to reproductive healthcare, and the right to financially provide for our families and be compensated the same as men. And we will continue these fights until our Constitution declares that women are equal in the eyes of the law.

It is time for full constitutional equality. The American people overwhelmingly support this bipartisan legislation. I am proud to vote for it again today in honor of the generations of women that have made strides toward equality. I know that we will soon achieve it.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ).

Mrs. SPARTZ. Madam Speaker, I think it is a good discussion to have, but I don’t want to spend my time hearing from people from the other side, if they do believe this issue is still valid and necessary, to actually restart this process from the beginning, because we are wasting our time right here. A 1972 amendment cannot be ratified, it doesn’t exist. It has expired. It is unconstitutional. A lot of things have changed.

We can debate if it is necessary or not, but if we want to have a real debate, we need to restart this from the beginning because time has expired on something that doesn’t exist. So I would ask not to support this amendment, and it is unconstitutional.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his time, and I want to thank Mrs. MALONEY and Ms. SPAHFER for their long work on this, and thank every woman before them who have worked hard on this effort.

Congress created the limitation on years on the passage of the ERA, and Congress can change it, and Congress should change it.

I am the product of the work of a woman, my mother, and her mother produced her. We should not forget women and their commitment and invaluable contributions to our birth.

Every woman should have the same rights as a man. They don’t get paid the same, they are discriminated in the workplace, they are harassed, they are abused. They should have equal rights.

Women who have blazed a trail for the generations that have occurred in America, and we believe that it won’t happen until we pass this bill.

I favor the passage and I appreciate the spirit in which it is offered.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. This push to remove the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment is an unnecessary and unconstitutional power grab.

This bill is unconstitutional. Congress set a deadline for the ERA; it was 1979. With only 35 of the 38 States needed for ratification at the time, Congress extended the deadline to 1982, but no other States joined in, ending the ratification process for the equal rights amendment.

Even the late Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said that the deadline for the ERA ratification had long passed. She added, “I would like to see a new beginning. I’d like it to start over.” There’s too much controversy over latecomers—Virginia, long after the deadline passed. Plus, a number of States have withdrawn their ratification. So, if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard States that said, “We’ve changed our minds?” If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to ratify the ERA, they have to start over.

Women also already have equal rights. After the decision after the decision, the United States Supreme Court has underscored that the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution gives women equal rights and prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, rendering, I believe, the ERA unnecessary.

Finally, if ratified, the ERA would be used to codify the right to abortion, undoing pro-life protections, and forcing taxpayers to fund abortions.

The New Mexico Supreme Court ruled that their State’s ERA provision required the State to fund abortions. Numerous pro-abortion groups have already made the case for ratifying the ERA on the basis of expanding their abortion agenda. Just listen to the words of the organizations pushing this legislation themselves.

The National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League, NARAL, has claimed that, “With its ratification, the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion.” Planned Parenthood and the Women’s Law Project has said that State bans and government funding of elective abortions are “contrary to a modern understanding of the ERA.”

The National Organization for Women has said, “An ERA—properly interpreted—could negate the hundreds of laws that have been passed restricting access to abortion care and contraception.”

With this unconstitutional bill, my colleagues across the aisle are hiding behind the rhetoric of equality for women to eliminate any and all protections for unborn babies, half of which would be girls, the women, if given the chance to live.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee will control the time.

Mr. COHEN. Unlike Alexander Haig, I am only here temporarily.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who is from the East Side and who, as chairperson, brought us the great hearing last year on the ERA.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, there is no time limit on equality. The equal rights amendment passed the needed 38 States, including the great State of New York. Enough is enough. It is long past time for women to be in the Constitution.

We may not always be able to control, nor should women’s rights be dependent upon who controls State governments, who is in the White House or Congress, or who sits on the Supreme Court.

Our rights shouldn’t be determined by these types of things. It should be in the document, the document they intended and that they could not pass. It is long past time to spell out equality in our Constitution with the ERA.

Unfortunately, we are seeing the effects of gender inequality acutely during this pandemic. An estimated 1 million more women than men have lost their jobs, and a disproportionate number of those suffering are Black women and Latinas.

We need to pass it. It is urgently needed. Let’s just imagine if the ERA had been ratified in the 1970s, as it should have been.

Would we have needed today a dramatic Me Too, Time’s Up movement with hundreds of thousands of women having to tell their often painful personal stories in order to get justice?

Would the Violence Against Women Act and other legislation addressing sexual assault have been passed, if it had been passed much sooner without the risk of a Supreme Court ruling limiting a woman’s right to sue? Women could sue directly if they were in the Constitution.
We have the opportunity to make equal rights under the law a reality for our mothers, our daughters, our granddaughters, and ourselves. We must recognize that there is no time limit on equality and vote to pass today’s resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentlewoman please pull her mask up.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. NADLER), who is the chairman of the committee, that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will control the balance of the time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, discrimination against women is a part of America’s history, but it should not be our future. That is why we need the equal rights amendment.

It was not an accident that women were left out of the Constitution. The Founders very much believed us to be unequal and, as such, we could not own property, vote, hold certain jobs, or even serve on a jury.

The impacts of that discrimination are still felt today. Women are paid less than men, are more likely to face discrimination for being pregnant.

The Founders were wrong, and this is our chance to fix it by doing what they refused to do: assert in the Constitution that women, too, have rights.

The ERA will not end discrimination, but it will empower us to fight it in court. Already, 38 States have ratified this amendment, which satisfies the requirements in the Constitution. The vast majority of Americans support it.

Congress set a deadline for ratification, which means we can repeal it. It is time to affirm that there is no expiration date on equality.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the language of the equal rights amendment is simple, but don’t be deceived by its simple language.

The reviving of the deadline and ratification movement in the Congress would destroy all distinctions between men and women, enshrine abortion, and empower the woke feminist mob.

The equal rights amendment is dead and should remain dead. The States and Congress missed the deadline to have the amendment passed in 1978. The Trump Department of Justice issued a legal opinion in January that the deadline for the ERA has already passed, by any legal measure.

The ERA would be a new constitution empowering women to demand abortion on demand. Have we not murdered enough people in the womb in this country, over 62 million?

Guaranteeing abortion on demand is completely wrong. It is not a constitutional right. As a matter of fact, the person in the womb should have the constitutional right. It is not a “my body, my choice” issue because the person in the womb is not the same body as the women who are the same body as the women who are the same body as the women.

Also, NARAL Pro-Choice America claims: “With its ratification, the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion.”

If anything, there should be guaranteeing that constitutional right to people in the womb. They should have the constitutional right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Let’s carry on. VAWA, Violence Against Women Act. Democrats have hijacked a program designed to help marginalized women and have turned it into a political weapon that erases gender and destroys all religious freedom.

On the wall right here, it says: In God We Trust. God states that He created male and female, not a plethora of genders that anyone can choose from.

They want to let men calling themselves women sleep with men in domestic abuse shelters. The Democrats will not be satisfied until every battered woman is forced to sit next to her abuser as long as she continues to be male and female, not a plethora of genders.

That is not science. Science says that there are only two genders, male and female, according to the chromosomes. Democrats want to destroy our country. They want to close every church and nonprofit that doesn’t capitulate to their oppressive agenda. Democrats want to put domestic violence abusers in the same room as their victims. Democrats want to dissolve all sex-based protection for women and girls through the relentless onslaught of gender identity ideology advances.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, every amendment to the 22nd Amendment, except for the 27th, has had a deadline for ratification inserted in the resolution. But if you look at the Constitution, Madam Speaker, you won’t find the deadline. That is because the deadline is part of the congressional resolution proposing the amendment, not part of the amendment itself.

What Congress can propose, Congress can alter, which is all we are proposing to do today.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is wonderful to see Members of Congress wearing white today to observe the fact that we are marking history by passing legislation about equality in our country.

I thank Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER for her relentless championing of this equal rights amendment in terms of the date the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee referenced. I also thank CAROLYN MALONEY for her long-term advocacy of the equal rights amendment. I thank Chairman NADLER for enabling us to have this legislation on the floor today and for his leadership on this issue over time.

Madam Speaker, 100 years ago, in 1921, a solemn promise was made to the women of our country, one honoring our most fundamental truth as a nation, as the equal rights amendment was first introduced. When it was first introduced, it said: “Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.”

Simple, clear, fair, and just. Yet, a century later, that promise remains unfulfilled. The equal rights amendment still has not been enshrined in the Constitution, and American women still face inequality under the law and, therefore, in their lives.

In recent years, American women have renewed the legal fight for the equal rights amendment. Women of all ages—broadly—students, mothers, seniors, communities of color, indigenous women, et cetera—have taken up the mantle of the suffragists before them, standing on suffragists’ shoulders as they marched, mobilized, protested, and voted for their rights. Because of their courage and commitment, 38 States have now ratified the equal rights amendment.

But one final barrier remains: removing the artificial, arbitrary time limit for ratification. As the distinguished chairman pointed out, that deadline is not in the Constitution. Until we remove that arbitrary time limit, the ERA cannot become part of our Constitution.

Last year, the House passed legislation to remove this arbitrary time limit, but unfortunately, the Senate failed to do so. So, today, the House will, once again, pass this legislation and send it to the Senate for a vote. We are proud to be doing it in Women’s History Month.

We salute again Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, our champion on the legislation on the floor today, and Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, who has been our lead sponsor of the ERA for 25 years now.

Madam Speaker, I thank Members from both sides of the aisle, including cosponsor Representative TOM REED from New York, for their bipartisan support for ratification. As the distinguished chair of the committee referenced. I also thank CAROLYN MALONEY for her long-term advocacy of the equal rights amendment passed with bipartisan supermajorities in both Chambers of Congress, and it enjoyed the strong support of President Nixon, who wrote in 1968 that “the task of achieving constitutional equality between the sexes is still not completed” and pointed out that all Republican National Conventions since 1940 have
Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the achievements women have made and reaffirm that we are already equal under current law.

Women represent 51 percent of the population, comprise over half of college students, make up the majority of medical and law school students, and run 12.3 million women-owned businesses while generating $1.8 trillion each year.

Little girls can be whatever they want to be, whether that is an astronaut, a doctor, a full-time mom working at home, or a Member of Congress.

The ERA would not add to the rights already guaranteed by the 14th Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause, but it could jeopardize them.

How? Two ways.

First, by making it discriminatory to offer benefits to women: women's scholarships, women's colleges, job protection for pregnant women, and safe spaces may all be on the chopping block.

When the equal rights amendment was first proposed a century ago, many women's rights advocates recognized the negative ramifications it would bring. In fact, future First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt expressed concerns that legislation protecting women in the workplace could be eliminated should the ERA become part of the U.S. Constitution.

Secondly, because the 1972 definition of sex as male and female is no longer accepted, the amendment would require new protections for sexual orientation and gender identity. This is a path that has already proven to be a threat to women’s privacy, safety, and equality. Don’t take it from me. Talk to the nine women in California who were sexually harassed in a women’s shelter by a biological male identifying as a woman.

The equal rights amendment would not only codify inequality for women, but also destroy the rights of the unborn. The ERA advocates have been unequivocal about their support for abortion and for using the ERA to overturn pro-life laws.

Courts have already used State versions of the ERA to force taxpayers to fund abortions. A Federal ERA would threaten State pro-life laws. Federal protections like the Hyde amendment, and conscience protections for American medical professionals who will no longer be forced to perform an abortion.

Fortunately, the time limit to pass the ERA expired decades ago, and there is agreement that Congress cannot go back and remove a deadline from a previous constitutional amendment initiative. For example, the Supreme Court has already recognized that the 1972 ERA expired, and the Department of Justice issued a ruling saying: “Congress may not revive a proposed amendment after the deadline, for its ratification has expired.”

Just over a week ago, a Federal district court ruled that the deadline to ratify the ERA “expired long ago.” And the recent ratifications of the amendment arrived “too late to count.”

Pretending we can remove the deadline for passage is both futile and deceptive. The ERA is a threat to the historical strides women have made. It will eradicate State and Federal pro-life laws and policies, and the process is blatantly unconstitutional.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this resolution and to, instead, uphold the Constitution, promote life, and protect women’s rights.

Mrs. McBATH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our esteemed leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Women’s History Month, we do so with an awareness that so much work in the fight for equality remains. Much has been accomplished, but much remains to be done. This is one of those.

That is what the House is focusing on this week, women’s equality, women’s safety and justice, and women’s opportunity. I am proud that we are taking action to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act within the first 3 months of the new Congress.

I was a cosponsor—and proud of it—of the original 1994 Violence Against Women Act. We passed the original VAWA on a bipartisan basis and reauthorized it with bipartisan support in 2000 and again in 2005. Those were overwhelming votes of 371–1 and 415–4.

Now we are talking about the equal rights amendment. I understand.

In 2013, we did it again on VAWA. 87 Republicans joining all 199 Democrats in the House vote. Every time we reauthorized the law, we made it stronger, ensuring protections for more women who were victims of domestic abuse, stalking, and other crimes.

Last Congress, our House Democratic majority passed a VAWA reauthorization that included these expanded protections, but Senate Republicans blocked it from consideration. Not that they offered an alternative, not that they said: This is a problem and we need to solve it. It has been bipartisan, so here is our view and we will go to conference on it. They simply blocked it.

It is essential, Madam Speaker, that Congress take action with a long-term reauthorization of VAWA, made all the more critical by the rise in domestic violence we have seen during the COVID-19 pandemic and more people having to stay home; an epidemic of domestic violence. Let’s send a message to the women and men of America that Congress will continue to do its part to root out domestic violence and abuse.

I was just with Congresswoman Jackson Lee, the sponsor and the chair of the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee. Chairman...
Madam Speaker, I am speaking on both VAWA, obviously, and the ERA, two very critically important pieces of legislation.

Last year, Virginia became the 38th State to ratify the equal rights amendment. When I hear the opposition to the equal rights amendment, you would think that we were organizing to defeat women's rights. I think some of these speeches were written by Lewis Carroll.

After Virginia passed and became the 38th State, the House passed a resolution to affirm that, with Virginia’s action, the equal rights amendment had been duly added to our Constitution as the 28th Amendment. However, the Republican-led Senate refused to do the same.

Now, with the Democratic-led Senate, I am hopeful that Congress can affirm the adoption of that amendment and provide strong, legal backing to those seeking to have it recognized by our courts as a full part of our Constitution.

What little faith we demonstrate in the courts of the United States of America when it is going to be interpreted, according to some, as not affirming equal rights for women, but somehow undermining equal rights. That is why I say that I think these speeches were written by Lewis Carroll.

The amendment simply states, as I am sure has been said: “Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.”

How can that be misinterpreted to say somehow we are enunciating a proposition that would undermine rather than protect and lift up the rights of women?

It is long overdue that we, as a Nation, affirm this truth: that all men and women are created equal. Not the same, quite obviously, but equal, endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Madam Speaker, I have two granddaughters and I have three great-granddaughters. The late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, the famous or, as she would say from time to time, the infamous RGB—said this: “I would like to see my grandchildren, when they pick up the Constitution, to see that notion—that women and men are persons of equal stature—I’d like them to see that it is a basic principle of our society.”

Madam Speaker, that is what this amendment is about. It should have been passed two centuries ago, but it is never too late to do the right thing. And we can take a major step forward this week to make that happen by passing the bipartisan resolution offered by Representatives JACKIE SPEIER and TOM REED.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting both H.J. Res. 17 and the re-authorization of the Violence Against Women Act. Both will articulate our concern for women, for mothers, for daughters, for sisters, for neighbors, for friends.

We have a chance this week to send a message that Congress will not tolerate violence or discrimination against women, and we have an opportunity equally this Women’s History Month, not just with words, but with actions that mean something by making history in a very positive way, benefiting not only women, but our Nation as a whole.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support these two very important pieces of legislation.

Mrs. McBATH. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) to control the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that established that deadline was passed for the very amendment that established that deadline.

Of course, they don’t explain how to deal with the five States that have rescinded their ratification votes. The courts have already ruled against this approach as brazenly unconstitutional.

As Ruth Bader Ginsburg, an ardent supporter of the ERA, pointed out a few years ago: “So, if you count a late-comer on the plus side, how can you disregard States that said, ‘We’ve changed our minds?’”

If the majority were serious, it would reintroduce the ERA and debate it openly and constitutionally, as Justice Ginsburg suggested. They won’t, because they know that in the nearly half century that has passed since the ERA was approved, the world itself has passed them by.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, every person, regardless of sex, must be treated equally under the law. H.J. Res. 17 reaffirms this core American value. It makes clear that the arbitrary deadline in the equal rights amendment may not stand in the way of achieving full equality for women. With women losing their jobs at disproportionately high rates, the COVID-19 pandemic has only further revealed the need for this amendment.

In 2020, American women lost more than 5 million jobs. A vote for this resolution is a vote equal access to healthcare. It is a vote for equal pay for the same work. It is a vote for equal opportunity and basic human rights in all other aspects of life for women in this country.

Congress must act now to remove this arbitrary deadline. There must be no time limit on guaranteeing equal rights under the law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 17.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, nearly a half century ago, Congress passed the equal rights amendment and sent it to the States with a 7-year deadline for ratification. When that deadline expired, it was three States short of passage.

Many States rejected it because it was duplicative of the Fifth and 14th Amendments to the Constitution. Our Constitution already guarantees that all Americans receive equal protection under the law, and indeed these provisions have driven our progress as a society.

More importantly, many felt that the ERA would unleash a crippling avalanche of activist litigation that could have unforeseen and unintended implications to issues ranging from abortion to freedom of conscience and freedom of speech.

Today, 50 years after its adoption, the Democrats propose to retroactively amend the ERA to remove its deadline. They argue that Congress can alter amendments it has sent to the States, even a half century later, and yet still count their ratification votes from a half century ago.

This would allow them to add three States that voted to ratify long after the deadline was passed for the very amendment that established that deadline.

If the majority were serious, they would reintroduce the ERA and debate it openly and constitutionally, as Justice Ginsburg suggested. They won’t, because they know that in the nearly half century that has passed since the ERA was proposed, the world itself has passed them by.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these two very important pieces of legislation.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 17.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, nearly a half century ago, Congress passed the equal rights amendment and sent it to the States with a 7-year deadline for ratification. When that deadline expired, it was three States short of passage.

Many States rejected it because it was duplicative of the Fifth and 14th Amendments to the Constitution. Our Constitution already guarantees that all Americans receive equal protection under the law, and indeed these provisions have driven our progress as a society.

More importantly, many felt that the ERA would unleash a crippling avalanche of activist litigation that could have unforeseen and unintended implications to issues ranging from abortion to freedom of conscience and freedom of speech.

Today, 50 years after its adoption, the Democrats propose to retroactively amend the ERA to remove its deadline. They argue that Congress can alter amendments it has sent to the States, even a half century later, and yet still count their ratification votes from a half century ago.

This would allow them to add three States that voted to ratify long after the deadline was passed for the very amendment that established that deadline.

If the majority were serious, they would reintroduce the ERA and debate it openly and constitutionally, as Justice Ginsburg suggested. They won’t, because they know that in the nearly half century that has passed since the ERA was proposed, the world itself has passed them by.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these two very important pieces of legislation.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 17.
This legislation is not about special rights. It is not about preferential treatment, and it is not about erasing sex differences. It is about finally guaranteeing equal rights, plain and simple.

Critics of the ERA know that, or at least they would if they actually read the legislation. It is right there for all of us to see. “Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex,” period.

Everyone in this Capitol has a mother, and I know that if all of us are blessed to have daughters, this amendment is about them. It is about completing the work of generations of women before us who marched for full equality, and it is about finishing that journey so that the next generation will experience nothing other than full and fair rights under the law.

I urge my colleagues to give our daughters that chance. Join us and pass this resolution.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of removing this arbitrary time limit for ratifying the equal rights amendment.

I ask all my colleagues: Are we going to tell our mothers, our sisters, daughters, nieces, and granddaughters that there is an expiration date on equality? I hope that answer is no.

This pandemic has only worsened the inequality that women are facing, especially women of color. Making the equal rights amendment a part of our Constitution guarantees that men and women are truly treated equal under the law.

Today, the House can send a clear message that we will not tolerate sexual discrimination, that gender equality shall be the law of the land.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, today, we confront one of America’s lingering legacies of discrimination.

At America’s founding, women were intended to be the law of the Constitution and, as second-class citizens, we did not have the right to vote or own property.

Today, we still receive less pay for the same work, and we face actual or imminent threats of violence and harassment.

But the equal rights amendment rejects that.

After over a century, the ERA is on the cusp of ratification, and we finally have a President who will make this long overdue provision of our Constitution a reality.

Women’s rights should not depend on which party is in power. These basic fundamental rights must be guaranteed. We must secure equality for women under the law, in the Constitution, and in our daily lives.

If we want to hand a more perfect union over to our daughters—and I least they would if they actually read the legislation. It is right there for all of us to see. “Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex,” period.

Everyone in this Capitol has a mother, and we know that if all of us are blessed to have daughters, this amendment is about them. It is about completing the work of generations of women before us who marched for full equality, and it is about finishing that journey so that the next generation will experience nothing other than full and fair rights under the law.

I urge my colleagues to give our daughters that chance. Join us and pass this resolution.

Mrs. SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. LAWRENCE).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, for nearly 50 years, our country has struggled to make equal rights for women a foundational value in the United States Constitution through the equal rights amendment. Women deserve nothing less than equal treatment, whether it be equal pay for equal work, freedom from discrimination, freedom from sexual assault, or freedom from domestic violence. The equal rights amendment will help to fill those gaps.

We now have enough States for that to become the law of the land. This resolution will help formalize the path for this much-needed change, and I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution so that every woman and every girl can have equal justice under the law.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: What are you afraid of? Why? Why can you not affirm equal rights for women in the United States of America? It is not a hard mountain to climb. But it says every woman and every girl can have equal justice under the law.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, we are prepared to close.

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

Madam Speaker, I oppose H.J. Res. 17. I believe that the speakers we have had here today on our side have agreed with that and made very, very effective points on why to oppose this resolution.

Men and women are already equal under the Constitution. This legislation would make us no more equal. It is merely a vehicle for the far-left’s special interest groups to enact their pro-abortion agenda. It is unconstitutional. It is unnecessary. And it should not become law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, Alice Paul’s equal rights amendment was introduced in both Houses of Congress back in 1923. But 91 years later, the United States Constitution still does not explicitly declare that women have equal rights under the law.

We are the only western democracy without such a clause in its Constitution. Today, we have an opportunity to rectify that glaring omission.

The arbitrary deadline for ratification that Congress imposed, and later extended, can be just as easily removed, because it is not part of the amendment, as some of our Republican friends said.

Every amendment since the 22nd Amendment, except for the 27th, has had such a clause. And if you look at the text of the Constitution, it is not there. That is because the deadline is part of the resolution proposing the constitutional amendment, not part of the constitutional amendment. If Congress can establish a deadline by resolution, it can certainly, by resolution, extend or change the deadline. That is all this resolution does.

Adopting the ERA would bring our country closer to truly fulfilling values of inclusion and equal opportunity for all people. Adopting this legislation would help make this a reality.

I urge all Members to support this resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend remarks.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we have just been engaged in presenting to the public the Violence Against Women Act. But all of it stands on the shoulders of the equal rights amendment, which has been long overdue.

What an amazing journey that this legislation has taken, and how sad it is to acknowledge that we are one of only a few nations that does not have an equal rights amendment in its Constitution.

I remember going to Afghanistan and working with the women of Afghanistan to include the rights of women in their Constitution. I want to say that again: To include the rights of women in their Constitution.

So let me speak clearly to vital points of this resolution. This is not an abortion bill. However, we realize that the right to choose is embedded in the Constitution in the Ninth Amendment. But this is not that.

It is a bill that says that women have a right, as Alice Paul said so many years ago, to be able to have rights of equality under this flag, under this Constitution. Are we suggesting that that should not be?

In addition, let it be very clear that any court decision that was issued, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, that is, the Commonwealth of Virginia v. Ferriero, we can explain that case. I have seen that Court's said the only authority to extend the deadline was Congress, and here we are. Congress is now intending to extend that deadline.
Nothing in the Constitution prohibits that. It is not embedded in the amendment. And by Article V, we are able to deal with deadlines. Deadlines are a simple process of statutory authority, and that is what we are doing today. I can’t think of many issues that are closer to the heart of the Constitution than equality and the protections that come with it. I think about the women who were denied equal treatment. I think about the 80 cents for every dollar men earn. The Equal Rights Amendment makes sense of equal treatment.

By removing the ratification deadline that Congress set previously, H.J. Res. 17 ensures that the recent ratifications by Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia are counted and that the ERA becomes part of the Constitution.

We are on the verge of a breakthrough for equality in this country, despite all the obstacles in our current political and social climate. This resolution will ensure that no deadline stands in the way. Therefore, I strongly support H.J. Res. 17 and urge its passage by the House.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong support for H.J. Res. 17, a resolution removing the time limit for the Equal Rights Amendment.

Women in the United States make extraordinary contributions to our workforce and communities—and even more so in the face of the COVID–19 pandemic. Yet, unfortunately, we remain unprotected under the law from discrimination. This long-overdue legislation will enshrine in our Constitution the principle of women’s equality and explicitly prohibit discrimination based on sex.

The Equal Rights Amendment states simply: “equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.” And in this simple text is guaranteed the following:

Avenues of legal recourse for people who face sex-based discrimination,

Prompting of Supreme Court to consider cases of sex discrimination with rigorous standards, and

The power for Congress to enact laws that ensure sex equality in all aspects of life.

It is for these reasons, and many others not listed, that we must act to remove the arbitrary time limit for ratification and codify this Amendment.

As a member of the Democratic Women’s Caucus, I am steadfast in my commitment to advancing women’s rights both in my district and across the nation. My tenure in Congress has been in part dedicated to advocating on behalf of women and their successes—but I stand on the shoulders of generations of heroines fighting for equality. It is in their honor that I support this legislation today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 17.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I include the following letters of endorsement for H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women’s Act (VAWA) into the RECORD.

Hon. JERRY NADLER,
Representative, New York, NY.

Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
Representative, Pennsylvania, PA.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Representative, Texas, TX.

From the Congressional Record:
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NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER
ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JERRY NADLER,
Representative, Washington, DC.

Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
Representative, Pennsylvania, PA.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Representative, Texas, TX.

Dear Representatives Nadler, Jackson Lee,

I have long held a deep belief in the importance of addressing the issue of domestic violence. As a nation, we must take action to ensure that our communities are safe and that those who have suffered from domestic violence are provided with the necessary support to rebuild their lives.

With each reauthorization of VAWA, Congress has made important steps forward to better address the needs of survivors and communities. Based on extensive conversations with victims and their families, we must continue to address the issues that have been prevalent in the past.

Accord the Centers for Disease Control's National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), 1 in 4 women and 1 in 5 men are the victim of physical violence, contact sexual violence and/or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime.

We are particularly grateful for the bipartisan support that mobilizes the Black community and allies through its education and outreach; training and technical assistance; resource development; research; and public policy efforts.

We are also supportive of other key proposals for the reauthorization, such as:

- Protecting survivors of dating violence from firearms
- Promoting firearm surrender programs
- Strengthening and enforcing public housing protections, ensuring access to healthcare options, expanding civil legal representation, and reducing the impact of non-Native perpetrators on Native lands

Thank you for not only hearing the needs of Black survivors, but also addressing them in H.R. 1620 which provides measured enhancements for the bipartisan support and protections that are solutions-based, expanding the safety net.

Again, thank you for championing the needs of victims and survivors and for supporting the work of domestic and sexual violence programs across the country. We look forward to continuing to work with you and your colleagues to ensure the bipartisan support for VAWA 2021 and to pass legislation that will provide needed services and supports to survivors and their families and communities.

Sincerely,

FAZNAQ Q. SAIFIULLAH,
Chief Executive Officer.

THE NATIONAL CENTER ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
US. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Representatives Jackson Lee,

As a nation, we must work together to address the challenges faced by survivors of domestic and sexual violence.

According to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), 1 in 4 women and 1 in 5 men are the victim of physical violence, contact sexual violence and/or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime.

We are particularly grateful for the bipartisan support that mobilizes the Black community and allies through its education and outreach; training and technical assistance; resource development; research; and public policy efforts.

We are also supportive of other key proposals for the reauthorization, such as:

- Protecting survivors of dating violence from firearms
- Promoting firearm surrender programs
- Strengthening and enforcing public housing protections, ensuring access to healthcare options, expanding civil legal representation, and reducing the impact of non-Native perpetrators on Native lands

Thank you for not only hearing the needs of Black survivors, but also addressing them in H.R. 1620 which provides measured enhancements for the bipartisan support and protections that are solutions-based, expanding the safety net.

Again, thank you for championing the needs of victims and survivors and for supporting the work of domestic and sexual violence programs across the country. We look forward to continuing to work with you and your colleagues to ensure the bipartisan support for VAWA 2021 and to pass legislation that will provide needed services and supports to survivors and their families and communities.

Sincerely,

KARMA COTTMAN,
Executive Director.

YWCA,
to maintain the safety, resources, and protections critical to all survivors, particularly women of color and other marginalized communities. Of particular importance, VAWA includes many of these.

From an increased investment in sexual violence services and prevention programs and culturally specific organizations that serve survivors, we are building on the trust and support of individuals to hold offenders accountable on tribal lands to ensure that the violence against women continues to rise with this silent epidemic. Survivors cannot wait another day for the critical protections identified in the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2021. We urge you to vote yes on this critical bill.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please contact Fum Yuen, YWCA USA Director of Government Relations if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE V. BRANE,
Vice President of Public Policy & Advocacy.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE TO END SEXUAL VIOLENCE

March 4, 2021.

Honors Jack Lee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Jack Lee and Fitzpatrick:

On behalf of the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence (NAESV) and our 1,000 local rape crisis centers and educators, we write to you today to support the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 2021. The updated bill includes many of these.

With each iteration of VAWA, Congress goes the next step to address the needs of survivors and communities. Based on extensive conversations with local programs and advocates, we brought forward several key enhancements, and we are very pleased that these enhancements are included in the updated bill.

From an increased investment in sexual violence services and prevention programs and culturally specific organizations that serve survivors, we are building on the trust and support of individuals to hold offenders accountable on tribal lands to ensure that the violence against women continues to rise with this silent epidemic. Survivors cannot wait another day for the critical protections identified in the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2021. We urge you to vote yes on this critical bill.
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NATIONAL ALLIANCE TO END SEXUAL VIOLENCE

March 4, 2021.

Honors Jack Lee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.
increases survivors’ access to safe housing. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 also recognizes the disparate impact of gender-based violence on communities of color due to systemic racism and increases funding for culturally specific organizations serving these communities. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 further builds on our critical work and strengthens protections and supports the programs that serve them.

We thank you, again, for your leadership, and we urge the House to pass the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 as a matter of utmost urgency.

Sincerely,

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS, House of Representatives, Washington, DC

RE: Support for Passage of HR 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE, House of Representatives, Washington, DC

Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON LEE AND REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK: I am writing on behalf of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), the nation’s oldest and largest organization of American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments, to thank you for your leadership in introducing HR 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2021, and to convey our support for your efforts. NCAI has been actively involved in the development of the tribal provisions of VAWA in each of the past reauthorizations of the bill. Each time VAWA has been reauthorized, it has included important provisions aimed at improving safety and justice for Native women.

In 2019, NCAI adopted resolution ECWS–19–005 (attached), which sets forth five priorities for reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA):

(1) include provisions, like those included in the bipartisan Native Youth and Tribal Officer Protection Act and Justice for Native Survivors of Sexual Violence Act, that amend 25 U.S.C. 1304 to address jurisdictional gaps including: child abuse and endangerment; assaults against law enforcement officers; sexual violence; stalking; trafficking; and the exclusion of certain tribes from the law;

(2) create a permanent authorization for DOJ’s Tribal Access to National Crime Information Program and ensure that TAP is available to all tribes;

(3) improve the response to cases of missing and murdered women in tribal communities;

(4) identify and address the unique barriers to safety for Alaska Native women and provide culturally appropriate services; and

(5) reauthorize VAWA’s tribal grant programs and ensure that funding is available to cover costs incurred by tribes who are exercising jurisdiction pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1304.

We are pleased to see that your legislation continues to build on VAWA’s promise and includes the key priorities that have been identified by NCAI and its member tribes and advocates to further enhance safety for victims in tribal communities.

As you know, tribal communities continue to be plagued by the highest crime victimization rates in the country. A recent study of the Bureau of Justice Statistics found that over 80% of Native Americans will be a victim of intimate partner violence, sexual violence, or stalking in their lifetime. The study also found that 90% of Native American women were victims of intimate partner violence were victimized by a non-Indian perpetrator. Sadly, Native children are particularly affected by this violence. Native children are 50% more likely to experience child abuse and sexual abuse than white children. The complicated jurisdictional framework at play in Indian Country continues to undermine safety for victims of violence in tribal communities.

Eight years ago, when Congress passed VAWA 2013, it included a provision, known as Special Domestic Violence Jurisdiction (SDVCJ), that reaffirmed the inherent sovereign authority of Indian tribal governments to exercise criminal jurisdiction over tribal, local, and federal jurisdictions, to include violent crimes not qualifying protection orders or commits domestic or dating violence against Indian victims on tribal lands. Since passage of VAWA 2013, we have witnessed the ways in which tribal jurisdiction has transformed access to justice for some domestic violence victims, and also the ways in which it fails short for victims of sexual violence, stalking, trafficking, and child abuse. We welcome introduction of your bill, which would address many of the gaps in the existing law and make important strides toward restoring public safety and justice on tribal lands.

We are particularly grateful that your legislation recognizes that Native children are equally in need of the protections that were extended to adult domestic violence victims in VAWA 2013. The Tribal Nations implementing SDVCJ have children been involved as victims or witnesses in SDVCJ cases nearly 60% of the time. These children have been assaulted or have faced physical intimidation and threats, are living in homes and communities with school-related problems, medical illnesses, post-traumatic stress disorder, and other impairments. However, federal law currently limits SDVCJ to crimes committed only against intimate partners or persons covered by a qualifying protection order. The common scenario reported by Tribal Nations is that they are only able to charge a non-Indian batterer for violence against the mother, and can do nothing about violence against the children. Your bill would change that.

Your bill will also make strides in improving the coordination and collaboration between tribal, local, and federal jurisdictions, particularly with regard to criminal justice information sharing. These reforms are desperately needed and will make a real difference for victims of crime in Indian Country. We look forward to continuing this important work with your offices and thank you for your commitment to tribal communities.

Thank you,

FAWN SHARP,
President

THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS RESOLUTION #ECWS–19–005

WHEREAS, according to DOJ, American Indian and Alaska Native children suffer at a higher rate of violent crime than any other race in the United States, and this violence has immediate and long term effects,
including; increased rates of altered neuro-
logica development; poor physical and men-
tal health; poor school performance; sub-
stance abuse; and overrepresentation in the juve-
nile justice system.

Whereas, a 2016 report from the National Insti-
tute for Justice (NIJ) confirmed that 56% of Na-
tive women experience sexual violence by an
interracial perpetrator as non-Hispanic
White victims and Native stalking victims are
nearly 4 times as likely to be stalked by someone
of a different race, but federal law
prevents tribal courts from holding non-
Indian offenders accountable for these crimes;

Whereas, reauthorizing VAWA included, a provi-
sion directing the Attorney General to permit In-
dian tribes to enter information into and ob-
tain information from federal criminal infor-
mation databases;

Whereas, in 2015 DOJ announced the Tribal
Access Program for National Crime Informa-
tion (TAP), which provides eligible tribes
with access to the Crime Information
Services systems;

Whereas, there has never been funding au-
thorized for the TAP program and some tribes
report that they are unable to access the
program;

Whereas, on some reservations, American
Indian and Alaska Native women are mur-
dered at more than 10 times the national av-
rage;

Whereas, in many cases, law enforcement
has failed to adequately respond to cases of
missing and murdered American Indian and
Alaska Native women, leaving family mem-
bers to organize their own searches and com-
unity marches for justice and without ac-
tion to protect family;

Whereas, Alaska Native women experience
some of the highest rates of violence in the coun-
try and geographical remoteness, ex-
reme weather, the lack of transportation in-
frastructure, and unique jurisdictional com-
xplexities present unique challenges to Native
women’s safety;

Whereas, certain tribes subject to restric-
tive settlement acts have not been able to
implement the tribal jurisdiction provision of
VAWA 2010;

Now therefore be it resolved, that NCAI
calls on Congress to move swiftly to pass a
long-term reauthorization of VAWA that will;

Include provisions like those included in
the Native Youth and Tribal Officer Protec-
tion Act and Justice, for Native Survivors
of Sexual Violence Act that amend 25 USC
1304 to address jurisdictional gaps including:
child abuse and endangerment; assaults
against law enforcement officers; sexual vio-
lence; and trafficking; and the exclu-
sion of certain tribes from the law;

Create a permit authorization for DOJ’s
Tribal Access to National Crime Information
Program and ensure that TAP is available to
all tribes;

Improve the response to and classification
of incidents of missing and murdered Indian
women consistent with NCAI Resolution
PHX-16-477;

Identify and address the unique barriers to
safety for Alaska Native women, based upon
meaningful findings, and provide access to
all programs; and

Reauthorize VAWA’s tribal grant programs
and ensure that funding is available to tribal
funds incurred by tribes who are exercising
jurisdiction pursuant to VAWA;

Be it further resolved, that NCAI will op-
pose any VAWA reauthorization bill that
undermines tribal sovereignty, unfairly penal-
izes tribes in accessing federal funds, or that

diminishes tribal inherent authority to de-
fine and address crimes of domestic or dating
violence, sexual violence, stalking, or traf-
cking; and

Be it finally resolved, resolution shall be
the policy of NCAI until it is withdrawn or
modified by subsequent resolution.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted by
the Executive Committee at the Executive
Council Winter Session of the National Con-
gress of American Indians, held at the Cap-
itol Hilton, February 12, 2019, with a quorum
present.

Attest: 
JUANA MAJEL DIXON, 
Recording Secretary.
JEFFERSON KEEL, 
President.

LEGAL MOMENTUM—THE WOM-
EN’S LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDU-
CATION FUND,


HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives, 
Washington, DC.

HON. BRIAN FITZPATRICK, 
House of Representatives, 
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON LEE AND
REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK: Legal Momen-
tum, the Women’s Legal Defense and Edu-
cation Fund commends you for introducing the
Violence Against Women Reauthoriza-
tion Act of 2021. Legal Momentum is the na-
ton’s first and longest-serving advocacy or-
ganization dedicated to advancing gender
equality. We make these advancements through targeted litigation, innovative pub-
lic policy, and education. Preventing and re-
sponding to gender-based violence is a core
pillar of Legal Momentum’s work, in rec-
ognition of the fact that freedom from vio-
lence is central to achieving true equality.

Legal Momentum is proud to have been
closely involved in developing the landmark
bipartisan legislation that became the Vio-
ence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994. Our
organization played a critical role in
drafting and advocating for VAWA’s passage,
beginning with then-Senator Joe
Biden in 1990. We have since worked in coali-
tion with the National Task Force to End
Sexual and Domestic Violence to see en-
hanced services and protections included in
each reauthorization of VAWA, each of
which had bipartisan support. Legal Momen-
tum is grateful to you for your dedication to
reauthorizing VAWA—In a way that responds
to the needs of all those affected by gender-
based violence.

The updates to the existing Violence
Against Women Act that are included in
your bill reflect the real needs of victims and
survivors, expanding the program to prevent
gender-based violence, closing Tribal and
firearms loopholes to protect all survivors, strengthening public hous-
ing protections for survivors, expanding the ability of providers to respond to sexual har-
assment, and prioritizing support for Com-
munities of Color.

The Violence Against Women Reauthoriza-
tion Act of 2021 responds to the urgent issues
survivors face every day by supporting pro-
grams to prevent gender-based violence,
closing Tribal and firearms loopholes to pro-
tect all survivors, strengthening public hous-
ing protections for survivors, expanding the ability of providers to respond to sexual har-
assment, and prioritizing support for Com-
munities of Color.

JWI and our 75,000 members and supporters
greatly appreciate your dedication and lead-
ership in advancing this critical mission of
passing a targeted bill that will have a broad
impact on all survivors. Congress now has an
opportunity to come together and pass
meaningful legislation to help save the lives
of victims of gender-based violence—we are
grateful that you are spearheading this ef-
fort.

Thank you again for being tireless cham-
pions of survivors.

Sincerely,
LYNN HECHT SCHAFFRAN, Esq.,
Senior Vice President.

LYNN HECHT SCHAFFRAN, Esq.,
Senior Vice President.


HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HON. JEROLOD NADLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HON. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN JACKSON LEE, REP-
RESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK, AND CHAIRMAN
NADLER: Jewish Women International (JWI),
the leading Jewish organization working to
end gender-based violence, applauds your
steadfast dedication and leadership in intro-
ducing the bipartisan Violence Against
Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 (H.R. 1620).

As a Steering Committee member of the
National Task Force to End Sexual and Do-

vance, convener of the Interfaith
Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual

ance, and co-chair of Faiths United to
Prevent Gun Violence, JWI supports this bill that builds on
VAWA’s previous successes and adds key en-
hancements to ensure the safety of victims
domestic violence, dating violence, sexual
assault, and stalking.

The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) is our nation’s single most effective tool in
responding to the devastating crimes of do-

vence, and stalking—providing lifesaving pro-
services to survivors. VAWA has dramatically enhanced and
improved our nation’s response to violence against women. VAWA is essential in the
fundamental programs and services that sur-
vivors rely on every day. This commonsense legislation protects victims and survivors,
helps save lives, and makes our communities safer places to worship, heal, and thrive.

Even with all of the advancements in the last twenty-seven years, there is still a tre-
mendous amount of work that remains. One
third of all women (nearly 52 million women)
in the United States have been victims of
sexual violence by an intimate partner. In
2016 alone, there were 1.1 million domestic
violence victimizations, 54% of which in-
volved domestic partners. The Department of
Justice’s Criminal Victimization 2016 Bul-
letin found that more than 10% of all violent
crime is due to intimate partner violence.

The Violence Against Women Reauthoriza-
tion Act of 2021 responds to the urgent issues
survivors face every day by supporting pro-
grams to prevent gender-based violence,
closing Tribal and firearms loopholes to pro-
tect all survivors, strengthening public hous-
ing protections for survivors, expanding the
ability of providers to respond to sexual har-
assment, and prioritizing support for Com-
munities of Color.

JWI and our 75,000 members and supporters
greatly appreciate your dedication and lead-
ership in advancing this critical mission of
passing a targeted bill that will have a broad
impact on all survivors. Congress now has an
opportunity to come together and pass
meaningful legislation to help save the lives
of victims of gender-based violence—we are
grateful that you are spearheading this ef-
fort.

Thank you again for being tireless cham-
pions of survivors.

Sincerely,
MEREDITH JACOBS,
JWI CEO.
Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,  
Hon. JERROLD NADLER,  
in support of H.R. 1620, the “Violence Against  
Communities.

We must act now to reauthorize Violence Against  
Women Act of 1994. H.R. 1620 increases access to  
services, safety, and justice for all survivors.  

VAWA Reauthorization is a necessary part of our national  
response to ending gender-based violence. It includes  
narrowly focused, yet critical, enhancements to address  
gaps identified by survivors and direct service providers.  

Among many provisions, the measure maintains vital protections for all survivors, including  
access to safe housing and economic independence, and eliminates longstanding undue  
financial barriers to housing for survivors.

VAWA Reauthorization is a necessary part of our national response to ending gender-based  
violence. It includes narrowly focused, yet critical, enhancements to address gaps identified by survivors and direct service providers. Among many provisions, the measure maintains vital protections for all survivors, including access to safe housing and economic independence, and eliminates longstanding undue financial barriers to housing for survivors.

VAWA has proven success record—in the quarter-century since it passed, domestic violence has decreased by approximately two-thirds, and intimate partner homicides decreased by approximately one-third. However, despite these gains, domestic violence and sexual assault cases have increased significantly.

In addition to ensuring important pathways to safety, justice, and well-being for all survivors, H.R. 1620 includes important enhancements that improve access to intervention and prevention services. We are enthusiastic about the funding for legal and housing services that are life-saving resources for survivors of domestic and sexual violence. We are also very encouraged by the funds allocated to providing culturally specific services.

The Violence Against Women Act is landmark  
legislation first enacted in 1994 and signed into law by President Bill Clinton which has—through policy reforms, interstate cooperation and grant allocation—been pivotal in providing a national response to protecting half of the population.

Equally important, it has ushered in a seismic transformation on how society perceives violence against women. VAWA was enacted in response to the prevalence of domestic and sexual violence, and the significant impact of such violence on the lives of all victims.

I remember those days well because I was serving on the board of the Houston Area Women’s Center (HAWC), at that time the sole shelter in the Houston area offering sanctuary to victims and women at risk of domestic violence.

Despite its import, VAWA has been enacted since September 30, 2018, and we as a body are now called upon by survivors to reauthorize it.

VAWA has a proven success record—in the quarter-century since it passed, domestic violence has decreased by approximately two-thirds, and intimate partner homicides decreased by approximately one-third. However, despite these gains, domestic violence and sexual assault cases have increased significantly.

In addition to ensuring important pathways to safety, justice, and well-being for all survivors, H.R. 1620 includes important enhancements that improve access to intervention and prevention services. We are enthusiastic about the funding for legal and housing services that are life-saving resources for survivors of domestic and sexual violence. We are also very encouraged by the funds allocated to providing culturally specific services.

This landmark, transformative legislation is needed now more than ever. Police departments across the country have reported increases in domestic violence: 18 percent increase in San Antonio; 22 percent increase in Portland, Oregon; 10 percent increase in New York City.

A recent meta-analysis of 18 different studies concern domestic violence during the pandemic found that domestic violence cases have increased an average of over 8 percent across the country.

In the United States, an estimated 10 million people experience domestic violence every year, and more than 15 million children are exposed to this violence annually.

According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, about 20 people per minute are physically abused by an intimate partner.

About 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men experience severe intimate partner physical violence, sexual violence, and/or partner stalking with injury. Today, in Texas, 35.10 percent of women and 34.5 percent of men are subjected to domestic violence.

We cannot forget the victims of domestic violence like Yashica Fontenot, who was murdered in Harris County, Texas, by her husband just one day after Christmas last year while she was trying to escape her relationship.

Nor can we forget Debra Seidenfaden, who was murdered by her husband in Houston after an argument.

Nor can we forget the Houston woman who was tied up and sexually assaulted in her own home just last week, or the Houston woman whose body was found by her husband at a medical office this month; or the Houston mother and grandmother who was murdered by her son-in-law while she attempted to protect her daughter and grandchildren.

There are countless stories like this throughout our country, which is why it is imperative to reauthorize VAWA by passing H.R. 1620. The stories of these women remind us of the urgency to protect survivors now, before it is too late, because many of these deaths are preventable.

Since VAWA’s codification in 1994, more victims report episodes of domestic violence to the police and the rate of non-fatal intimate partner violence against women has decreased by almost two-thirds.

H.R. 1620 has also led to a significant increase in the reporting of sexual assault. From 1994 to 2015, the rate of women murdered by men in single victim/single offender incidents dropped 29 percent.

In the first 15 years of VAWA’s validity, rates of serious intimate partner violence declined by 72 percent for women and 64 percent for men. Research suggests that referring a victim to a domestic violence or sexual assault advocate has been linked to an increased willingness to file a police report—survivors with an advocate filed a report 59 percent of the time, versus 41 percent for individuals not referred to a victim advocate.

Prior to VAWA, law enforcement lacked the resources and tools to respond effectively to domestic violence and sexual assault, and this problem cannot be addressed sufficiently by the law enforcement alone.

Congress must continue sending the clear message that violence against women is unacceptable.

VAWA has been reauthorized three times—in 2000, 2005, and 2013—with strong bipartisan approval. The law continues to provide a national response to protecting survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

H.R. 1620 addresses the needs of sex trafficking victims while creating a demonstration program on trauma-informed training for law enforcement.

H.R. 1620 increases access to grant programs for culturally specific organizations and ensures culturally specific programs are included in the development and implementation of service, education, training, and other grants.

H.R. 1620 expands protections for vulnerable populations such as youth, survivors without shelter, Native American women, and LGBTQ persons.

H.R. 1620 ensures that Deaf people are included in grants targeting people with disabilities.

VAWA is central to our nation’s efforts to fight the epidemic of domestic, sexual, and
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dating violence and stalking, and we as a body are now called upon by survivors to reauthorize it.

It is important to note that H.R. 1620 did not happen on its own. It was the product of a collaborative effort of stakeholders, including victim advocates. It was the product of those willing to share their stories of the abuse suffered at the hands of those who were entrusted to love, but instead harmed. The courage, strength, and resilience displayed by survivors has reminded us all that we must continue to foster an environment for victims of violence to come forward and expose episodes of violence against women.

Having listened to concerned stakeholders from all pockets of the country, we have put pen to paper and produced a bill that is endorsed by the bipartisan National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NTF), which is a national collaboration comprising a large and diverse group of 35 national, tribal, state, territorial, and local organizations, advocates, and individuals that focuses on the development, passage and implementation of effective public policy to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

This bill recognizes the urgency and dire need faced by the victims and survivors throughout this country during a significant moment of ongoing domestic violence caused by this pandemic and experienced by both women and men. The love for a spouse, the comfort of a mother and the best wishes for a sister know no political allegiance.

I am determined to work with my colleagues and others to complete the mission I accepted in the 115th Congress when the House passed the VAWA legislation I authored, H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2017, all the way through this pandemic and experienced by both women and men. The love for a spouse, the comfort of a mother and the best wishes for a sister know no political allegiance.

I am determined to work with my colleagues and others to complete the mission I accepted in the 115th Congress when the House passed the VAWA legislation I authored, H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2017, all the way through this pandemic and experienced by both women and men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SPANBERGER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to Resolution 233, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. 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.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2021
Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 233, I call up the bill (H.R. 1620) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, 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 233, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–3, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 117–12, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1620

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Universal definitions and grant conditions.
Sec. 3. Agency and Department Coordination.
Sec. 4. Effective date.
Sec. 5. Availability of funds.
Sec. 6. Sense of Congress.

TITLE I—ENHANCING LEGAL TOOLS TO COMBAT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

Sec. 101. Stop grants.
Sec. 102. Grants to encourage improvements and alternatives to the criminal justice response.
Sec. 103. Legal assistance for victims.
Sec. 104. Grants to support families in the justice system.
Sec. 105. Outreach and services to underserved populations grants.
Sec. 106. Criminal provisions.
Sec. 107. Rape survivor child custody.
Sec. 108. Enhancing culturally specific services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.
Sec. 109. Grants for lethality assessment programs.

TITLE II—IMPROVING SERVICES FOR VICTIMS

Sec. 201. Sexual assault service programs.
Sec. 202. Sexual Assault Service Programs.
Sec. 203. Rural domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and child abuse enforcement assistance program.
Sec. 204. Grants for training and services to end violence against people with disabilities and Deaf people.
Sec. 205. Training and services to end abuse in the justice system.
Sec. 206. Demonstration program on trauma-informed, victim-centered training for law enforcement.

TITLE III—SERVICES, PROTECTION, AND JUSTICE FOR YOUNG VICTIMS

Sec. 301. Rape prevention and education grant.
Sec. 302. Creating hope through outreach, options, services, and education (CHOOSE) for children and youth.
Sec. 303. Grants to combat violent crimes on campus.

TITLE IV—VIOLANCE REDUCTION PRACTICES

Sec. 401. Study conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
Sec. 402. Saving Money and Reducing Tragedies (SMART) through Prevention grants.

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS RESPONSE

Sec. 501. Grants to strengthen the healthcare systems response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

TITLE VI—SAFE HOMES FOR VICTIMS

Sec. 601. Housing protections for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.
Sec. 602. Ensuring compliance and implementation; prohibiting retaliation against victims.
Sec. 603. Protecting the right to report crime from one’s home.
Sec. 604. Transitional housing assistance grants for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
Sec. 605. Addressing the housing needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.
Sec. 606. United States Housing Act of 1937 amendments.

TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS

Sec. 701. Findings.
Sec. 702. National Resource Center on workplace violence to assist victims of domestic and sexual violence.
Sec. 703. Provisions related to Unemployment Compensation and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program.
Sec. 704. Study and reports on barriers to survivors’ economic security access.
Sec. 705. GAO Study.
Sec. 706. Education and information programs for survivors.
Sec. 707. Severability.

TITLE VIII—HOMICIDE REDUCTION INITIATIVES

Sec. 801. Prohibiting persons convicted of misdemeanor crimes against dating partners and persons subject to protection orders.
Sec. 802. Prohibiting stalkers and individuals subject to court order from possessing a firearm.

TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN

Sec. 901. Findings and purposes.
Sec. 902. Authorizing funding for the Tribal access programs.
Sec. 903. Tribal jurisdiction over covered crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, obstruction of justice, sexual violence, sex trafficking, stalking, and assault of a law enforcement officer or corrections officer.

TITLE X—OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Sec. 1001. Establishment of Office on Violence Against Women.
Sec. 1002. Office on Violence Against Women a later life.
Sec. 1003. Office on Violence Against Women reauthorization.

TITLE XI—IMPROVING CONDITIONS FOR VICTIMS

Sec. 1101. Improving the treatment of primary caregivers of incarcerated women.
Sec. 1102. Public health and safety of women.
Sec. 1103. Research and Support on women in federal incarceration.
Sec. 1104. Reentry planning and services for incarcerated women.

TITLE XII—LAW ENFORCEMENT TO ENHANCE PUBLIC SAFETY

Sec. 1201. Notification to law enforcement agencies of prohibited purchase or attempted purchase of a firearm.
Sec. 1202. Reporting of background check denials to state, local, and Tribal authorities.
TITLElII—CLOSING THE LAWFUL ENFORCEMENT CONSENT LOOPHOLE

Sec. 1291. Short title.

Sec. 1292. Prohibition on engaging in sexual acts while acting under color of law.

Sec. 1293. Incentives for States.

Sec. 1294. Reports to Congress.

Sec. 1295. Definition.

TITLElIV—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 1401. National stalker and domestic violence reduction.

Sec. 1402. Federal victim assistants reauthorization.

Sec. 1403. Child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners.

Sec. 1404. Sex offender management.

Sec. 1405. Court-appointed special advocate program.

Sec. 1406. Sexual assault forensic exam program grants.

Sec. 1407. Review on link between substance use and victims of domestic violence domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

Sec. 1408. Interagency working group to study Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence.

Sec. 1409. National Domestic Violence Hotline.

Sec. 1410. Deputy Assistant Attorney General on Culturally Specific Communities.

TITLE XIV—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 1501. National stalker and domestic violence reduction.

Sec. 1502. National Resource Center Grant.

Sec. 1503. National strategy, classification, and reporting on domestic violence.

Sec. 1504. Federal victim assistants reauthorization.

Sec. 1505. Definition.

Sec. 1506. Prohibition on engaging in sexual acts while acting under color of law.

Sec. 1507. Increased funding for formula grants authorized.

Sec. 1508. Application.

Sec. 1509. Definition of covered formula grant.

Sec. 1510. Increased funding for formula grants authorized.

Sec. 1511. Grant term.

Sec. 1512. Uses of funds.

Sec. 1513. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. UNIVERSAL DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.

Section 40092 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “In this title” and inserting “In this title, and for the purpose of all grants authorized under this title”;

(B) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(5) COURT-BASED AND COURT-RELATED PERSONNEL.—The term ‘court-based personnel’ means persons working in the court, whether paid or volunteer, including—

(A) clerks, special masters, domestic relations officers, administrators, mediators, custody evaluators, guardians ad litem, lawyers, mediators, probation, parole, interpreters, victim assistants, victim advocates, and judicial, administrative, or any other professionals or personnel similarly involved in the legal process;

(B) court security personnel;

(C) personnel working in related, supplemental agencies (such as child support enforcement); and

(D) any other court-based or community-based personnel having responsibilities or authority to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the court system;”;

(I) by inserting “who cannot access, or” before “who face barriers”;

(II) by striking “and using victim services” and inserting “, or receiving or offering appropriate victim services”;

and

(III) by striking “alienating” and inserting “immigration”; and

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

“(66) ABUSE IN LATER LIFE.—The term ‘abuse in later life’—

(A) means—

(i) neglect, abandonment, economic abuse, or willful harm of an adult aged 50 or older by an individual in an ongoing relationship of trust with the victim;

(ii) domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking of an adult aged 50 or older by any individual; and

(B) does not include self-neglect.

(47) RESTORATIVE PRACTICE.—The term ‘restorative practice’ means a process, whether court-referred or community-based, that—

(A) involves, on a voluntary basis, and to the extent possible, those who have committed a specific offense and those who have been harmed as a result of the offense, as well as the affected community;

(B) has the goal of collectively seeking accountability from the accused, and developing a framework whereby the accused is responsible for his or her actions, and a plan for providing relief to those harmed, through allocation, restitution, community service or other processes upon which the victim, the accused, the community, and the court (if court-referred) can agree;

(C) is conducted in a framework that protects victim safety and supports victim autonomy; and

(D) includes protocols to address the use of information disclosed during such process for other law enforcement purposes.

(48) DIGITAL SERVICES.—The term ‘digital services’ means services, resources, information, support or referrals provided through electronic communications platforms and media, whether via mobile device technology, video technology, or computer technology, including utilizing the internet, as well as any other emerging communications technologies that are appropriate for the purposes of providing services, resources, information, support, or referrals for the benefit of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(49) ECONOMIC ABUSE.—The term ‘economic abuse’, in the context of domestic violence, dating violence, and abuse in later life, means behavior that is coercive, deceptive, or unreasonable, where the device is installed, and may include home automation systems, door locks, and thermostats.

(51) TECHNOLOGICAL ABUSE.—The term ‘technological abuse’ means an act or pattern of behavior that occurs within domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence or stalking and is
intended to harm, threaten, intimidate, control, stalk, harass, impersonate, exploit, extort, or monitor, except as otherwise permitted by law, another person, that occurs using any form of information and communication technologies, includes information technologies, or any other emerging technologies.

(52) FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION.—The term ‘female genital mutilation’ has the meaning given such term in section 116 of title 18, United States Code.

(53) ELDER ABUSE.—The term ‘elder abuse’ has the meaning given such term in section 172 of the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act. The terms ‘abuse,’ ‘elder,’ and ‘exploitation’ have the meanings given those terms in section 2011 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397).

(54) FORCED MARRIAGE.—The term ‘forced marriage’ means a marriage to which one or both parties do not or cannot consent, and in which one or more elements of force, fraud, coercion is present. Forced marriage can be both a form of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking.

(55) HOMELESS.—The term ‘homeless’ has the meaning given such term in section 41024(6).

(56) NO-CONTACT ORDER.—The term ‘no-contact order’ means an order issued under a law of a State by a court that restrains a person who previously threatened, injured, or attempted to injure a victim to have no contact, directly or indirectly, with the victim.

(57) PARTNER VIOLENCE.—The term ‘partner violence’ means any physical, sexual, economic, or psychological harm or threat of harm by a current or former intimate partner or cohabiting partner.

(58) PERSON.—The term ‘person’ means a natural person.

(59) PERSONAL INJURIES.—The term ‘personal injuries’ means any personal injuries that may result from the commission of a crime.

(60) PROHIBITED CONTACT.—The term ‘prohibited contact’ includes any direct or indirect contact between a victim and a perpetrator, including, but not limited to, communication, interaction, or contact through any means.

(61) PROSECUTION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—The term ‘prosecution of violence against women’ means the prosecution of any offense against women.

(62) PROTECTOR.—The term ‘protector’ means any person who is authorized by law to protect a victim from any abuse.

(63) PROTECTOR OR PETITIONER.—The term ‘protector or petitioner’ means any person who is authorized by law to seek protection for a victim from abuse.

(64) PUBLIC AID.—The term ‘public aid’ means any form of financial assistance provided by a government agency to a person who is eligible.

(65) SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall take effect upon its enactment and shall apply to any sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual abuse, or stalking that occurs on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EFFECTIVE ON DATE OF ENACTMENT.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect until October 1, 2021.

(c) PROVIDING VICTIM SERVICES.—By the appropriate law enforcement agency from and the return of such weapon to the entity has received funding from the Office on Violence Against Women.

The heads of Executive Departments responsible for carrying out this Act are authorized to coordinate and collaborate on the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including sharing best practices and efficient use of resources and technology for victims and those seeking assistance from the Government.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect upon its enactment and shall apply to any sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual abuse, or stalking that occurs on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EFFECTIVE ON DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

SEC. 5. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

Any funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations under this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress—

(1) that sex trafficking victims experience sexual violence and assault; and

(2) that Federal recognition of their recovery is important.

TITLE I—ENHANCING LEGAL TOOLS TO COMBAT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

SEC. 101. STOP GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 1041 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 201(b)—

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ‘‘including implementation of the non-discrimination requirements in section 40003(9)(l) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994’’.

(b) in paragraph (6), by inserting ‘‘and legal assistance’’ after ‘‘improving delivery of victim services’’.

(c) in paragraph (9)—

(1) by striking ‘‘older and disabled women’’ and inserting ‘‘people 50 years of age or over, people with disabilities, and Deaf people’’;

(2) by inserting ‘‘legal assistance’’ after ‘‘counseling’’; and

(3) by striking ‘‘older and disabled individuals’’ and inserting ‘‘those persons of advanced age or with disabilities’’.

(D) in paragraph (11), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ‘‘, including rehabilitative work with offenders, restorative practices, and similar initiatives’’;

(E) in paragraph (19), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end.

(F) in paragraph (20), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(G) by inserting after paragraph (20), the following:

‘‘(G) developing and implementing laws, polices, procedures, or training to ensure the lawful recovery and storage of any dangerous weapon by the appropriate law enforcement agency from and the return of such weapon when appropriate, where any Federal, State, Tribal, or local court has—

‘‘(A)(i) issued protective or other restraining orders against such a perpetrator; or

‘‘(ii) found such a perpetrator to be guilty of misdemeanor or felony crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

‘‘(B) ordered the perpetrator to relinquish dangerous weapons that the perpetrator possesses or has used in the commission of at least one of the aforementioned crimes; and

‘‘(C) procedures, regulations, or training under this section shall include the safest means of recovery of, and best practices for storage of, relinquished and recovered dangerous weapons and their return, when applicable, at such time as the individual is no longer prohibited from possessing such weapons under Federal, State, or Tribal law, or posted law enforcement notices.

‘‘(2) developing, enlarging, or strengthening culturally specific victim services programs to provide culturally specific victim services regarding, responses to, and prevention of female genital mutilation; and

‘‘(3) providing victim advocates in State or local law enforcement agencies, prosecutors’ offices, and courts and providing supportive services and advocacy to urban American Indian and Alaska Native victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.’’.

(2) in section 207—

(a) in subsection (d) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (6) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(b) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

‘‘(f) the proof of compliance with the requirements regarding training for victim-centered prosecution, described in section 1207;'}
“(6) proof of compliance with the requirements regarding civil rights under section 4002(b)(13) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994;”;

(B) by amending subsection (i) in paragraph (1), by striking the semicolon at the end the following: “and the requirements under section 4002(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b)(3))”;

(ii) by inserting after “gender identity,” the following: “sexual orientation, gender identity,”.; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) requires the Attorney General to certify to the State, Indian Tribal, and territorial government receiving a grant under this part to such potential grantee that, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021, the Attorney General shall by rule establish procedures for such a certification.

(8) (B) in paragraph (2), by striking “or local” and inserting “or local.””;

(9) (A) in paragraph (3), by striking “in domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking cases, including policies addressing the use of bench warrants, body attachments, and material witness warrants for victims who fail to appear. The training shall be developed by experts in the fields of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking, and prosecution.”;


(b) GRANTS.—Section 2101 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 14461) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this part is to assist States, Indian Tribal governments, State and local governments, including juvenile courts, Tribal courts, and units of local government to improve the criminal justice response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and to seek safety and autonomy for victims.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “proarrest” and inserting “offender accountability and homicide reduction”;

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking “legal advocacy services programs” and inserting “legal advocacy and legal assistance programs”; and

(C) in paragraph (7), strike “and tribal jurisdictions” and inserting “and jurisdictional boundaries, coalitions, and victim service providers;”;

(D) in paragraph (8)—

(i) by striking “older individuals” (as defined in section 191 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1902))” and inserting “older individuals (as defined in section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965)”;

(ii) by striking “and” at the end; and

(E) in paragraph (19), by inserting before the period at the end the following “, including victims who are older, victims who are pregnant, and victims who are older individuals.”;

(ii) by striking “older individuals” and inserting “older individuals.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraphs (1), by striking “in order to develop and implement restorative practices.”; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking “encourage or local” and inserting “local, culturally specific.”

(C) in paragraph (4), after “dating violence,” insert “stalking,”; and

(D) in subsection (f)(1)—

(A) by striking “$57,000,000” and inserting “$75,000,000”;

(B) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026.”

(b) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the return on investment for legal assistance grants awarded pursuant to section 102(c) of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 20121), including an accounting of the amount saved, if any, on housing, medical, or employment social welfare programs.

SEC. 104. GRANTS TO SUPPORT FAMILIES IN THE JUICE SYSTEM. Section 1301 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12646) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “educate” and inserting “(A) educate”; and

(ii) by adding “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking “as defined in such heading.”

(C) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) in paragraph (8)—

(i) by striking “improve” and inserting “improve”;

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “and insert the following:

“(B) establishes community-based initiatives within the court system (such as court watch programs, victim assistants, pro se victim assistance programs, community-based supplemental services);”;

(D) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end;
“(9) develop and implement restorative practices (as such term is defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994);”; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 105. OUTREACH AND SERVICES TO UNDER-SERVED POPULATIONS GRANTS.

Section 121 of the Violence Against Women Act and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 12291) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this grant program is to ensure that all underserved populations (as such term is defined in section 40002 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(a)) are given non-exclusionary consideration in each grant cycle. Periodic priority may be placed on certain underserved populations and forms of violence to meet identified needs and must be accompanied by a non-priority option.”;

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

“(A) by inserting “effectiveness” and inserting “response”;

(B) by adding “specimen” before “before training”;

(C) by inserting “2022 through 2026” and the following:

“(6) developing, enlisting, or strengthening culturally specific programs and projects to provide culturally relevant services regarding, responses to, and prevention of female genital mutilation; or

“(7) strengthening the response of social and human services by providing population-specific training for service providers on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in underserved populations.”; and

(3) in subsection (g) by:

(A) by striking “$2,000,000” and inserting “$30,000,000”;

and

(B) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 106. CRIMINAL PROVISIONS.

Section 2265 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(3)—

(A) by striking “restraining order or injunction,” and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The prohibitions under this paragraph apply to all protection orders for the protection of a person residing within a State, territorial, or Tribal jurisdiction, whether or not the protection order was issued by that State, territory, or Tribe.”;

and

(2) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following: “This applies to all Alaska Tribes without respect to ‘Indian country’ or the population of the Native village associated with the Tribe.”.

SEC. 107. RAPE SURVIVOR CHILD CUSTODY.

Section 400 of the Justice for Victims of Traf-ficking Act of 2015 (34 U.S.C. 21308) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 108. ENHANCING CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

Section 121 of the Violence Against Women Act and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 12291) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “shall take 5 percent of such appropriated amounts” and inserting “shall take 10 percent of such appropriated amounts”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 109. GRANTS FOR LETHALITY ASSESSMENT PROGRAMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may make grants to States, units of local government, Indian Tribes, domestic violence victim service providers, and State or Tribal Domestic Violence Coalitions for technical assistance and training in the operation or establishment of a lethality assessment program.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “lethality assessment program” means a program that—

(1) rapidly connects a victim of domestic violence to local community-based victim service providers;

(2) helps first responders and others in the justice system, including courts, law enforcement agencies, and prosecutors of Tribal government and units of local government, identify and respond to possibly lethal circumstances; and

(3) identifies victims of domestic violence who are at high risk of being seriously injured or killed by an intimate partner.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—To be eligible for a grant under this section, an applicant shall demonstrate experience in developing, implementing, evaluating, and disseminating a lethality assessment program.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(e) DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions and grant conditions in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291) apply:

TITLE II—IMPROVING SERVICES FOR VICTIMS

SEC. 201. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 41601 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12251) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”;

(2) in subsection (i)(2), by striking “leadership training” and inserting “leadership training in the operation or establishment of a lethality assessment program.”;

(3) in subsection (i)(4), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 202. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 41601(f)(1) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12251) is amended by striking “$40,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “$60,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.”.

SEC. 203. RURAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 42925 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12251) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “women and inserting “adults, youth,” and

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 204. GRANTS FOR TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND DEAF PEOPLE.

Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12212) is amended—

(1) in the heading—

(A) by striking “women” and inserting “PEOPLE”;

and

(B) by inserting after “DISABILITIES” the follow- ing: “AND DEAF PEOPLE”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “individuals” each place it appears and inserting “people”;

and

(B) by inserting after “with disabilities” as de- fined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabil- ities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102)” the fol- lowing: “and Deaf people”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “disabled individuals” each place it appears and inserting “people with dis- abilities and Deaf people”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting after “law enforcement” the following: “and other first re- sponders”;

and

(C) in paragraph (8), by striking “providing advocacy and intervention services within” and inserting “to enhance the capacity of”;

(4) in subsection (e), by inserting “and Deaf people”;

and

(5) in subsection (o), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 205. TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END ABUSE IN LATER LIFE.


(1) in the heading, by striking “ENHANCED TRAINING” and inserting “TRAINING”;

(2) by striking subsection (c) DEFINITIONS.— In this section—

and all that follows through paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting the following: “The Attorney General shall make grants to eligible entities in accordance with the following:”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) of subsection (b) as paragraphs (1) through (4);

(4) in paragraph (1) (as redesignated by para- graph (3) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking “, including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, exploitation, and neglect” each place it appears;

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “leaders, victim advocates, victim service providers, courts, and first responders to better serve victims of abuse in later life” and inserting “leaders, victim advocates, victim service providers, courts, and first responders to better serve older victims;”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “or other community-based organizations in recogniz- ing and addressing instances of abuse in later life” and inserting “community-based or- ganizations, or other professionals who may identify or respond to abuse in later life”; and

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking “leaders, victim advocates, victim service providers, courts, and first responders to better serve victims of abuse in later life” and inserting “leaders, victim advocates, victim service providers, courts, and first responders to better serve older victims;”;

and

(ii) in clause (i), by striking “advocates, vic- tim service providers, and courts to better serve victims of abuse in later life” and inserting “leaders, victim advocates, victim service providers, courts, and first responders to better serve older victims;”;

and

SEC. 206. TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND DEAF PEOPLE.

Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12212) is amended—

(1) in the heading—

(A) by striking “women” and inserting “PEOPLE”;

and

(B) by inserting after “DISABILITIES” the fol- lowing: “AND DEAF PEOPLE”;

Britishys
(iii) in clause (ii), by striking “in later life,” and inserting “50 years of age or over,”; and

(4) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by paragraph (3), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026.”)

SEC. 306. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON TRAUMA-INFORMED, VICTIM-CENTERED TRAINING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Subtitle Q—Trauma-informed, Victim-centered Training for Law Enforcement

SEC. 41701. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON TRAUMA-INFORMED, VICTIM-CENTERED TRAINING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘Attorney General’ means the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Office of Violence Against Women;

“(2) the term ‘covered individual’ means an individual who interfaces with victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including—

“(A) an individual working for or on behalf of an eligible entity;

“(B) a school or university administrator or personnel (including a campus police officer or a school security official); and

“(C) an emergency services or medical employee;

“(3) the term ‘demonstration site’, with respect to an eligible entity that receives a grant under this section, means—

“(A) if the eligible entity is a law enforcement agency described in paragraph (4)(A), the area over which the eligible entity has jurisdiction; and

“(B) if the eligible entity is an organization or agency described in paragraph (4)(B), the area over which a law enforcement agency described in paragraph (4)(A) that is working in collaboration with the eligible entity has jurisdiction; and

“(4) the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a State, local, territorial, or Tribal law enforcement agency; or

“(B) a national, regional, or local victim services organization or agency working in collaboration with a law enforcement agency described in subparagraph (A).

“(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to carry out the demonstration program under this section, which includes implementing trauma-informed, victim-centered techniques designed to—

“(A) prevent re-traumatization of the victim;

“(B) ensure that covered individuals use evidence-based practices to respond to and investigate cases of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

“(C) improve communication between victims and law enforcement officers in an effort to increase the likelihood of the successful investigation and prosecution of the reported crime in a manner that protects the victim to the greatest extent possible;

“(D) increase collaboration among stakeholders who coordinate the coordinated community response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

“(E) evaluate the effectiveness of the training process and content by means of—

“(i) investigative and prosecutorial practices and outcomes; and

“(ii) the well-being of survivors and their satisfaction with the services provided by the coordinated community response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

“(2) SELECTION.—The Attorney General shall make grants under this section for each of the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

“(3) AWARD BASIS.—The Attorney General shall award grants under this section to multiple eligible entities for use in a variety of settings and communities, including—

“(A) urban, suburban, Tribal, remote, and rural areas;

“(B) college campuses; or

“(C) traditionally underserved communities.

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant to—

“(1) train covered individuals within the demonstration site of the eligible entity to use evidence-based, trauma-informed, and victim-centered techniques designed to—

“(i) elicit valuable information about the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(ii) avoid re-traumatization of the victim;

“(B) conducting field investigations that mirror best and promising practices available at the time of the investigation;

“(C) customizing investigative approaches to ensure a culturally and linguistically appropriate approach to the community being served;

“(D) becoming proficient in understanding and responding to complex cases, including cases of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(E) by providing for the coordination of trauma-informed, victim-centered care for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

“(d) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Justice, shall require that evaluations be designed to—

“(1) design a system for generating and collecting the appropriate data to facilitate an independent process or impact evaluation of the use of the grant funds;

“(2) periodically conduct an evaluation described in paragraph (1); and

“(3) periodically make publicly available, during the grant period—

“(A) preliminary results of the evaluations conducted under paragraph (2); and

“(B) recommendations for improving the use of the grant funds.

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“The Attorney General shall carry out this section using amounts otherwise available to the Attorney General for that fiscal year.

“(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to interfere with the due process rights of the individual.

TITLE III—SERVICES, PROTECTION, AND JUSTICE FOR YOUNG VICTIMS

SEC. 301. RAPE PREVENTION AND EDUCATION GRANT.

Section 3019A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 209k–1D) is amended by—

(1) in subsection (a)—

“(A) by striking the semicolon at the end of the following: “or digital services (as such term is defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994);”;

“(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “professionals” and inserting “professionals, including school-based professionals, to identify and refer students who may have experienced or are at risk of experiencing sexual violence”;

(2) in subsection (b), in clauses (i) and (ii), by redesignating clause (i) as clause (ii) and inserting the following as clause (i):

“(i) involving a male victim; or

“(ii) involving a lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (commonly referred to as ‘LGBT’) victim;

“(3) by redesignating subsections (d) through (e), respectively, as subsections (c) through (d), respectively;

“(4) by inserting the following new subsection:

“(c) MEANINGFUL INVOLVEMENT OF STATE SEXUAL ASSAULT COALITIONS, CULTURALLY SPECIFIC ORGANIZATIONS, AND UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.—In granting funds to States, the Secretary shall set forth procedures designed to ensure meaningful involvement of the State or territorial sexual assault coalitions, culturally specific organizations, and representatives from undere served communities in the application for and implementation of funding.”;

(5) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (4)), by striking “$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “$110,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026;”;

(6) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following: “Not less than 80 percent of the total amount made available under this subsection in each fiscal year shall be awarded in accordance with this paragraph.”;

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) STATE, TERRITORIAL, AND TRIBAL SEXUAL ASSAULT COALITION ALLOTMENT.—Of the total amount made available under this subsection in each fiscal year, not less than 15 percent shall be available to state, territorial, and tribal sexual assault coalitions for purposes of coordinating and providing prevention activities, providing assistance to prevention programs, and
collaborating and coordinating with Federal, State, Tribal, and local entities engaged in sexual violence prevention. From amounts appropriated for grants under this subsection for each fiscal year, not less than 10 percent of funds shall be available for grants to tribal sexual assault coalitions, and the remaining funds shall be available for grants to State and territorial coalitions, in accordance with the sex trafficking, or female genital mutilation, or on sex trafficking, including technology abuse and reproductive and sexual coercion, that is age-appropriate, culturally relevant, ongoing, delivered in multiple venues. (iv) in subparagraph (E), by inserting after "or" the following: "domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking,
(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "stalking, or sex trafficking," inserting "stalking, or sex trafficking," and (C) in paragraph (3), by striking "stalking, sexual assault, and stalking, including technology abuse and reproductive and sexual coercion, that is age-appropriate, culturally relevant, ongoing, delivered in multiple venues."
SEC. 501. GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

Section 300P of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 200g-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “community health workers, violence prevention advocates working with health providers,” after “health staff;”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “(including midwives and doulas)” after “residents;” and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “response” after “improve the” and inserting “capacity”;

(ii) by inserting “and respond to” after “(including behavioral and mental health programs)”;

(iii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “a semicolon;” and

(iv) by inserting “and” at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting “universal education on healthy relationships” after “providers to;”;

(B) by striking “identify”;

(iii) by inserting “trauma-informed” after “provide;” and

(iv) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “include”;

(C) by inserting “and promote prevention during in person or virtual visits,” after “or stalking.”;

(ii) by striking the period at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following:

“(i) the development, implementation, dissemination, and evaluation of best practices, tools, and training materials, including culturally relevant tools, for behavioral health professionals to identify and respond to domestic violence, sexual violence, stalking, and dating violence; and

(ii) the development and provision of culturally relevant training and follow-up technical assistance programs to improve the capacity of such coalitions to coordinate and support health advocates and other health system partners;”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(i) by striking “identification” after “practice of” and inserting “and”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “capacity”;

(i) by inserting “(including midwives and doulas)” after “residents;” and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by inserting “including labor and sex trafficking” after “other forms of violence and abuse;”;

(ii) by inserting “culturally competent clinical” after “and”;

(iii) by inserting “and promote prevention during in person or virtual visits,” after “or stalking.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(2)(A)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “CHILD AND ELDER ABUSE” and inserting the following:

“CHILD ABUSE AND ABUSE IN LATER LIFE;”;

(B) by striking “child or elder abuse” and inserting the following:

“child abuse or abuse in later life;”;

(4) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(i), by striking “eldest” and inserting “elder abuse” and inserting “abuse in later life;”;

(5) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(ii), by inserting “programs that promote the prevention of sexual assault as well as” after “implementation of”;

(6) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(iii)—

(A) by inserting “and exposure to violence against generations” after “abuse;” and

(B) by striking “and”;

(7) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(iv)—

(A) by inserting “mental health,” after “den-”;

(B) by striking “exams,” and inserting “exams and certifications;”;

(8) in subsection (b)(2)(C), by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) providing funding to State domestic and sexual violence coalitions to improve the capacity of such coalitions to coordinate and support health advocates and other health system partners;”;

(9) in subsection (c)(3)(A) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following:

“(i) culturally and specific population specific organizations, and specifically organizations whose leadership include Black or Indigenous people, People of Color, or LGBTQ+ individuals; and

(ii) programs developing and implementing community-driven solutions to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, instead of carceral and law enforcement intervention;”;

(10) in subsection (c)(3)(B)(i)(III) by inserting “nonprofit entity” the following “, including a culturally-specific organization or community-based organization working to address the social determinants of health;”;

(11) in subsection (c)(3)(C)(i)—

(A) by striking “strategies for” and inserting “strategies for”;

(B) by inserting “and generations” after “life span;”;

(C) by striking “settings” and inserting “settings and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) strategies to address primary prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, instead of carceral and law enforcement interventions including strategies that address related social determinants of health and center economic justice, anti-racism, and that are inclusive of all genders and identities including LGBTQ+ individuals;”;

(12) in subsection (c)(3)(C)(ii)—

(A) by inserting “culturally specific organizations” after “advocacy organizations;” and

(B) by striking “State or tribal law enforcement task forces (where appropriate);”;

(13) by adding a period at the end of “(ii) improve the capacity of substance use disorder treatment programs, harm reduction programs for people who use substances, and systems to serve survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;”;

(14) by inserting “and reduce funding for State domestic and sexual violence coalitions to improve the capacity of such coalitions to coordinate and support health advocates and other health system partners;”;

C) by striking “and” at the end; and

(D) by inserting “the following” after “capacity.”;
care, including physical, mental, or behavioral health care' before the period at the end; (15) in subsection (g)—
(A) by striking ‘‘$10,000,000’’ and inserting ‘‘$3,500,000’’; and
(B) by striking ‘‘2014 through 2018’’ and inserting ‘‘2022 through 2026’’; and
(17) in subsection (h), by striking ‘‘herein’’ and ‘‘Section’’.

TITLE VI—SAFE HOMES FOR VICTIMS

SEC. 601. HOUSING PROTECTIONS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VI- OLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41411 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13911) is amended by—
(I) in subsection (a),—
(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ‘‘brother, sister,’’ and inserting ‘‘sibling,’’; and
(B) in paragraph (3)(A),
(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ‘‘including the direct loan program under such section’’;
(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking ‘‘the program under subsection A of’’ and inserting ‘‘the programs under’’;
(iii) in subparagraph (E)—
(D) by striking ‘‘sections 514, 515, 516, 533, and 538 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1484, 1485, 1486, 1490m, and 1490p–2)’’ and inserting ‘‘sections 513, 533, and 542 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1484, 1485, 1486, 1490m, 1490p–2, 1490r)’’; and
(B) by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;
(iv) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and
(v) by adding at the end the following:
(K) the provision of assistance from the Housing Trust Fund established under section 1338 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4591);
(L) the provision of assistance for housing under the Comprehensive Service Programs for Homeless Veterans program under subchapter II of chapter 26 of title 38, United States Code;
(M) the provision of assistance for housing and facilities under the grant program for homeless veterans with special needs under section 2061 of title 38, United States Code;
(N) the provision of assistance for permanent housing under the program for financial assistance for supportive services for very low-income veteran families in permanent housing under section 312 of title 38, United States Code;
(O) housing assisted under the rent supplement program under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701a); and
(P) any other Federal housing programs providing affordable housing to low- and moderate-income persons by means of restricted rents or rental assistance as identified by the appropriate agency; and
(C) by adding at the end the following:
(4) COLLABORATIVE APPLICANT.—The term ‘‘collaborative applicant’’ has the meaning given the term in section 401 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360).

(5) CONTINUUM OF CARE.—The term ‘‘Continuum of Care’’ means the Federal program authorized under subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.).

(6) COVERED HOUSING PROVIDER.—The term ‘‘covered housing provider’’—
(A) includes the individual or entity under a covered housing program that has responsibility for the oversight of housing assisted under a covered housing program; and
(B) includes public housing agencies, sponsors, owners, mortgagors, managers, grantees under a covered housing program, and local governments or agencies thereof, and nonprofit or for-profit organizations or entities.

(7) DRUG-RELATED CRIMINAL ACTIVITY.—The term ‘‘drug-related criminal activity’’ has the meaning given the term in section 3(b)(9) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1450a(b)(9)).

(8) EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT.—The term ‘‘emergency solutions grant’’ means a grant provided under subsection B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11371 et seq.).

(9) EMERGENCY TRANSFER.—The term ‘‘emergency transfer’’—
(A) except as provided under subparagraph (B), means a transfer under subsection (e) from a unit of a covered housing provider to any other unit under the same covered housing provider, or to a management agent of the covered housing provider; and
(B) with respect to a project funded under the Continuum of Care, means a transfer under subsection (e) to any unit of the same covered housing provider under the same covered housing program.

(10) EXTERNAL REFERRAL.—The term ‘‘external referral’’—
(A) except as provided under subparagraph (B), means a referral provided to a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking by a covered housing provider to the applicable regional office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Drug Free Schools and Communities Program, or any other relevant governmental entity.

(11) HUD REGIONAL OFFICE.—The term ‘‘HUD regional office’’ means a regional office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(12) NATIONAL VAWA VICTIMS RELOCATION POOL VOUCHER.—The term ‘National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool Voucher’ means a housing voucher provided under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437l).

(13) PROGRAM PARTICIPANT.—The term ‘‘program participant’’ means an individual, including an unaccompanied youth or family who is assisted by programs under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360 et seq.).

(2) in subsection (b)(3)—
(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting after ‘‘CRIMINAL ACTIVITY’’ the following: ‘‘and FAMILY BREAK-UP’’;
(B) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows: ‘‘(A) DENIAL OF ASSISTANCE, TENANCY, AND OCCUPANCY RIGHTS PROHIBITED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A tenant, program participant, or resident of a unit who is an unreported member of the household because of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, dating violence, or stalking shall not be denied assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program solely on the basis of criminal activity, including drug-related criminal activity, engaged in by the perpetrator of the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subclause (I) shall be construed to limit the authority to terminate assistance to a tenant or program participant or oversight of a tenant or program participant from housing assisted under a covered housing program if a public housing agency or an owner, recipient or operator of the project demonstrating an actual and imminent threat to other tenants, program participants, or individuals employed at or providing service to the housing if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant or program participant is not evicted.

(3) REVIEW PRIOR TO TERMINATION FOR CURRENT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.—Before terminating assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program to a tenant or program participant who is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking as a result of the criminal activity of the tenant or program participant, including drug-related criminal activity—
(A) the covered housing provider shall consider—
(aa) the seriousness of the case;
(bb) the extent of participation or culpability of the tenant or program participant in the criminal activity;
(cc) whether the tenant or program participant was coerced by the perpetrator of the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;
(dd) any other relevant mitigating circumstances; and
(II) the covered housing program shall provide the tenant or program participant with—
(1) a written summary of the conduct conducted by the covered housing program; and
to the findings of the review;”;
(C) in subparagraph (B)—
(i) in the heading, by striking ‘‘BIFURCATION’’ and inserting ‘‘FAMILY BREAK-UP’’;
(ii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as clauses (ii) and (iii), respectively;
(iii) by inserting before clause (ii), as so redesignated, the following:
‘‘(i) provide any other tenant, program participant, or resident of the unit who is an unreported member of the household because of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
(ii) provide a tenant, program participant, or resident described in subclause (I) with not less than 180 days—
(aa) to remain in the unit under the same tenancy and conditions as the tenant, program participant, or resident; and
(bb) find new housing or establish eligibility for another covered housing program,’’;
(iv) in clause (ii), as so redesignated—
(I) in the heading, by striking "IN GENERAL" and inserting "EVICITION"; and
(II) by inserting after "public housing agency" that paragraph—
(a) by striking clause (ii), as so redesignated;
(b) by striking subparagraph (C)—
(i) in clause (i), by striking "or" at the end;
(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and a public housing agency under the Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), a public housing agency under the McKinney-Vento Homelessness Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360 et seq.), an entity under policies and procedures established by participating jurisdictions, participating jurisdictions, participating jurisdiction of the tenant or program participant, or resident under paragraph (2) shall approve an application submitted by a tenant, program participant, or resident can request an emergency transfer or a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher, or both; if a safe unit is available, the cover...

(B) VOUCHERS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A tenant, program participant, or resident shall also meet the eligibility criteria described in paragraph (3).

(2) VOUCHERS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A tenant, program participant, or resident shall also meet the eligibility criteria described in paragraph (3).

(3) PREFERENCES.—Each appropriate agency shall ensure that standardized documents relating to the implementation of this title are—

(4) EMERGENCY TRANSFERS AND NATIONAL VAWA VICTIMS RELLOCATION POOL POLICIES.—

(I) in the matter preceding the request for emergency transfer from a tenant or program participant, or resident the request for the emergency transfer or a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher—

(ii) if a safe unit is available, an emergency transfer shall occur not later than 10 days after the date on which the covered housing provider approves the request.

(iii) if a safe unit is not available, the covered housing provider shall provide to the tenant, program participant, or resident a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher.

(v) if the emergency transfer request has been denied due to reasons unrelated to the availability of a safe and suitable unit, the tenant, program participant, or resident may appeal the decision through the applicable grievance or hearing process of the covered housing provider.

(D) with respect to a request for a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher—

(vi) the request may be made to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development by a tenant, program participant, or resident under paragraph (2); if a safe unit is available, an emergency transfer...

(3) EMERGENCY TRANSFERS AND NATIONAL VAWA VICTIMS RELLOCATION POOL POLICIES.—

(I) the tenant, program participant, or resident shall also meet the eligibility criteria described in paragraph (3).

(2) IN GENERAL.—A tenant, program participant, or resident shall also meet the eligibility criteria described in paragraph (3).

(3) PREFERENCES.—Each appropriate agency shall ensure that...
“(F) mandate that emergency transfers take priority over non-emergency transfers; 

“(G) mandate that emergency transfers are not considered new applicants and take priority over emergency waiting lists for a covered housing program; 

“(H) incorporate confidentiality measures to ensure that the appropriate agency and the covered housing provider do not disclose any information regarding a tenant, program participant, or resident who is victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including the location of a new dwelling unit to any person or entity without the time-limited written authorization of the tenant or program participant, and communication by a covered housing provider with a rental assistance form and manner that the victim determines to be safe and secure; and 

“(I) mandate that when a tenant or program participant submits an emergency transfer request to a covered housing provider, the covered housing provider shall provide contact information for—

(1) local organizations offering assistance to tenants and other housing providers who may have safe and available housing; or 

(2) a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher.

Section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Two Appropriations.—Beginning in fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter, there are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 to provide vouchers for rental assistance under this paragraph."

SEC. 602. ENSURING COMPLIANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION; PROHIBITING RETALIATION AGAINST VICTIMS.

Chapter 2 of subtitle N of title IV of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 41411 the following:

“SEC. 41412. COMPLIANCE REVIEW.

“(a) REGULAR COMPLIANCE REVIEWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each appropriate agency shall—

(A) coordinate and facilitate emergency transfers and external referrals across projects funded under the Continuum of Care; 

(B) prioritize an external referral across projects funded under the Continuum of Care for the next available safe housing option for which a tenant or program participant may be eligible; 

(C) coordinate external referrals with the collaborative applicant of the local Continuum of Care, or designee of the collaborative applicant, in other jurisdictions in cases where a tenant or program participant requests an out-of-jurisdiction transfer; 

(D) ensure that a tenant or program participant is not required to be reassessed and retains chronically homeless status, if applicable, through the local Continuum of Care intake process, the emergency transfer or external referral placement; and 

(E) ensure costs associated with temporary relocations described in paragraph (4) are considered costs of supportive services under the Continuum of Care program.

“(2) FREQUENCY.—Each appropriate agency shall—

(A) in collaboration with public housing agencies and the entities described in paragraph (2), develop and implement a regional emergency transfer and external referral plan, which shall—

(i) set forth how covered housing providers shall coordinate external referrals with the HUD regional office; 

(ii) be submitted to the Violence Against Women Director described in section 41413 and made publicly available; and 

(iii) include any additional policies, priorities, and strategies set by the entities described in paragraph (5); and 

(B) in consultation with the Violence Against Women Advisory Council described in section 41413, facilitate external referral requests for tenants or program participants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking of which the tenant or program participant cannot obtain an emergency transfer or a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher.

“National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool Vouchers.—Section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(2) IN GENERAL.—Each appropriate agency shall—

(A) determine the number of emergency transfers, National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers, and external referrals needed to facilitate implementation of this section.

(B) examine each covered housing provider compliance with confidentiality provisions set forth in section 41413(a)(4); and

(C) coordinate with any relevant officials of the appropriate agency, be incorporated into other existing compliance review processes of the appropriate agency; and

(D) examine—

(i) covered housing provider compliance with requirements prohibiting the denial of assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights on the basis of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; 

(ii) covered housing provider compliance with confidentiality provisions set forth in section 41413(a)(4); 

(iii) covered housing provider compliance with the notification requirements set forth in section 41411(h)(2); 

(iv) covered housing provider compliance with accepting documentation set forth in section 41411(i); 

(v) covered housing provider compliance with emergency transfer, external referral, and National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool Voucher requirements set forth in section 41411(e); and 

(vi) covered housing provider compliance with the prohibition on retaliation set forth in section 4144.

“(2) FREQUENCY.—Each appropriate agency shall conduct the review described in paragraph (1) on a regular basis, as determined by the appropriate agency.

“(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Act of 2021, each appropriate agency shall issue regulations to implement subsection (a), which shall—

(A) define standards of compliance for covered housing providers; 

(B) include detailed reporting requirements, including the number of emergency transfers, external referrals, and National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers requested and granted, as well as the length of time needed to process emergency transfers; National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers, and external referrals; and

(C) include detailed reporting requirements, including the number of emergency transfers, external referrals, and National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers requested and granted, as well as the length of time needed to process emergency transfers; National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers, and external referrals; and

(D) mandate that emergency transfers take priority over non-emergency transfers; 

(E) mandate that emergency transfers are not considered new applicants and take priority over emergency waiting lists for a covered housing program; 

(F) incorporate confidentiality measures to ensure that the appropriate agency and the covered housing provider do not disclose any information regarding a tenant, program participant, or resident who is victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including the location of a new dwelling unit to any person or entity without the time-limited written authorization of the tenant or program participant, and communication by a covered housing provider with a rental assistance form and manner that the victim determines to be in a form and manner that the victim determines to be safe and secure; and

(G) mandate that when a tenant or program participant submits an emergency transfer request to a covered housing provider, the covered housing provider shall provide contact information for—

(1) local organizations offering assistance to tenants and other housing providers who may have safe and available housing; or 

(2) a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher.

Section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Two Appropriations.—Beginning in fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter, there are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 to provide vouchers for rental assistance under this paragraph."
(3) include standards for corrective action plans where a covered housing provider has failed to meet compliance standards.

(c) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Each appropriate agency shall make an agency-wide assessment of the information collected during the compliance review process completed pursuant to this subsection—

(1) act on an evaluation of each topic identified in subsection (a); and

(2) make is publicly available.

SEC. 41413. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN DIRECTOR.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be, within the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a Violence Against Women Director (in this section referred to as the ‘‘Director’’). (b) The Director shall—

(1) support implementation of the provisions of this subtitle;

(2) coordinate development of Federal regulations, policies, protocols, and guidelines on matters relating to the implementation of this subtitle, at each agency administering a covered housing program;

(3) coordinate and coordinate with designated officials within the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Justice concerning legislation and other issues related to or affecting the housing provisions under this subtitle;

(4) provide technical assistance, coordination, and support to each appropriate agency regarding advancing housing protections and access to housing for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, in accordance with this subtitle;

(5) ensure that adequate technical assistance is made available to covered housing providers regarding implementation of this subtitle, as well as other issues related to advancing housing protections for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including compliance with this subtitle;

(6) act as a liaison with the judicial branches of Federal, State, and local governments on matters relating to the housing needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(7) implement a quality control system and a corrective action plan system for those covered housing providers that fail to comply with this subtitle, wherein—

(A) covered housing providers completing corrective action plans shall be required to consult with national, State, or local programs focused on victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(B) the corrective action plans shall include provisions for covered housing providers to review and develop appropriate notices, procedures, and staff training to improve compliance with this subtitle, in consultation with national programs focused on victims described in paragraph (A);

(8) establish a formal reporting process to receive individual complaints concerning noncompliance with this subtitle;

(9) coordinate the development of interagency guidelines to improve the availability of centralized information concerning available dwelling units for use in facilitating the emergency transfer process;

(10) coordinate the process for tracking of referrals made to the National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers, and further implement, as necessary, any policies or procedures relating to the National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool and its vouchers;

(11) work with HUD regional offices to develop a mechanism to implement regional external referral plans and officials at each appropriate agency relating to the development of Federal regulations, policy, protocols, and guidelines regarding uniform timeframes for the completion of applications for the National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers, and external referrals;

(12) coordinate with each appropriate agency to have all compliance documents relating to the implementation of this title are translated into and made available in multiple languages, are accessible to persons with disabilities, and made accessible to covered housing providers within a reasonable time upon adoption of the documents by the appropriate agency;

(13) ensure that the documents described in paragraph (11), including guidance and notices to victims, are distributed in commonly encountered languages by covered housing providers consistent with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) and any guidance issued by the appropriate agencies in accordance with Executive Order 13166 (42 U.S.C. 2000d-1 note; relating to access to services for persons with limited English proficiency); and

(14) in consultation with each appropriate agency, identify compliance review processes that could incorporate the compliance reviews required under section 41412(a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

SEC. 41414. PROHIBITION ON RETALIATION.

(a) Nonretaliation.—No covered housing provider shall discriminate against any person because that person has opposed any act or practice made unlawful by this subtitle, or because that individual notified, testi- fied, or participated in any matter related to this subtitle.

(b) PROHIBITION ON COERCION.—No covered housing provider shall intimidate, threaten, or interfere with, or retaliate against, any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of the person having exercised or enjoyed, or, on account of the person having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any rights or protections under this subtitle, including—

(1) intimidating or threatening any person because that person is assisting or encouraging an individual entitled to claim the rights or protections under this subtitle;

(2) retaliating against any person because that person has participated in any investigation or action to enforce this subtitle.

(c) EXPULSION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL THE SECRETARY.—The authority of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Office for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity to enforce this section shall be the same as the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3610 et seq.).

SEC. 603. PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO REPORT CRIME FROM ONE'S HOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of subtitle N of title IV of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12491 et seq.), as amended by this title, is further amended by inserting after section 41414 the following:

“SEC. 41415. RIGHT TO REPORT CRIME AND EMERGENCY TRANSFER.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘covered governmental entity’ means any municipal, county, or State government that receives funding under section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306).

(b) RIGHT TO REPORT.—(1) In every encounter with landlords, homeowners, tenants, occupants, guests, or housing applicants based on requests for law enforcement or emergency assistance or based on criminal activity that occurred at a property, shall—

(1) allow the right to seek law enforcement or emergency assistance on their own behalf; or, in the case of a tenant, occupant, or guest was a victim of such criminal activity.

(2) be penalized based on their requests for assistance or based on criminal activity of which they are a victim or otherwise not at fault under statutes, ordinances, regulations, or policies adopted or enforced by covered governmental entities.

(2) PROHIBITED PENALTIES.—Penalties that are prohibited under paragraph (1) include—

(1) actual or threatened refusal to rent or renew tenancy;

(2) actual or threatened refusal to issue an occupancy permit or landlord permit; and

(3) execution or threatened eviction.

(3) REPORTING.—Consistent with the process described in section 104(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5304(b)), covered governmental entities shall—

(1) report any of their laws or policies, or, as applicable, the laws or policies adopted by subgrantees, that impose penalties on landlords, homeowners, residents, occupants, guests, or housing applicants based on requests for law enforcement or emergency assistance or based on criminal activity that occurred at a property; and

(2) certify that they are in compliance with the protections under this subtitle or describe the manner in which the covered governmental entities will take within 180 days to come into compliance, or to ensure compliance among subgrantees.

(4) OVERTIME.—Oversight and accountability mechanisms provided for under title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) shall be available to address violations of this section.

(c) SUBGRANTEES.—For those covered governmental entities that distribute funds to subgrantees, compliance with subsection (c)(1) includes inquiring about the existence of laws and policies adopted by an entity to impose penalties on landlords, homeowners, residents, occupants, guests, or housing applicants based on requests for law enforcement or emergency assistance or based on criminal activity that occurred at a property.

(b) SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE CRIME REDUCTION METHODS.—(1) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF BYRNE-LEHMAN FUND.—Section 501(a)(1) of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(a)(1)) is amended by adding after subparagraph (h) the following:

“(h) Programs for the development and implementation of methods of reducing crime in communities to supplant programs or policies. For purposes of this subparagraph, a punitive program or policy is a program or policy that—

(1) imposes a penalty described in section 41415(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 on the basis of a request for law enforcement or emergency assistance; or

(2) imposes a penalty described in section 41415(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 on a landlord, homeowner, tenant, program participant, resident, occupant, or guest because of criminal activity at the property, including domestic violence dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, where the landlord, homeowner, tenant, program participant, resident, occupant, or guest was a victim of such criminal activity.

(2) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF COPS FUNDS.—Section 1702(b) of part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (22), by striking ‘‘and’’ after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (23), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘;’’; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:
‘(d) to develop and implement methods of reducing crime in communities, to supplant punitive programs or policies (as such term is defined in section 501(a)(1));’.

SEC. 604. TEMPORARIAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.

Section 40299 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12351) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ‘‘the Director of the Violence Against Women Office’’ and inserting ‘‘the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women’’;

(B) by inserting after ‘‘, other non-profit, non-governmental organizations’’ the following: ‘‘, population-specific organizations’’; and

(2) in subsection (b), in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding clause (A)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘2014 through 2018’’ and inserting ‘‘2022 through 2025’’;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘5 percent’’ and inserting ‘‘8 percent’’; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking ‘‘0.25 percent’’ and inserting ‘‘0.5 percent’’.

SEC. 605. ADDRESSING THE HOUSING NEEDS OF WOMEN IN PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING.—Sec.

404 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12491) and monitoring compli-
 ance with the confidentiality protections of sub-
 section (c)(4) of such section.’’;

(b) COLLABORATIVE GRANTS TO INCREASE THE SAFETY OF VICTIMs.—Section

41404(i) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12474(i)) is amended by striking ‘‘2014 through 2018’’ and inserting ‘‘2022 through 2026’’;

(c) GRANTS TO C0NTER VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING.—Sec-

tion 41405 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12495) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ‘‘the Director of the Violence Against Women Office’’ and inserting ‘‘the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women’’;

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(D), by inserting after ‘‘linguistically and culturally specific service providers.’’ the following: ‘‘population-specific organizations’’;

(3) in subsection (g), by striking ‘‘2014 through 2018’’ and inserting the following: ‘‘2022 through 2026’’;

SEC. 606. UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937 AMENDMENTS.

Section 5(a)(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c–1(d)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (13) to read as fol-
 lows:

‘‘(13) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.—

(A) COPIES.—A copy of—

‘‘(i) all standardized notices issued pursuant to the housing protections under subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, including the notice required under section 41411(d) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994;

(ii) the emergency transfer plan issued pursuant to section 41411 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; and

(iii) any and all memoranda of understanding with other covered housing providers developed in accordance with emergency transfers under section 41411(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

(B) DESCRIPTIONS.—A description of—

‘‘(i) services, or programs provided or offered by an agency, either directly or in partnership with other service providers, to child or adult victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

‘‘(ii) any activities, services, or programs provided or offered by a public housing agency that helps child or adult victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, to obtain or maintain housing;

‘‘(iii) any activities, services, or programs provided or offered by a public housing agency to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, or to enhance victim safety in assisted families; and

(iv) all other services and support services offered to staff of the public housing agency to provide a basic understanding of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and facilities to develop the housing protections of section 41411 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.’’; and

(2) in paragraph (15), by inserting ‘‘the Violence Against Women Act of 1994’’ before ‘‘the Fair Housing Act’’.

TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS

SEC. 701. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Over 1 in 3 women experience sexual vio-
 lence, and 1 in 5 women have survived com-
 pleted or attempted rape. Such violence has a devestating impact on physical and emo-
 tional health, financial security, and ability to maintain their jobs, and thus impacts inter-
 state commerce and economic security.

(2) The Office of Women of the Department of Justice defines domestic vio-
 lence as a pattern of abusive behavior in any re-
 lationship that is used by one intimate partner to gain or maintain power and control over an-
 other intimate partner. Domestic violence can include physical, sexual, emotional, eco-
 nomic, or psychological actions or threats of actions that intimidate, terrorize, coerce, domin-
 ate, or exploit. Domestic violence includes any behaviors that intimidate, mani-
 pulate, humble, isolate, frighten, ter-
 rorize, coerce, threaten, blame, hurt, injure, or wound an intimate partner.

(3) The Centers for Disease Control and Pre-
 vention report that domestic violence or intimate partner violence is a serious public health issue for millions of individuals in the United States. Nearly 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men in the United States have suffered sexual violence, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner.

(4) Transgender and gender non-conforming people face extraordinary levels of physical and sexual violence.

(5) More than 1 in 4 transgender people have faced bias-driven assault, and this rate is higher for trans women and trans people of color.

(6) The American Foundation for Suicide Pre-
 vention has found that transgender and gender non-conforming people had an elevated prevalence of suicide attempts, especially when they have suffered physical or sexual violence.

(7) Homicide is one of the leading causes of death for women on the job. Domestic partners or relatives commit 43 percent of workplace homicides and 64 percent of all workplace homicides involve female victims, compared to 4 percent of workplace homicides among women during the period. In fact, in 2010, homicides among women at work increased by 13 percent despite continuous declines in overall workplace homicides in recent years.

(8) Women in the United States are 11 times more likely to be murdered with guns than women in other high-income countries. Female intimate partners are 13 times more likely to be murdered, compared to male intimate partners, with a firearm than all other means combined. The presence of a gun in domestic violence situations increases the risk of homicide for women by 500 percent.

(9) Violence can have a dramatic impact on the survivor of such violence. Studies indicate that 44 percent of surveyed employed adults ex-
 perienced the effect of domestic violence in the workplace, and 64 percent indicated their work-
 place performance was affected by such vio-
lence. Another recent study found that 90 per-
cent of offenders used workplace resources to express anger, check up on, pressure, or threat-
en a survivor. Sexual assault, whether occurring in the context of domestic violence or an em-
 ployee’s work performance, require time away from work, and undermine the employee’s abili-
ty to maintain a job. Nearly 50 percent of sex-
ual assault survivors lose their jobs or are forced to quit in the aftermath of the assault.

(10) Studies find that 60 percent of single unem-
 ployed victims of economic insecurity of house-
 holds with single mothers live in economic insecurity. Significant barriers that survivors confront include access to housing, transpor-
tation, and child care. Ninety-two percent of homeless women have experienced domestic vio-
lence, and more than 50 percent of such women cite domestic violence as the direct cause for homelessness. Survivors are deprived of their autonomy, liberty, and security, and face tremen-
doous threats to their health and safety.

(11) The Centers for Disease Control and Pre-
 vention report that survivors of intimate partner violence lose nearly 8 million days of paid work, which is the equivalent of more than 32,000 full-time jobs and almost 5,600,000 days of household production. Therefore, women disproportionately need time off to care for their health or to find safety solutions, such as obtaining a restraining order or finding hous-
ing to avoid or prevent further violence.

(12) Annual costs of intimate partner violence are estimated to be more than $8,300,000,000. Ac-
 cording to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the costs of intimate partner vio-
lence against women in 1995 exceeded an esti-
 mated $5,800,000,000. These costs included nearly $4,100,000,000 in the direct costs of medical and mental health treatment, and nearly $1,800,000,000 in the indirect costs of lost pro-
ductivity. These statistics are generally consid-
ered to be underestimated because the costs asso-
ciated with the criminal justice system are not included.

(13) Fifty-five percent of senior executives re-
cently surveyed said domestic violence has a harmful effect on their company’s productivity, and more than 70 percent said domestic violence negatively affects attendance. Seventy-eight percent of human resource professionals con-
sider partner violence a workplace issue. How-
 ever, more than 70 percent of United States workplaces have no formal program or policy that addresses workplace violence, let alone do-
mestic violence. In fact, only four percent of em-
ployers provided training on domestic violence.

(14) Studies indicate that one of the best pre-
dicators of whether a survivor will be able to stay away from his or her abuser is the degree of his or her economic independence. However, domes-
tic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking often negatively impact a survivor’s ability to maintain employment.

(15) Abusers frequently seek to exert financial control over their partner’s ability to acquire, use, and maintain access to, money, credit, own-
ership of assets, or access to governmental or private financial benefits, including defaulting on credit card debt, mortgages, or rent. Other forms of such abuse may include preventing someone from attending school, threatening to or actu-
ally withdrawing access to cash, checking, or credit accounts, and attempting to damage or sabotage
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the creditworthiness of an intimate partner, including forcing an intimate partner to write bad checks, forcing an intimate partner to default on payments related to household needs, such as housing, or forcing an intimate partner into bankruptcy. 

(17) The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–144), and the amendments made by that Act, ensures that health plans must cover preventive services, including screening and counseling for domestic violence, at no additional cost. In addition, it prohibits insurance companies from discriminating against patients for preexisting conditions, like domestic violence.

(18) You may also contact one of the agencies listed above to help survivors. Federal law in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act does not explicitly—

(A) authorize survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to take leave from work to seek legal assistance and redress, counseling, or assistance with safety planning activities; 

(B) provide job protection to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; or

(D) prohibit insurers from disclosing information about abuse and the location of the survivors through insurance databases and other means. 

(19) This Act aims to empower survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to obtain a voluntary separation from an individual having a voluntary separation from such State law solely on the basis of the individual themselves; and

(20) or stalking to be free from violence, hardship, or trauma to provide trauma informed programming, and education and vocational institutions, and victim service providers.

SEC. 702. NATIONAL RESOURCES CENTER ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE.

Section 41501 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12501) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “and sexual harassment” after “domestic and sexual violence”; and

(B) by striking “employers and labor organizations, and victim service providers”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “;” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “and stalking” and inserting “stalking”;

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by adding the following new paragraph:

“(A) to provide trauma-informed programming to support survivors seeking employment and centered around culturally specific organizations or programs that primarily serve populations traditionally marginalized in the workplace.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting before the period at the end “or sexual harassment”;

(4) in subsection (c)(2) by striking “sexual harassment” after “sexual violence”;

(5) in subsection (e), by striking “$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2026”;

SEC. 703. PROVISIONS RELATED TO UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEedy FAMILIES PROGRAM.

(a) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(1) SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—Section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (18), by redesignating paragraph (19) as paragraph (21), and by inserting after paragraph (18) the following new paragraph:

“(19) no personal separation caused by the individual having a voluntary separation from work if such separation is attributable to such individual being a victim of sexual harassment or a survivor of sexual assault or stalking; and”

(2) VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT OR STALKING.—Section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is further amended by inserting after paragraph (19), as added by paragraph (1) of this subsection, the following new paragraph:

“(20) no personal separation caused by the individual having a voluntary separation from work if such separation is attributable to such individual being a victim of sexual harassment or a survivor of sexual assault or stalking if such individual submits such evidence as the State deems sufficient.”

(3) DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED.—Section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.—

(1) DOCUMENTATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall deem sufficient—

(A) evidence of such sexual harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the form of—

(i) a sworn statement and a form of identification;

(ii) a police or court record; or

(iii) documentation from a professional from whom such individual has sought assistance, including those associated with medical, legal, or religious professions; and

(B) an attestation that such voluntary separation is attributable to such sexual harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(2) SUFFICIENT DOCUMENTATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall deem sufficient—

(A) evidence of such sexual harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the form of—

(i) a sworn statement and a form of identification;

(ii) a police or court record; or

(iii) documentation from a professional from whom such individual has sought assistance, including those associated with medical, legal, or religious professions; and

(B) an attestation that such voluntary separation is attributable to such sexual harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(3) REPORT.—Section 303(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (16) as paragraphs (5) through (13), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) Such methods of administration as will ensure—

(i) applicants and potential applicants for unemployment compensation are notified of the availability of assistance under this part in any manner, and containing such information as the Secretary specifies.

(3) REPORT.—(A) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the program established under this subsection.

(B) REPORT AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for the dissemination to the public of the report submitted.
under subparagraph (A) not later than 10 days after the submission of such report to Congress under such subparagraph. Such procedures shall include the use of the internet to disseminate such clause.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

(i) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2022 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(A); and

(ii) $8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(B).

(B) THREE-YEAR AVAILABILITY OF GRANT FUNDS.—Each recipient of a grant under this subsection shall return to the Secretary any unused portion of such grant not later than 3 years after the date the grant was awarded, together with any earnings on such unused portion.

(C) AMOUNTS RETURNED.—Any amounts returned pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be available without further appropriation to the Secretary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (1)(B).

(e) NATIONAL GRANT PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPING A MODEL TRAINING PROGRAM FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEedy Families PERSONNEL TRAINING.—

(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this subsection referred to as the ‘‘Secretary’’) shall—

(A) dominate a model training program (and related materials) for the training required under 402(a)(8) of the Social Security Act, and if the state so elects, section 402(a)(7) of such Act; and

(B) provide technical assistance with respect to such model training program to eligible States (as defined in section 402 of the Social Security Act).

In developing the model training program under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may award grants and contracts and may develop such program in cooperation with an eligible partner.

(2) ELIGIBLE PARTNER DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘‘eligible partner’’ means an entity that—

(A) a State or tribal domestic violence coalition or sexual assault coalition; or

(B) a State or local victim service provider with recognized expertise in the dynamics of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking whose primary mission is to provide services to survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including a rape crisis center or domestic violence program.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the program established under this subsection.

(B) REPORT AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for the dissemination to the public of the report submitted under this paragraph. Not later than 10 days after the Secretary shall submit such report to Congress under such subparagraph. Such procedures shall include the use of the internet to disseminate such report.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

(A) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2022 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(B).

(f) EXAMINATIONS AND REPORTS REQUIRED.—

(1) COMPLIANCE REVIEW; EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(A) UNEMPLOYMENT AMENDMENTS.—

(i) NOTIFICATION OF THE RESULTS OF REVIEW.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall notify each State whether the laws, regulations, and policies identified by the State under such clause satisfy the requirements described pursuant to clause (i) and, to the extent such laws, regulations, and policies fail to satisfy such requirements, the recommendation of the Secretary of Labor of the steps the State may take to remedy such failure and provide any necessary technical assistance.

(ii) EFFECTIVE DATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT AMENDMENTS.—

(I) PROVISIONS RELATING TO SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date that is 60 days after the earlier of—

(I) the date on which a State is notified by the Secretary of Labor under subparagraph (A)(ii) that the laws, regulations, and policies identified by the Secretary of Labor satisfy the requirements described pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i); or

(II) the date on which a State is notified by the Secretary of Labor under subparagraph (A)(iv) that the laws, regulations, and policies identified by the Secretary of Labor satisfy such requirements, 1 year after the date of such notification.

(II) PROVISIONS RELATING TO VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT OR STALKING.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date that is 60 days after the earlier of—

(I) the date on which a State is notified by the Secretary of Labor under subparagraph (A)(iv) that the laws, regulations, and policies identified by the Secretary of Labor satisfy the requirements described pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i); or

(II) the date on which a State is notified by the Secretary of Labor under subparagraph (A)(iv) that the laws, regulations, and policies identified by the Secretary of Labor satisfy such requirements, 2 years after the date of such notification.

(iii) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DOCUMENTATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(3) shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) TANF AMENDMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendment made by subsection (c) shall be applicable in the next State plan submitted to the Secretary under such State plan.

(B) EXTENSION OF EFFECTIVE DATE FOR STATE LAW AMENDMENT.—In the case of a State plan under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires state action (including legislation, regulation, or other administrative action) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendment made by this section, the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such amendment on the basis of its failure to meet these additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that precedes the date of enactment of this Act.

For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is considered to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 704. STUDY AND REPORTS ON BARRIERS TO SURVIVORS’ ECONOMIC SECURITY ACCESS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall conduct an analysis of the barriers that survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking throughout the United States experience in maintaining economic security as a result of issues related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall submit a report to Congress on the study conducted under subsection (a).

(c) CONTENTS.—The study and reports under this section shall include—

(1) identification of geographic areas in which State laws, regulations, and policies have a strong impact on the ability of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to exercise—

(A) any rights under this Act without compromising personal safety or the safety of others, including family members and excluding the abuser; and

(B) other components of economic security, including financial empowerment, affordable housing, transportation, healthcare access, and quality education and training; and

(2) identification of geographic areas with shortages in resources for such survivors, with an accompanying analysis of the extent and impact of such shortages;

(3) analysis of factors related to industries, workplace settings, employer practices, trends, and other elements that impact the ability of such survivors to exercise any rights under this Act without compromising personal safety or the safety of others, including family members; and

(4) recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Labor with respect to resources, oversight, and enforcement tools to ensure successful implementation of the provisions of this Act in order to support the economic security and safety of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(5) best practices for States, employers, health carriers, insurers, and other private entities in addressing issues related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

Sec. 705. GAO STUDY.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that examines, with respect to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who are, or were, enrolled at institutions of higher education and borrowed a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) for which the survivors have not repaid the total interest and principal due, each of the following:

(1) Implications of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking on a borrower’s ability to repay their Federal student loan.

(2) The adequacy of policies and procedures regarding Federal student loan deferment, forbearance, and grace periods when a survivor...
has to suspend or terminate the survivor’s enrollment at an institution of higher education due to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(3) The adequacy of institutional policies and practices regarding retention or transfer of credits when a survivor has to suspend or terminate the survivor’s enrollment at an institution of higher education due to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(4) The availability or any options for a survivor of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to obtain any relief or restitution on the survivor’s Federal student loan debt due to the use of forced arbitration, gag orders, or bans on class actions.

SEC. 706. EDUCATION AND INFORMATION PROGRAMS FOR SURVIVORS.

(a) PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGN.—(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor, in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services (though the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), the Attorney General (through the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women), and the grand recipient under section 41501 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291 et seq.), shall establish a national resource center on workplace responses to assist victims of domestic and sexual violence, shall coordinate and provide for a nation of public employers and education campaigns to raise public awareness of the workplace impact of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including outreach to employers, service providers, teachers, and other key partners. This campaign shall pay special attention to ensure that survivors are made aware of the existence of the following types of workplace laws (federal and/or State): anti-discrimination laws that bar treating survivors differently; leave laws, both paid and unpaid that are available for use by survivors; unemployment insurance laws and policies that address survivor eligibility; the provision of outreach and education under this paragraph shall be conducted in a manner that is effective for and accessible to people with disabilities and people without disabilities.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary of Labor, in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Attorney General, as described in paragraph (1), may disseminate information from the public outreach and education campaign on the resources and rights referred to in this subsection directly or through arrangements with health agencies, professional and nonprofit organizations, labor organizations, stakeholders, advocacy, and support groups, labor organizations, institutions of higher education, clinics, the media, and Federal, State, and local agencies.

(b) DISSEMINATION.—The information disseminated under paragraph (2) shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

1. The resources and rights that are available to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

2. (i) established in this Act and the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291 et seq.);

(b) guidelines and best practices on prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault;

(c) resources that promote healthy communications and relationships.

(d) resources that encourage bystander intervention in a situation involving domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, or stalking.

(E) resources that promote workplace policies that support and help maintain the economic security of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including guidelines on best practices to promote the creation of effective employee assistance programs; and

(F) resources and rights that the heads of Federal agencies described in paragraph (2) determine are appropriate to include.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EMPLOYER.—The term ‘employer’ includes any individual employed by an employer. In the case of an individual employed by a public agency, such term means an individual employed as described in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)(2)).

(2) BASE.—The term includes a person employed as described in subparagraph (A) on a full- or part-time basis, for a fixed time period, on a temporary basis, pursuant to a contract, as a participant in a work assignment as a condition of receipt of Federal or State income-based public assistance.

(3) EMPLOYER.—The term ‘employer’ includes any person acting directly or indirectly in an employment relationship to an employee, and includes a public agency that employs individuals as described in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, but does not include any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer) or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(4) FLSA TERMS.—The terms ‘employ’ and ‘State’ have the meanings given in the terms in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201).

(c) STUDY ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES.—The Secretary of Labor, in conjunction with the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, shall conduct a study on the status of workplace response to employees who experience domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking while employed, in each State and nationally, to improve the access of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to supportive resources and economic security.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to carry out this section, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

SEC. 707. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of such provisions or amendments to any person or circumstance shall not be affected.

TITLE VIII—HOMICIDE REDUCTION INITIATIVES

SEC. 801. PROHIBITING PERSONS CONVICTED OF MISDEMEANOR CRIMES AGAINST DATING PARTNERS AND PERSONS SUBJECT TO COURT ORDERS ON POSSESSING A FIREARM.

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking ‘‘that restrains such person’’ and all that follows, and inserting ‘‘described in subsection (g)(6);’’

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘;’’; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

‘‘(8) who has been convicted in any court of a misdemeanor crime of stalking;’’; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows—

‘‘(8) who is subject to a court order—

‘‘(A) that was issued—

‘‘(B) includes—

‘‘(i) a dating partner or former dating partner; and

‘‘(ii) any other person similarly situated to a specified dating partner;’’.

Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to require that sexual contact between two persons have occurred to establish the existence of any relationship for purposes of this paragraph. For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘‘dating partner’’ means, with respect to a person, a person who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the person ‘‘.”.

(2) in paragraph (33)(A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ‘‘Except as provided in subparagraph (C),’’;

(B) in clause (i), by inserting after ‘‘Federal, State,’’ the following: ‘‘, local,’’; and

(C) by inserting ‘‘that support and help maintain the economic security of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking’’ after ‘‘spouse’’, each place it appears;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (34) and (35) as paragraphs (33) and (34) respectively; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (33) the following:

‘‘(34)(A) The term ‘misdeemeanor crime of stalking’ means an offense that—

‘‘(I) is a misdemeanor offense of stalking under Federal, State, Tribal, or municipal law; and

‘‘(ii) is a course of harassment, intimidation, or surveillance of another person that—

‘‘(I) that person was represented by counsel in or in any industry or activity affecting commerce who employs 15 or more individuals; and

‘‘(B) includes any person acting directly or indirectly in an employment relationship to an employee, and includes a public agency that employs individuals as described in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, but does not include any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer) or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(3) FLSA TERMS.—The terms ‘employ’ and ‘State’ have the meanings given in the terms in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201).

(c) STUDY ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES.—The Secretary of Labor, in conjunction with the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, shall conduct a study on the status of workplace response to employees who experience domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking while employed, in each State and nationally, to improve the access of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to supportive resources and economic security.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to carry out this section, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.
declined to prosecute nearly 52 percent of violent crimes that occur in Indian country. (11) Investigation into cases of missing and murdered Indian women is made difficult for Tribal law enforcement agencies due to a lack of resources, such as—
   (A) necessary training, equipment, or funding;
   (B) a lack of expertise in the area; or
   (C) a lack of appropriate laws in place; and
   (D) a lack of access to Federal, State, and local law enforcement databases.

(12) Domestic violence cases are among the most dangerous calls that law enforcement receives.

The complicated jurisdictional scheme that exists in Federal law
   (A) has a significant negative impact on the ability to provide public safety to Indian communities;
   (B) has been increasingly exploited by criminals; and
   (C) requires a high degree of commitment and cooperation among Tribal, Federal, and State law enforcement officials.

(14) Restoring and enhancing local, Tribal, or territorial capacity to address violence against women provides for greater local control, safety, accountability, and transparency.

(15) In States with restrictive land settlement acts such as Alaska, “Indian country” is limited, resulting in local Tribal responses either nonexistent or insufficient to meet the needs, jurisdiction unnecessarily complicated and increases the already high levels of victimization of American Indian and Alaska Native women. According to the Tribal Law and Order Act Commission Report, Alaska Native women are over-represented in the domestic violence victim population by 256 percent; they comprise 19 percent of the State population, but are 47 percent of reported rape victims. And among other Indian Tribes, Alaska Native women suffer the highest rates of domestic and sexual violence in the country.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are—
   (1) to clarify the responsibilities of Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments with respect to responding to cases of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, trafficking, sexual violence, crimes against children, and assault against Tribal law enforcement officers and murdered Indians;
   (2) to increase coordination and communication among Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies;
   (3) to empower Tribal governments with the resources and information necessary to effectively respond to cases of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sex trafficking, sexual violence, and missing and murdered Indians; and
   (4) to improve the collection of data related to missing and murdered Indians and the sharing of information among Federal, State, and Tribal officials responsible for responding to investigations involving Indians.

SEC. 902. AUTHORIZING FUNDING FOR THE TRIBAL ACCESS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 534 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 each for fiscal years 2022 through 2026, to remain available until expended, for the purposes of enhancing the ability of Tribal government entities to access, enter information into, and obtain information from, Federal criminal information databases, as authorized by this section.”

(b) INDIAN TRIBE AND INDIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT DEPARTMENT.—In the heading of title 28, United States Code, is further amended by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) INDIAN TRIBE AND INDIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT DEPARTMENT.—The Attorney General shall permit Tribal law enforcement entities (including entities designated by a Tribe as maintaining public safety within a Tribe’s territorial jurisdiction that has no federal or state arrest authority) and Bureau of Indian Affairs law enforcement agencies—
   (1) to access and enter information into Federal criminal information databases; and
   (2) to obtain information from the databases.”

SEC. 903. TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER COVERED CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, SEX TRAFFICKING, STALKING, AND ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OR CORRECTIONS OFFICER.

Section 204 of Public Law 90-284 (25 U.S.C. 1304) (commonly known as the “Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968”) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE” and inserting “CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, SEXUAL VIOLENCE, SEX TRAFFICKING, STALKING, AND ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OR CORRECTIONS OFFICER”;

(2) in subsection (a)(6), in the heading, by striking “SPECIAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CRIMINAL JURISDICTION” and inserting “SPECIAL TRIBAL CRIMINAL JURISDICTION”;

(3) by striking “special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction” each place such term appears and inserting “special Tribal criminal jurisdiction”;

(4) in subsection (a)(8), by adding at the end the following:

“(d) STALKING.—The term ‘stalking’ means engaging in a course of conduct directed at a specific person proscribed by the criminal law of any Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs that would cause a reasonable person to—
   (A) fear for the person’s safety or the safety of others; or
   (B) suffer substantial emotional distress.”;

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (10) and (11), respectively;

(6) by inserting before paragraph (10) (as redesignated) the following:

“(8) SEX TRAFFICKING.—The term ‘sex trafficking’ means conduct—
   (A) consisting of—
      (I) recruiting, entic- ing, harboring, transport- ing, providing, obtaining, advertising, main- taining, patronizing, or soliciting by any means a person; or
      (II) benefiting, financially or by receiving anything of value, from participation in a venture that has engaged in an act described in clause (I); and
   (B) with knowledge or willfully causing a child to engage in any conduct that constitutes an offense described in clause (A), and
   (C) by applying Federal, State, or Tribal law enforcement databases.

(7) The term ‘sexual violence’ means violence—
   (A) that has engaged in an act described in subsection (a) of title 18, United States Code.

(8) The term ‘coercion’ and ‘commercial sex act’ have the meanings given in the terms in section 1591(e) of title 18, United States Code.

(9) The term ‘commercial sex act’ means any nonconsensual sexual act or contact proscribed by the criminal law of the Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs, including in any case in which the victim lacks the capacity to consent to the act.”

(10) by redesigning paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(11) by redesigning paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (2) through (4);

(12) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated), to read as follows:

“(3) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The term ‘domestic violence’ means violence—

SEC. 904. TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER COVERED CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, SEX TRAFFICKING, STALKING, AND ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OR CORRECTIONS OFFICER.
“(A) committed by a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the victim, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a person who is cohabitating with or has cohabited with the victim as a spouse or intimate partner, or by a person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic- or family- violence laws of an Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs; or

“(B)(i) committed against a victim who is a child under the age of 18, or an elder as such term is defined by Tribal law), including when a offender recklessly engages in conduct that creates a substantial risk of death or serious bodily injury to the victim, or committed as described in subparagraph (A) while the child or elder is present; and

“(ii) the child or elder—

“(I) resides or has resided in the same household as the offender; and

“(II) is related to another victim of the offender by blood or marriage;

“(IV) is under the care of a victim who is an intimate partner or former spouse of the offender; or

“(V) is under the care of a victim of the offender who is similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic- or family- violence laws of an Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs;"

“(G) by inserting, before paragraph (2) (as redesignated by the following):

“(1) ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OR CORRECTIONAL OFFICER.—The term ‘assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer, and violation occurs, and the violation involves interfering with the administration or due process of the Tribe’s laws including any Tribal criminal jurisdiction, including—

“(ii) a crime of dating violence; and

“(iv) a crime of domestic violence; and

“(v) detention and correctional facilities (including facilities construction);

“(vi) alternative rehabilitation centers; and

“(vii) culturally appropriate services and assistance for victims and their families; and

“(viii) criminal codes and rules of criminal procedure, and evidence concerning violence.

“(B) to provide indigent criminal defendants a means to assist public officials within its territorial jurisdiction, to enter information into and obtain information from national crime information databases;”

“(H) by inserting after paragraph (4) (as redesignated by the following):

“(5) OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE.—The term ‘obstruction of justice’ means any violation of the law enforcement or correctional officer, and violation involves interfering with the administration or due process of the Tribe’s laws including any Tribal criminal jurisdiction, including—

“(i) a crime of domestic violence; and

“(ii) a crime of dating violence; and

“(iii) a crime of assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer;”

“(J) INDIAN COUNTRY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘Indian country’ shall inure to the United States, at least 75 percent Alaska Native.”

“TITLE X—OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

SEC. 1001. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2002 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10442) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ‘‘Violence Against Women Act of 1994’’ and inserting ‘‘Office on Violence Against Women’’;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting after ‘‘the Department of Justice’’ the following: ‘‘, not subsumed by any other office’’; and


(b) DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2603 of the Omnibus Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10443) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2603. DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.

(a) APPOINTMENT.—The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Director for the Office on Violence Against Women (in this title referred to as the ‘‘Director’’) to be responsible, under the general authority of the Attorney General, for the administration, coordination, and implementation of the programs and activities of the Office.

(b) OTHER EMPLOYMENT.—The Director shall not—

“(1) engage in any employment other than that of serving as Director; or

“(2) serve as any other Federal employee in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Office makes any contract or

(c) VACANCY.—In the case of a vacancy, the President may designate an officer or employee who shall act as Director during the vacancy.

(d) COMPENSATION.—The Director shall be compensated at a rate of pay not to exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5316).

(e) DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2004 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10444) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2004. DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.

The Director shall have the following duties:

(1) Maintaining liaison with the judicial branches of the Federal and State Governments on matters relating to violence against women;

(2) Providing information to the President, the Congress, the judiciary, State, local, and Tribal governments, and the general public on matters relating to violence against women;

(3) Serving, at the request of the Attorney General, as the representative of the Department of Justice in efforts to develop policy, provide technical assistance, and analyze the distribution of funding in order to support culturally specific organizations.

(4) Serving, at the request of the President, acting through the Attorney General, as the representative of the United States Government on human rights and economic justice matters related to violence against women in international fora, including, but not limited to, the United Nations;

(5) Carrying out the functions of the Department of Justice under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103–32), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–386), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–4; 127 Stat. 1252), and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021, including with respect to those functions—

(A) the development of policy, protocols, and guidelines;

(B) the development and management of grant programs and other programs, and the provision of technical assistance under such programs; and

(C) the awarding and termination of grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts;

(6) Providing technical assistance, coordination, and support to—

(A) other components of the Department of Justice, in efforts to develop policy and to enforce Federal laws relating to violence against women, including the litigation of civil and criminal actions relating to enforcing such laws;

(B) State, local, and Tribal agencies, in efforts to develop policy, provide technical assistance, synchronize Federal definitions and protocols, and improve coordination among agencies carrying out efforts to eliminate violence against women, including Indian or indigenous women; and

(C) grants to efforts to combat violence against women and to provide support and assistance to victims of such violence;

(7) Enforcing such rules, regulations, guidelines, and procedures as are necessary to carry out any function of the Office.”.

(d) STAFF OF OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2005 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10445) is amended in the heading, by striking “VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN OFFICE” and inserting “OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN”.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 121(a)(1) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 12141(a)(1)) is amended by striking “VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN Office” and inserting “the Office on Violence Against Women”.

SEC. 1002. OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN A DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR CULTURALLY SPECIFIC COMMUNITIES.

Part T of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (34 U.S.C. 10441 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 2004 the following:

“SEC. 2004A. DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR CULTURALLY SPECIFIC COMMUNITIES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office on Violence Against Women a Deputy Director for Culturally Specific Communities.

(b) DUTIES.—The Deputy Director shall—

(1) serve, at the request of the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women—

(A) in the development of grants related to culturally specific services and contracts with culturally specific organizations;

(B) coordinate Federal policy, protocols, and guidelines on matters relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, in culturally specific communities;

(C) advise the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women concerning policies, legislation, implementation of laws, and other issues related to culturally specific communities;

(2) coordinate Federal policy, protocols, and guidelines in the Department of Justice to develop policy and to enforce Federal laws relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in culturally specific communities; and

(3) ensure that appropriate technical assistance, developed and provided by entities having expertise in culturally specific communities, is made available to grantees and potential grantees proposing to serve culturally specific communities; and

(4) provide technical assistance, coordination, and analysis to other offices and bureaus in the Department of Justice to develop policy and to enforce Federal laws relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in culturally specific communities;

(5) ensure that appropriate technical assistance, developed and provided by entities having expertise in culturally specific communities, is made available to grantees and potential grantees proposing to serve culturally specific communities; and

(6) ensure access to grants and technical assistance for culturally specific organizations and analyze the distribution of funding in order to identify barriers for culturally specific organizations.

TITLE XI—IMPROVING CONDITIONS FOR WOMEN IN FEDERAL CUSTODY

SEC. 1101. IMPROVING THE TREATMENT OF PRIMARY CARETAKER PARENTS AND OTHER INDIVIDUALS IN FEDERAL PRISONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Rapid Assessment of Conditions for Women in Federal Custody Act”.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§4051. Treatment of primary caretaker parents and other individuals

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ‘primary caretaker parent’ means a primary caretaker parent under the Bureau of Prisons;

(2) the term ‘covered institution’ means a Federal penal or correctional institution;

(3) the term ‘holiday’ means the Director of the Bureau of Prisons;

(4) the term ‘post-partum recovery’ means the first 8-week period of post-partum recovery after giving birth;

(5) the term ‘primary caretaker parent’ has the meaning given the term in section 31903 of the Family Unity Demonstration Project Act (34 U.S.C. 12245);

(6) the term ‘prisoner’ means an individual who is incarcerated in a Federal penal or correctional institution, including a vulnerable person; and

(7) the term ‘vulnerable person’ means an individual who—

(A) is under 21 years of age or over 60 years of age;

(B) is pregnant;

(C) identifies as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or in transition;

(D) is victim or witness of a crime;

(E) has filed a nonfrivolous civil rights claim in Federal or State court;

(F) has a serious mental or physical illness or disability; or

(G) during the period of incarceration, has been determined to have experienced or to be experiencing severe trauma or to be the victim of gender-based violence—

(i) by any court or administrative judicial proceeding; or

(ii) by the individual;

(iii) by the individual’s attorney or legal service provider; or

(iv) by the individual;

(b) GEOGRAPHIC PLACEMENT.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—The Director shall establish within the Bureau of Prisons an office that determines the placement of prisoners.

(2) PLACEMENT OF PRISONERS.—In determining whether the placement of a prisoner described in subparagraph (A) of section 4051 shall—

(A) the prisoner has children, place the prisoner as close to the children as possible;

(B) the prisoner is a victim of gender-based violence or a transgender or intersex prisoner to a facility for male or female prisoners, and in making other housing and programming assignments, consider on a case-by-case basis whether a placement would ensure the prisoner’s health and safety, including serious consideration of the prisoner’s own views with respect to their safety, and whether the placement would present management or security problems; and

(C) consider any other factor that the office determines to be appropriate.

(c) PROHIBITION ON PLACEMENT OF PREGNANT PRISONERS OR PRISONERS IN POST-PARTUM RECOVERY IN SEGREGATED HOUSING UNITS.—

(1) PLACEMENT IN SEGREGATED HOUSING UNITS.—A covered institution may not place a prisoner who is pregnant or in post-partum recovery in a segregated housing unit unless the prisoner presents an immediate risk of harm to themselves or other prisoners.

(2) RESTRICTIONS.—Any placement of a prisoner described in subparagraph (A) in a segregated housing unit shall be limited and temporary.

(d) PARENTING CLASSES.—The Director shall provide parenting classes to each prisoner who is a primary caretaker parent, and such classes shall be made available to prisoners with limited English proficiency in compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(e) TRAUMA SCREENING.—The Director shall provide training, including cultural competency training, to each correctional officer and each employee of the Bureau of Prisons who regularly interacts with prisoners, including each institutional and health care professional, to enable those correctional officers and employees to—

(1) identify a prisoner who has a mental or physical health need relating to trauma the prisoner has experienced; and

(2) refer a prisoner described in paragraph (1) to the appropriate healthcare professional for treatment.

(f) INMATE HEALTH.—

(1) HEALTH CARE ACCESS.—The Director shall ensure that all prisoners receive adequate health care.

(2) HYGIENIC PRODUCTS.—The Director shall make essential hygiene products, including shampoo, toothpaste, toothbrushes, and any other hygiene product the Director determines appropriate, available without charge to prisoners.
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SEC. 1102. PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY OF PRISONERS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Stop Infant Mortality And Recidivism Reduction Act” or the “SIMARRA Act.”

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons shall establish a pilot program (in this section referred to as the “Director”) to develop tools to communicate parenting program availability and eligibility criteria to each employee of the Bureau of Prisons and each pregnant inmate to ensure that each pregnant inmate in the custody of a Bureau of Prisons facility understands the resources available to such inmate and (C) report to Congress in accordance with subsection (i).

(c) DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF PRISONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out this section in consultation with—

(A) a licensed and board-certified gynecologist or obstetrician;

(B) the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts;

(C) the Director of the Office of Probation and Pretrial Services;

(D) the Director of the National Institute of Justice;

(E) the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(2) INMATE REQUIREMENTS.—For the duration of the term of participation in the Program, the inmate shall—

(A) verify that appropriate steps are taken to ensure that the infant born to the inmate is removed from the inmate’s care as soon as possible;

(B) participate in any educational or counseling opportunities established by the Director, including topics such as child development, parenting skills, domestic violence, vocational training, or substance abuse, as appropriate;

(C) abide by any court decision regarding the legal or physical custody of the child; and

(D) make decisions using data that is based on the best available statistical and empirical evidence.

(3) ELIGIBILITY.—An inmate may apply to participate in the Program if the inmate—

(I) is pregnant at the beginning of or during the term of imprisonment.

(II) for addressing the specific needs of Federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers to assure that such programs and interventions are evidence-based and to suggest changes, deletions, and expansions based on the results of such analyses;

(3) METHODS.—In carrying out the duties under paragraph (2), the Director shall—

(A) consult relevant stakeholders; and

(B) make decisions using data that is based on the best available statistical and empirical evidence.

(4) ELIGIBILITY.—An inmate may apply to participate in the Program if the inmate—

(I) is pregnant at the beginning of or during the term of imprisonment.

(II) is in the custody or control of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

(f) PROGRAM TERMS.

(1) TERM OF PARTICIPATION.—To correspond with the purposes and goals of the Program to promote bonding during the critical stages of child development, an eligible inmate selected for the Program may participate in the Program, subject to subsection (g), until the earliest of—

(A) the date that the inmate’s term of imprisonment expires;

(B) the date the infant fails to meet any medical criteria established by the Director or the Designee along with a collective determination of the persons listed in subsection (d)(1); or

(C) 36 months.

(g) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—For the duration of an inmate’s participation in the Program, the inmate shall agree to—

(A) take substantive steps towards acting in the role of a parent or guardian to any child of that inmate;

(B) participate in any educational or counseling opportunities established by the Director, including topics such as child development, parenting skills, domestic violence, vocational training, or substance abuse, as appropriate;

(C) abide by any court decision regarding the legal or physical custody of the child; and

(E) specify a person who has agreed to take at least temporary custody of the child if the inmate’s participation in the Program terminates before the inmate’s release.

(h) CONTINUITY OF CARE.—The Director shall take appropriate actions to prevent detachment or disruption of either an inmate’s or infant’s health and bonding-based well-being due to termination of the Program.

(i) REPORTING.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section and once each year thereafter for 5 years, the Director shall submit a report to the Congress with regards to progress in implementing the Program.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the termination of this section, the Director shall issue a final report to the Congress that contains a detailed statement of the Director’s findings and conclusions, including recommendations for legislation, administrative actions, and regulations the Director considers appropriate.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out the provisions of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.
Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and thereafter, every other year, the National Institute of Justice, in consultation with the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Bureau of Prisons (including the Women and Special Population Branch), shall prepare a status of women’s incarceration (including women in incarcerated facilities). Depending on the topic to be addressed, and the facility, data shall be collected from Bureau of Prisons personnel and a sample that is representative of the population of incarcerated women. The report shall include:

(1) With regard to federal facilities where women are incarcerated—

(A) an assessment of such women to questions from the Adverse Childhood Experience (ACES) questionnaire; 

(B) demographic data of such women, including race, sexual orientation and gender identity; 

(C) description of programs and services that support women’s incarceration,

(D) the number of such women who were engaged at the time that they entered incarceration;

(E) the number of such women who have children; 

(F) the crimes for which women are incarcerated and the length of their sentence and to the extent practicable, any information on the conditions under which such crimes were convicted & their experience of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; 

(2) With regard to all federal facilities where persons are incarcerated—

(A) a list of best practices with respect to women’s incarceration and transition, including staff orientation and training, and management practices (including making sanitary products readily available and easily accessible, and access to and provision of healthcare); 

(B) the existence of trauma treatment at each facility (including number of beds, and number of trained staff); 

(C) rates of serious mental illness broken down by gender and security level and a list of residential programs available by site; and 

(D) the availability of vocational education and a list of vocational programs provided by each facility.

SEC. 1104. REENTRY PLANNING AND SERVICES FOR INCARCERATED WOMEN.

The Attorney General, in coordination with the Office of Victims of Crime, the Pretrial Services and the Director of the Bureau of Prisons (including Women and Special Population Branch), shall collaborate on a model of gender responsive reentry planning and services (also known as "gender-responsive reentry") for incarcerated women, including the development of a national standard on prevention with respect to domestic and sexual violence. In developing the model, the Chief and the Director shall consult with such experts within the federal government (including the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice) and in the victim service provider community (including sexual and domestic violence and homelessness, job training and job placement service providers) as are necessary to the completion of a comprehensive plan. Issues addressed should include:

(1) the development by the Bureau of Prisons of a contract for gender collaborative services; and 

(2) the identification by re-entry affairs coordinators and responsive planning for the needs of re-entering women with respect to—

(A) housing, including risk of homelessness; 

(B) transitional risk to and risk for domestic and sexual violence; and 

(C) the need for parenting classes, assistance securing childcare, or assistance in seeking or securing financial stability (as may be necessary in the re-entry, parenting or other contexts).

TITLE XII—LAW ENFORCEMENT TOOLS TO ENHANCE PUBLIC SAFETY

SEC. 1201. NOTIFICATION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES OF PROHIBITED PURCHASE OF A FIREARM.

(a) In GENERAL.—Title I of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 108. NOTIFICATION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES OF PROHIBITED PURCHASE OF A FIREARM.

“(a) In GENERAL.—In the case of a background check conducted by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System pursuant to subsection (a) of section 9206 of title 18, United States Code, which background check determines that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g)(8), (g)(9), or (g)(10) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, and such determination is made after business days have elapsed since the licensee contacted the System and a firearm has been transferred to that person, the System shall notify the law enforcement agencies described in subsection (b).

“(b) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES DESCRIBED.—The law enforcement agencies described in paragraph (1) are law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction over the location from which the licensee contacted the System and the law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction over the residence of the person for whose the background check was conducted, as follows:

(1) The field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. 

(2) The local law enforcement agency. 

(3) The State law enforcement agency.

(4) The Tribal law enforcement agency. 

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 925A the following:

“Sec. 1202. REPORTING OF BACKGROUND CHECK RESULTS TO STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 925A the following:

“§ 925B. Reporting of background check denials to State, local, and Tribal authorities.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) provides a notice pursuant to section 922(b) of this title that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g)(8), (g)(9), or (g)(10) of section 922 of this title or State law, the Attorney General shall, in accordance with subsection (b), establish, in order to receive and expedite requests for assistance from State, Tribal, territorial and local law enforcement agencies responding to intimate partner violence cases, an office or office(s) within the Department of Justice that are responsible for responding to intimate partner violence cases:

(1) report to the law enforcement authorities of the State where the person sought to acquire the firearm and, if different, the law enforcement authorities of the State of residence of the person—

(1) the date and time the notice was provided; 

(2) the location where the firearm was sought to be acquired; 

(2) deputize State, Tribal, territorial and local law enforcement officers for the purpose of enhancing the capacity of the agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives in responding to and investigating violations of such paragraphs; and 

(b) each Field Division of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives; and 

(b) each Field Office of the United States Attorneys.

(b) IMPROVE INTIMATE PARTNER AND PUBLIC SAFETY.”

(c) QUALIFIED DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified’ means, with respect to an attorney, that the attorney is a licensed attorney in good standing with any relevant licensing authority.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 925A the following:

“§ 925B. Reporting of background check denials to State, local, and Tribal authorities.”

SEC. 1203. SPECIAL ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS AND CROSS-DEPUTIZED ATTORNEYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 925B the following:

“§ 925C. Special assistant U.S. attorneys and cross-deputized attorneys.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to improve the enforcement of paragraphs (8), (9), and (10) of section 922(g), the Attorney General may—

“(1) appoint, in accordance with section 543 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 2021 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, as amended by this Act, to represent the United States on certain firearms and explosives matters.

(c) QUALIFIED DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified’ means, with respect to a person to be made to the same State authorities that originally issued the notice with respect to the person.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The title of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 925A the following:

“§ 925B. Reporting of background check denials to State, local, and Tribal authorities.”

SEC. 1204. CLOSING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSENT LOophole.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This title shall be cited as “the Closing the Law Enforcement Consent Looophole Act of 2021”.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—A report is made in accordance with this subsection if the report is made within 24 hours after the provision of the notice described in subsection (a), except that the making of the report may be delayed for so long as is necessary to avoid compromising an ongoing investigation.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require a report with respect to a person to be made to the same State authorities that originally issued the notice with respect to the person.
SEC. 1302. PROHIBITION ON ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTS WHILE ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

(a) In general.—Section 2246 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by adding at the end the following: “or by any person acting under color of law”; and

(2) by redesigning subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(b) Offense.—Whoever, acting under color of law, knowingly engages in a sexual act with an individual, including an individual who is under arrest, in detention, or otherwise in the actual custody of any Federal law enforcement officer, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “sexual act” has the meaning given the term in section 2246; and

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following: “(5) The term ‘Federal law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given in the term in section 115.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item related to section 2246 as redesignated to read as follows: “2243. Sexual abuse of a minor or ward by any person acting under color of law.”

SEC. 1303. INCENTIVES FOR STATES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—The Attorney General is authorized to make grants to States that have in effect a law that—

(1) makes it a criminal offense for any person acting under color of law of the State to engage in a sexual act with an individual, including an individual who is under arrest, in detention, or otherwise in the actual custody of any law enforcement officer; and

(2) prohibits a person charged with an offense described in paragraph (1) from asserting the consent of the individual as a defense.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—A State that receives a grant under this section shall submit to the Attorney General, on an annual basis, in formation on—

(1) the number of reports made to law enforcement agencies in that State regarding persons engaging in a sexual act while acting under color of law of the State during the previous year, and

(2) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under color of law was reported during the previous year.

(c) APPLICATION.—A State seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(d) LIMIT.—A State may not receive a grant under this section for a 2-year period.

(e) USES OF FUNDS.—A State that receives a grant under this subsection shall use—

(1) 25 percent of such funds for any of the permissible uses of funds under the grant program described in paragraph (1) of subsection (d); and

(2) 75 percent of such funds for any of the permissible uses of funds under the grant program described in paragraph (2) of subsection (d).

SEC. 1304. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) the information required to be reported by the Attorney General under section 3(b); and

(2) information on—

(A) the number of reports made, during the previous year, to Federal law enforcement agencies regarding persons engaging in a sexual act while acting under color of law; and

(B) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under color of law was reported.

(b) REPORT BY GAO.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall make a report on any violations of section 2243(c) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 2, committed during the 1-year period covered by the report.

(c) DUTIES.—The Working Group shall consider the following:

(1) What activity constitutes different acts of sexual violence.

(2) Whether reports that use the same terms for acts of sexual violence are collecting the same data on these acts.

(3) Whether the context which led to an act of sexual violence should impact how that act is accounted for in reporting.

(4) Whether the data collected is presented in a way that allows the general public to understand what acts of sexual violence are included in each measurement.

(5) Steps that agencies that compile reports relating to sexual violence can take to avoid double counting incidents of sexual violence.

(d) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Working Group shall submit a report to Congress on the following:

(1) The activities of the Working Group.

(2) Recommendations to harmonize Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence and to make recommendations on the harmonization of such efforts.

(3) COMPOSITION.—The Working Group shall be comprised of at least one representative from each of the following agencies, who shall be selected by the head of that agency:

(1) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(2) The Department of Education.

(3) The Department of Health and Human Services.


SEC. 1401. NATIONAL STALKER AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE REDUCTION.


SEC. 1402. FEMALE VICTIM ASSISTANTS REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 4104 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13922) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 4104. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEMALE VICTIM ASSISTANTS.

(1) There are appropriated to be appropriated to the United States Attorney for the purpose of appointing victim/witness coordinators for the prosecution of sex crimes and domestic violence crimes, such coordinators shall be eligible to participate in the ‘STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program’.”.

SEC. 1403. CHILD ABUSE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR JUDICIAL PERSONNEL AND PRACTITIONERS REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 213(a) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 20324(a)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026.”.

SEC. 1404. SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT.

Section 40152(c) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12311(c)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026.”.

SEC. 1405. COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATE PROGRAM.

Section 219(a) of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20324(a)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026.”.

SEC. 1406. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM PROGRAM GRANTS.

Section 304(d) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(d)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2024” and inserting “2022 through 2026.”.

SEC. 1407. REVIEW ON LINK BETWEEN SUBSTANCE USE AND VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.

Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services shall complete a review and submit a report to Congress on whether being a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking increases the likelihood of having a substance use disorder.

SEC. 1408. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP TO STUDY FEDERAL EFFORTS TO COLLECT DATA ON SEXUAL VIOLENCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish an interagency working group (in this section referred to as the “Group”) to study Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence and to make recommendations on the harmonization of such efforts.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Working Group shall be comprised of at least one representative from each of the following agencies, which shall be selected by the head of that agency:

(1) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(2) The Department of Education.

(3) The Department of Health and Human Services.


(5) DUTIES.—The Working Group shall consider the following:

(1) The activities of the Working Group.

(2) Recommendations to harmonize Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence and to make recommendations on the harmonization of such efforts.

(3) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Working Group shall submit a report to Congress on the following:

(1) The activities of the Working Group.

(2) Recommendations to harmonize Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence.

(3) Actions Federal agencies can take to implement the recommendations described in paragraph (2).
(e) TERMINATION.—The Working Group shall terminate 30 days after the date on which the report is submitted pursuant to subsection (d).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "harmonize" includes efforts to coordinate sexual violence data collection to produce complementary information, as appropriate, without compromising programmatic needs.

(2) SEXUAL VIOLENCE.—The term "sexual violence" includes an unwanted sexual act (including both contact and non-contact) about which the Federal Government collects information.

SEC. 1409. NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOT-LINE

Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, a national domestic violence hotline for which a grant is provided under section 313 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act and the voluntary feature of texting via telephone to ensure all methods of communication are available for victims and those seeking assistance.

SEC. 1410. DEPUTY ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL ON CULTURALLY SPECIFIC COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

There shall be a Deputy Assistant Attorney General on Culturally Specific Communities within the Office of Justice Programs who shall, under the guidance and authority of the Assistant Attorney General for Justice Programs—

(1) oversee the administration of grants related to culturally specific services and contracts with culturally specific organizations;

(2) coordinate development of Federal policy, protocols, and guidelines on matters relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking in culturally specific communities;

(3) advise the Assistant Attorney General of the Office of Justice Programs concerning policies, legislation, implementation of laws, and other issues relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking in culturally specific communities;

(4) provide technical assistance, coordination, and support to other offices and bureaus in the Department of Justice to develop policy and to enforce Federal laws relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking in culturally specific communities;

(5) appropriate technical assistance, developed and provided by entities having expertise in culturally specific is made available to grantees and potential grantees proposing to serve culturally specific communities;

(6) ensure access to grants and technical assistance for culturally specific organizations and analyze the distribution of funding in order to identify barriers for culturally specific organizations.

TITLE XV—CYBERCRIME ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 1501. LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS FOR ENFORCEMENT OF CYBERCRIMES

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Attorney General shall award grants under this section to States and units of local government for the prevention, enforcement, and prosecution of cybercrimes against individuals.

(b) APPLICATION.—(1) In GENERAL.—To request a grant under this section, the chief executive officer of a State or unit of local government shall submit an application to the Attorney General within 90 days after the date on which funds to carry out this section are appropriated for a fiscal year, in such form as the Attorney General may require.

(A) A certification that Federal funds made available under this section will not be used to supplant State or local funds, but will be used to supplement existing resources of such agencies within 90 days after the date on which funds to carry out this section are appropriated for a fiscal year, in such form as the Attorney General may require.

(B) An assurance that, not fewer than 30 days before the application (or any amendment to the application) was submitted to the Attorney General, the application (or amendment) was submitted to the Attorney General (or by another officer of the applicant, if qualified under regulations promulgated by the Attorney General), that—

(i) the programs to be funded by the grant meet all the requirements of this section;

(ii) all the information contained in the application is correct;

(iii) there has been appropriate coordination with affected agencies; and

(iv) the application is consistent with all provisions of this section and other applicable Federal laws.

(C) A certification that the State or in the case of a unit of local government, the State in which the unit of local government is located, has in effect criminal laws which prohibit cybercrimes against individuals.

(D) A certification that any equipment described in subsection (c)(7) purchased using grant funds awarded under this section will be used primarily for investigations and forensic analysis of evidence in matters involving cybercrimes against individuals.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this section may only be used for programs that provide—

(1) training for State or local law enforcement personnel relating to cybercrimes against individuals, including—

(A) training such personnel to identify and protect victims of cybercrimes against individuals;

(B) training such personnel to utilize Federal, State, and local, and other resources to assist victims of cybercrimes against individuals;

(C) training such personnel to utilize technology to assist in the investigation of and response to cybercrimes against individuals; and

(D) the payment of overtime incurred as a result of such training;

(2) assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies in educating the public in order to prevent, deter, and identify violations of laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals;

(3) training for State or local emergency dispatch personnel relating to cybercrimes against individuals, including—

(A) training such personnel to identify and protect victims of cybercrimes against individuals;

(B) training such personnel to utilize Federal, State, local, and other resources to assist victims of cybercrimes against individuals;

(C) training such personnel to utilize technology to assist in the identification of and response to cybercrimes against individuals; and

(D) the payment of overtime incurred as a result of such training;

(4) assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies in educating the public in order to prevent, deter, and identify violations of laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals;

(5) assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies to establish task forces that operate solely to conduct investigations, forensic analyses of evidence, and prosecutions in matters involving cybercrimes against individuals;

(6) assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies in acquiring computers, computer equipment, and other equipment necessary for the use of the equipment for the duration of a reasonable period of use of such equipment;

(7) assistance in the facilitation and promotion of sharing, with State and local law enforcement, judges, and judicial personnel, relating to cybercrimes against individuals, including the use of multipledistrict task forces; or

(8) assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies in processing interstate extradition requests for violations of laws involving cybercrimes against individuals, including expenses incurred in the extradition of an offender from one State to another.

(f) REPORT TO THE SECRETARY.—On the date that is 1 year after the date on which a State or unit of local government submitted an application under this section, and annually thereafter, the chief executive of such State or unit of local government shall submit to the Attorney General a report which contains—

(1) a summary of the activities carried out during the previous year with any grant received by such State or unit of local government;

(2) an evaluation of the results of such activities; and

(3) such other information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than November 1 of each even-numbered fiscal year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report that contains a compilation of the information contained in the report submitted under subsection (d).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $20,000,000 for the 2022 fiscal year.

(2) LIMITATION.—Of the amount made available under paragraph (1) in any fiscal year, not more than 5 percent may be used for evaluation and monitoring, technical assistance, salaries, and administrative expenses.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) The term "cybercrime against individuals" means the criminal offenses applicable in the relevant State or unit of local government.
Congress finds the following:

(1) Approximately 17.5 million children are exposed each year to domestic violence.

(2) Most child abuse is perpetrated by a family member or a person known to the child. U.S. Department of Justice data shows that family members are almost half (49 percent) of the perpetrators of child sexual assault victims under age 6.

(3) Research suggests a child’s exposure to a batterer is among the strongest indicators of risk of incest victimization. One study found female children whose fathers were batterers of the non-abusive sex were at least four times as likely to experience father-daughter incest than female children who do not have an abusive father.

(4) More than 75 percent of child sexual abuse is perpetrated by a family member or a person known to the child. U.S. Department of Justice data shows that family members are almost half (49 percent) of the perpetrators of child sexual assault victims under age 6.

(5) Research suggests a child’s exposure to a batterer is among the strongest indicators of risk of incest victimization. One study found female children whose fathers were batterers of the non-abusive sex were at least four times as likely to experience father-daughter incest than female children who do not have an abusive father.

(6) Child maltreatment is a leading public health issue in the United States. Total lifetime financial costs associated with just one year of confirmed cases of child maltreatment (including child physical abuse, sexual abuse, psychological abuse and neglect) results in $124 billion in annual costs to the U.S. economy, or approximately one percent of the gross domestic product.

(7) Research shows that the effects of child sexual abuse are increased by a child’s exposure to a battered parent, and that family members are almost half (49 percent) of the perpetrators of child sexual assault victims under age 6.

(8) Research shows that the effects of child sexual abuse are increased by a child’s exposure to a battered parent, and that family members are almost half (49 percent) of the perpetrators of child sexual assault victims under age 6.
than 100 of these child murders are known to have occurred after a court ordered the child into contact with the dangerous parent over the objection of a safe parent or caregiver.

(10) Scientifically unsound theories that treat mothers’ abuse allegations as likely false attempts to undermine the father are frequently applied in family court to minimize or deny parents’ or children’s reports of abuse. Many experts who testify against abuse allegations lack expertise in the relevant type of alleged abuse, relying instead on unsound and unsupported theories.

(11) Judges presiding over custody cases with allegations of child abuse, child sexual abuse, and domestic violence are rarely required to receive evidence-based and culturally appropriate training on the dynamics, signs and impact of domestic violence and child abuse, including child sexual abuse.

SEC. 1604. DEFINITION OF COVERED FORMULA GRANT.

The term “covered formula grant” means a grant under part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10446(c)(4)) (commonly referred to as the “STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program”).

SEC. 1605. INCREASED FUNDING FOR FORMULA GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

(a) In General.—The Attorney General shall increase the amount provided to a State under the covered formula grants in accordance with this title.

(1) Evidence.—

(A) Experts.—The State has in place a law ensuring that, in a custody proceeding where a parent has been alleged to have committed domestic violence or child abuse, including child sexual abuse, evidence from court-appointed or other personnel identified in subparagraph (A) shall be for one year.

(B) Renewal.—A State that receives a covered grant may submit an application for a renewal of such grant at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require, including information regarding the law described in section 1605.

(c) Limit.—A State shall not receive a covered grant for more than 4 years.

SEC. 1609. USES OF FUNDS.

A State that receives an increase under the covered formula grants under this title shall use the amount of the increase for subgrants pursuant to section 2001(c)(4)(C) or (D) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10446(c)(4)).

SEC. 1610. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $300,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1620. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA, was signed into law in 1994 to help ensure that women in America are free from violence and free from fear. At the time that VAWA was enacted, it was all too common for violent crimes against women to go without appropriate response and to remain unaddressed by the criminal justice system.

But through programs implemented under VAWA, Congress began to help protect communities that need the assistance they need to combat the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Building on this success, H.R. 1620 is bipartisan legislation that reauthorizes and strengthens the Violence Against Women Act so that it can continue delivering vital services to those in need.

VAWA, which is not gender-exclusive, addresses the needs of men and women, children, persons with disabilities, homeless persons, and LGBTQ individuals, among others.

This reauthorization would also increase access to grant programs for...
I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 16, 2021. Hon. JERROLD NADLER, Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I write concerning H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021. This bill was primarily referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and subsequently to the Committee on Education and Labor and other committees. As a result of Leadership and the Committee on the Judiciary having consulted with me concerning this bill generally, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill so the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee on Education and Labor takes this action with our mutual understanding that by forgoing formal consideration of H.R. 1620, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and we will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so we may address any remaining issues within our Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee on Education and Labor to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Finally, I would appreciate a response confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1620.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 15, 2021.


I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 1620 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 1620 which fall within your Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER, Chairman.

MRS. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Violence Against Women Act was first signed into law almost 30 years ago with wide bipartisan support. The law recognizes that Federal laws covering domestic violence could help ease overburdened State and local criminal justice systems, and was narrowly defined and not controversial. Since its passage, it has been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis.

Unfortunately, in recent years, Democrats have politicized the law, straying further and further away from its original intent. This bill, H.R. 1620, is a continuation of the Democrats’ politicization, expanding and altering the fundamental nature of the Violence Against Women Act.

The most significant change in this reauthorization effort is that it erases important distinctions between women and men. It replaces violence against women” with “a person of any gender.” This bill would expand VAWA’s protection to include individuals who are transgender, of which are unproven and could force a woman to confront her abuser. This rewriting of the Violence Against Women Act not only under mines the original intent of this legislation, but also jeopardizes the safety and well-being of women at risk. It does more to advance the Democrats’ progressive agenda than it does to protect women.

It is not just VAWA. The Democrats’ open border agenda hurts women. Calls to defund, dismantle, and rethink local law enforcement hurt at-risk women. Never-ending government lockdowns that require battered and abused women to stay in violent households hurt women. A southern border open to dangerous drug cartels and human traffickers caused by President Biden’s border crisis hurts women. In fact, the Democrats’ open border policies incentivize women to make the dangerous trip to the U.S.-Mexico border on which one-third of women report being sexually abused.

Those are not the only problems with this legislation. H.R. 1620 also threatens Americans’ constitutional right to religious freedom. The bill denies faith-based exemptions for VAWA grant recipients, prohibiting religious organizations from running shelters and legal aid centers on the basis of their sincerely held religious beliefs. The Democrats’ open border policy could actually force faith-based centers for abused women to close.

H.R. 1620 also expands the definition of domestic violence to include economic and emotional duress, pulling funding away from combating the severity of violent crimes. This legislation disregards the well-being of women by promoting lofty concepts, such as restorative justice approaches to crimes against women, which are unproven and could force a woman to confront her abuser.

Democrats know that these are unnecessary additions that jeopardize the bipartisan reauthorization, so why are they choosing to proceed? Why are they putting forward this bill—with no hearings, no markups—in this Congress—at the expense of women’s safety and well-being?

Any crime or abuse against any single individual is abhorrent. State and Federal laws already protect individuals, women and men, from domestic violence and sexual abuse and any related reprehensible acts like dating violence and stalking. Resources should

Mr. Speaker. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

Their efforts, and those of many other Members, have produced this important bill that will not only continue the progress enabled by VAWA as originally envisioned, but also mark a new act an even more effective tool in addressing the horrible scourge of domestic violence.
be targeted to help those women and individuals cope and recover and also prevent further violence and abuse. This bill falls short of that goal and wildly distorts the original purpose of this law.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I stand today in a moment of history where we cannot go back. Have we heard that before? Women cannot go back. Women cannot continue in an intimidated fashion to tragically be subjected to men who violently attack them.

The LGBT community cannot go back. They cannot go back. They cannot go back to pueblos and reservations and not have any protection for those who violate those sacred places, rape them and then rush to jurisdiction outside and think they are protected.

Immigrant women cannot go back. That is what this legislation is about. It is a product borne of meticulous research and countless engagement with those on the ground working ultimately and intimately on these very important issues daily.

We began this long journey and hard-fought battle under the leadership of Republicans—I wrote the bill in 2018—who at the time refused to engage in putting forward their own version of VAWA when it expired in 2018 while they held the majority. The President, the Senate, the House, they did nothing. The Judiciary Committee would not even take the bill up, and it was supported by over 200 groups.

But we continue to push forward on behalf of all victims and survivors to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, first led by the President of the United States, then-Senator Joe Biden.

As we all know, VAWA is a landmark piece of legislation first enacted in 1994. The President was Bill Clinton. This legislation was enacted in response to the prevalence of domestic and sexual violence and the significant impact of such violence on the lives of women.

Statistics have revealed that this form of violence impacts us all. In the United States, an estimated 10 million people experience domestic violence every year. More than 15 million children are exposed to violence annually. According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, about 20 people per minute are physically abused by an intimate partner. About one in four women and one in nine men experience severe intimate partner physical violence, sexual violence, and partner stalking injury.

Today, in Texas, 35 percent of women and 34 percent of men are subjected to domestic violence. When discussing VAWA, we must focus on the lives of the victims of domestic violence like Ms. Fontenot, who was murdered in Harris County by her husband just 1 day after Christmas last year while she was trying to escape her relationship, and he shot at her son.

Nor can we forget Debra Seidenfaden, who was murdered by her husband in Houston after an argument. There are countless stories like this throughout the country. That is why it is imperative that we reauthorize this bill. Enough is enough. We must pass H.R. 1620 now.

Madam Speaker, I thank all the women, including Representative Slaughter, who started this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1620, the “Violence Against Women Act of 2021.”

H.R. 1620 is a product born of meticulous research and thoughtful and countless engagement with those on the ground working ultimately and intimately on these very important issues daily.

We began this long journey, and hard-fought battle under the leadership of Republicans, who at the time refused to engage or put forward their own version of VAWA when it expired in 2018 while they held the majority. But we continued to push forward on behalf of all victims and survivors to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994.

As we all know, VAWA is a landmark piece of legislation first enacted in 1994 and signed into law by President Bill Clinton as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

This legislation was enacted in response to the prevalence of domestic and sexual violence and the significant impact of such violence on the lives of women.

Statistics have revealed that these forms of violence impact us all.

In the United States, an estimated 10 million people experience domestic violence every year, and more than 15 million children are exposed to this violence annually. According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, about 20 people per minute are physically abused by an intimate partner. About 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men experience severe intimate partner physical violence, sexual violence, and/or partner stalking with injury.

Today, in Texas, 35.10 percent of women and 34.5 percent of men are subjected to domestic violence.

When discussing VAWA, we cannot forget the victims of domestic violence like Yashica Fontenot, who was murdered in Harris County, Texas by her husband just one day after Christmas last year while she was trying to escape her relationship.

Nor can we forget Debra Seidenfaden, who was murdered by her husband in Houston after an argument. There are countless stories like this throughout the country.

That is why it is imperative to reauthorize this law by passing H.R. 1620 now. Because enough is enough. Congress has reauthorized VAWA three times—in 2000, 2005, and 2013—with strong bipartisan approval and overwhelming support from Congress, States, and local communities.

During each reauthorization, VAWA would make various meaningful improvements to the Act to meet the varied and changing needs of survivors.

H.R. 1620 continues that tradition, and therefore, is intended to make modifications, as Congress has done in the past to all previous reauthorizations of VAWA.

H.R. 1620 is a bipartisan bill, reflecting a reasonable and compromise approach to reauthorize grant programs under the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

These moderate enhancements will address the many growing and unmet needs of victims and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

H.R. 1620 addresses the needs of sex trafficking victims while creating a demonstration program on trauma-informed training for law enforcement.

It increases access to grant programs for culturally specific organizations and ensure culturally specific organizations are included in the development and implementation of services, education, training, and other grants.

It adds a purpose area to assist communities in developing alternatives to housing ordinances that punish survivors for seeking law enforcement intervention.

H.R. 1620 expands protections for vulnerable populations such as youth, survivors without shelter, Native American women, and LGBTQI persons.

It ensures Deaf people are included in grants relating to people with disabilities.

H.R. 1620 is supported by the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, a coalition of more than 200 domestic violence groups.

VAWA expired since September 30, 2018, and we as a body are called upon by survivors to reauthorize it now.

As a tribute to our dearly departed Rep. Slaughter, who started this journey with then-Senator Biden in 1994, I respectfully urge my colleagues to join me, and the Chairman of Judiciary, along with our Republican partners—Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. MCCaul in particular—and pull together and pass H.R. 1620, a much-needed thoughtful and bipartisan response to the needs of all victims and survivors.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, Democrats are using domestic violence, which is a serious issue, as a front for just their latest gun control bill. This legislation contains red flag gun confiscation language and expands the grounds for lifetime bans of firearm possession.

Red flag gun confiscation laws upset due process. Under this legislation, an individual could have their guns removed from them without having the chance to face their accuser in court. That means a complaint and a judicial order could suspend a constitutionally guaranteed right, with no chance for the accused to respond under the law.
and view the Constitution as a negotiable suggestion.

This bill would expand the number of nonviolent misdemeanor offenses that produce a lifetime ban on firearm ownership, which is already applied to felons. It is ironic that in the same week that Democrats are voting in support of amnesty for illegal aliens who have committed up to two misdemeanors, they are voting to permanently suspend the constitutional rights of Americans who have committed one nonviolent misdemeanor.

I oppose this attempt to undermine due process, further restrict the Second Amendment, and expand the left's radical and relentless gun control agenda.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, before coming to Congress, I organized volunteer lawyers to represent survivors of domestic abuse, so I have seen firsthand both the need for the Violence Against Women Act and the remarkable impact of legal representation in moments of crisis.

That is why I am proud to support reauthorization of VAWA, which would, among other things, expand access to legal counsel for those who need it most.

Too often, survivors are left to navigate alone the overwhelming aftereffects of violence and abuse. Whether that means finding housing, medical, or other care in the aftermath of trauma, the process can be complicated and hard to manage.

Legal representation in these critical moments can make a life-changing difference. That is why I am proud to offer two amendments to VAWA today. The first would expand efforts to provide legal representation in postconviction relief proceedings. The second would increase access to legal aid for veterans who have unmet legal needs.

Everyone deserves access to quality legal representation for fundamental needs, and this bill gets us one step closer to that goal.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my amendments and the underlying legislation.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Protecting women and girls from violence and abuse and keeping them safe is deeply important to me and Members on both sides of the aisle.

Seven years before I was first elected to Congress back in 1994, President Bill Clinton signed into law the Violence Against Women Act. It was the first iteration of a very good bill, which, if you can believe it, passed the House then by a voice vote. It was supported by all but four in the Senate.

When it was reauthorized in the year 2000, I supported it and voted for it, and in 2006, VAWA again had my full support. In fact, since I have been in Congress, I have voted nearly a dozen times, both in the Judiciary Committee or here on the floor, to renew or strengthen the provisions of VAWA in an effort to do everything we all can do to protect women who have been or will be in the future be subjects of domestic violence, abuse, or other forms of harassment.

Historically, this legislation has been a truly bipartisan effort. Sadly, the effort put forth by the majority is anything but bipartisan.

What has happened between then and now? It seems to me that many on the left decided that they could use this critical legislation that is intended to protect women and girls from violence as a vehicle to promote their far-left political agenda. To me, this is a disturbing development, as the safety and well-being of all women and girls in this country is far too important to jeopardize with political calculations that could further divide the American people.

In fact, it is possible that passing this so-called VAWA reauthorization offered by the majority could result in some future with institutions shutting their shelter doors so that many women and girls who relied on their help, support, and protection wouldn’t have that protection.

This legislation could force women seeking to protect themselves or incarcerated in prison to be housed alongside biological males, potentially subjecting those women to further psychological, mental, or physical harm. To me, it is unconscionable to be aware of these and other shortcomings of this legislation and simply ignore it.

What should we do? We should continue to improve VAWA as we did prior to 2013. We should continue to protect those vulnerable individuals in our society who lean on our help to protect them. And we should accomplish it in a bipartisan, bicameral manner. Republicans and Democrats actually working together as we are capable of doing.

It is time we put politics and political agendas aside and reauthorize a Violence Against Women Act that continues to provide real protection for women and girls.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, unfortunately, when we talk about violence against women, we are often talking about domestic violence. Domestic violence claims the lives of far too many women, and it is especially deadly when it occurs in a household with a gun.

In the United States, there are 1 million women alive today who have reported being shot or shot at by their intimate partners, and there are many more who have been threatened or killed with a gun.

Closing the boyfriend loophole is a critical step to prevent abusers from obtaining a weapon, a weapon that will likely be used to escalate their abuse and a weapon that may have deadly consequences.

With this bill, we can truly help prevent, protect our families, and keep every American safer.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LEUKA).

Mrs. LEUKA. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

This version of the Violence Against Women Act does not protect women. Instead, this bill puts partisan political priorities ahead of women in need.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to claim they are the party of women, this partisan reauthorization proves that they only put women first when it is convenient.

I am a survivor of domestic violence from a previous marriage. I was afraid for my life, and I was afraid for my daughter’s life. Thankfully, I escaped that terrible situation. So I am intimately familiar with the desperate situations many women who are victims of domestic abuse face. As a domestic violence survivor, I know just how important services and protections are to women across our Nation.

Previous reauthorizations of the Violence Against Women Act have been bipartisan, but not this one. This bill is focused on partisan political priorities that force women’s domestic violence shelters to take in men who identify as women, strip away protections for religious organizations, and eliminate Second Amendment rights without due process.

The most egregious provisions of this bill push leftist gender ideology at the expense of important protections for women’s privacy and safety. Sex-segregated shelters provide a safe place for women who have been abused, often at the hands of men, and offer them a sense of privacy and security. If this bill is enacted, these shelters, under penalty of Federal law, would be required to take in men and shelter them with women, putting vulnerable women at risk.

Religious objections are also under attack in this legislation. This bill excludes critical First Amendment protections for faith-based organizations. The most certain way that attacks on religious organizations will continue over disagreements on religious liberty and gender ideology.

This bill is also being used to change and erode Second Amendment rights for everyone by introducing a new provision that would lower the standard by which government can take away someone’s right to bear arms without due process, including for nonfelony crimes.

Passing legislation that supports women who have been victims of domestic abuse, trafficking, and sexual assault should be a bipartisan issue. In this partisan Violence Against Women
Act, women in need are not the priority. Leftist ideologues are the priority.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the rates of COVID-19 spiked across the country, so did the rates of domestic violence. This pandemic with the toll the COVID-19 pandemic has taken on families, but especially families who have to experience domestic violence. Being locked in a situation with your abuser, with your attacker, was incredibly dangerous, and there has been terrible inflicted. We need to pass VAWA now. There is no reason not to support people who are victims of domestic violence. This is an enormous step forward.

I am grateful to the leaders who brought this forward, and I rise in support.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
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Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Violence Against Women Act.

Twenty persons a minute are injured by an intimate partner; that is 10 million American men and women every year. It is time to do something to continue this act and to extend it.

Madam Speaker, I have a number of amendments that have been accepted. I especially want to point out the SHIELD Act, which combats the non-consensual sharing of private, sexually explicit and nude images, commonly known as revenge porn, which now will be a crime.

My other amendment deal with creating a task force on sexual violence and education and directing the Secretary of Education to create climate surveys on student experiences with violence. Twenty percent of our college coeds are sexually assaulted or there are attempts of sexual assault on them each year.

Finally, the last amendment incentivizes States to pass a Survivors' Bill of Rights in the States Act, which is particularly important for rape kits.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, consider this: Your spouse or partner calls you names, he insults you, puts you down. He discourages you from going to work or school or seeing family members or friends.

He tries to control how you spend your money, where you go, or who you can see, what medicines you take. He acts possessive, gets angry when drinking alcohol.

He tries to control when you can see a doctor; threatens you with violence; and may hit, kick, shove, slap, choke, or otherwise hurt you, your children, your pets.

He forces you to have sex against your will. He blames you for his violent behavior and tells you that you deserve it.

And this comes from someone you love.

You are in pain and embarrassed to ask for help. You are one in four women. The Violence Against Women Act is critical for your safety and economic independence.

Madam Speaker, I urge its passage.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. I thank my colleague from Houston, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for her leadership and her tireless efforts to get this critical legislation to this House floor.

The Violence Against Women Act provides essential support for survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault, and its reauthorization now is vitally important, as many of my colleagues have shared. It is critical for organizations in my community that support survivors, like the Houston Area Women's Center, which has reported a dramatic rise in requests for their services through the coronavirus pandemic—more than 6,000 more calls responded to in 2020 alone.

Madam Speaker, in 2020, the number of people the center sheltered tripled. Sadly, we have been reminded again today of the dangers that women face in our society. The Violence Against Women Act provides resources and services that are lifesaving. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this legislation and to vote in support of it today.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN).

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today as the son of a single mom and as the brother of four sisters. Unfortunately, I have heard stories of abuse and assault and neglect throughout my life. I also heard these stories from my students and the many families I served throughout my time in education. The consistency throughout these stories illustrate how there is no recourse and there are no safe spaces for women to go to when they are under assault and being abused.

Madam Speaker, this past year, before joining Congress, I sat with a student and her mom in my office to call
a domestic violence help hotline. And we stayed on hold for hours before any-one came to the phone. There was no housing for them to go to in support of their safety. So I rise to support this legislation, and I rise to denounce the sexism and patriarchy and misogyny that exist within political arenas and within our laws.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Ms. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the survivors of domestic and sexual violence. It is completely unacceptable that we have allowed the Violence Against Women Act to expire. I am proud to have introduced two amendments that will strengthen protections for our most vulnerable communities. The first amendment will stop punishing children who have been sex-trafficked and have been in contact with the criminal justice system. The pandemic has also illustrated the urgency on what we need to do to make sure we reauthorize it.

As Americans, we have had to follow stay-at-home orders, and it has increased the amount of abuse among those who could not leave home. VAWA save lives. This isn’t a Democrat or Republican issue. It is justice and safety. It is time we get this done and reauthorize it.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, a society where every person is treated with respect, where there is equality before the law, where every woman is treated as a full and equal partner in society, that’s why we have the Violence Against Women Act which said: We are against violence no matter what color or women is to defer from confronting the hate that is often the motivation.

Madam Speaker, words matter and leadership matters. We must all loudly condemn actions and language rooted in fear and bigotry that harms all of us.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, a movement led by the Texas Council on Family Violence, and so many other advocates, first won passage of the Violence Against Women Act and brought the National Domestic Violence Hotline to Austin, which has now offered 5 million lifesaving responses. This act brought much-needed funding and hope to women across America who led coalitions.

Yet, the scourge of violence has continued. In San Antonio, a Collaborative led by Judges Monique Diaz and Peter Sakai has supplemented incredible Family Services led by Marta Peleaz and Patricia Castillo’s PEACE initiative. I have joined them for two town halls to listen, learn, and respond.

In Austin, Kelly White and Julia Spann continue the Safe Alliance, as Maria Johnson expands the Hays-Caldwell Center. But too many violent beatings have turned into killings. Because this reauthorization would close “the boyfriend loophole,” denying a gun to an abusive partner, the NRA and its Congressional Republican allies have been blocking renewal.

To today, I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.
course, the Senate-passed bipartisan bill prevailed. We had a big ceremony, participated in by the Native American community, our law enforcement community, Vice President Joe Biden, and signed by the President.

So here we are, unable to get it reauthorized 5 years later, in 2018 under the then-majority and President, and here we are today, finally able to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor.

And as I mentioned, for nearly three decades, the Violence Against Women Act has been a transformative force for safety and security of American women. Since its passage, domestic violence rates have declined by nearly two-thirds in America. Millions of women have gained access to protections from violence and abuse, and millions of survivors, to essential services and justice.

But we cannot be complacent: One in three women today face domestic abuse. Isn’t that a stunning figure? You wonder, how could it be? And partner violence is on the rise during the coronavirus pandemic, as many women are forced to quarantine in homes that are not safe.

Every time the Congress has reauthorized VAWA, we have strengthened its protections for women, based on extensive consultation with survivors, victim service providers, Indian country, law enforcement, and other experts. The authorization on the floor today continues that progress.

And as has been said by Mr. Doggett, we have to recognize the danger of the, shall we say, provisions in the bill that protect women from gun violence specifically.

Among its many life-saving provisions, this reauthorization makes vital new investments in prevention, improved services for victims of domestic violence, makes improvements in the criminal justice system’s response to gender-based violence and to the healthcare system’s response, prevents intimate partner homicide, and expands protections for victims and survivors, whether they are men or women. This is not just about women, it is the Violence Against Women Act, but it does protect anyone.

Democrats are particularly proud that this reauthorization improves the essential protections that I referenced that were objected to on the Republican bill in 2013, including women immigrants, LGBTQ, and Native American women, and it specifically supports communities of color in a culturally appropriate way.

This reauthorization is bipartisan, happily, and it is supported by more than 200 organizations representing women, women’s groups, faith-based organizations, law enforcement, the public health and medical communities, civil rights groups; the list goes on.

While it is unfortunate that we don’t know what will happen in the Senate, we are optimistic that the reauthorization can be successful on the other side of the Capitol, and on the other side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote for this reauthorization, so that we can advance justice, safety, and dignity for all.

Madam Speaker, the term VAWA has become synonymous with justice. Violence Against Women Act. I urge an ‘aye’ vote.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

VAWA established critical infrastructure that responds to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

For far too long, this vital update collected dust in the Senate graveyard. Thankfully, with a Democratic Senate majority and President Biden, we finally have real partners to secure justice, safety, and dignity for American women, particularly those who are most vulnerable.

The statistics remain deplorable: One in four American women are victims of domestic violence; one in six will be a sexual assault victim in their lifetime. The pandemic only exacerbated the need for services to comprehensively respond to these egregious crimes.

Now is no time to retreat from the vital work of improving the Federal response to gender-based violence. For Women’s History Month, let’s reaffirm our commitment to survivors everywhere, and make this world safer for all our mothers, sisters, and daughters.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ‘yes’ on this urgent legislation.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the Violence Against Women Act, this is something that should protect women.

Unfortunately, the Violence Against Women Act has expanded its protection beyond women and girls into transgender or biological males who are calling themselves women. You see, Democrats know this is a bad policy and agenda. In order to pass it, they have to hide behind real abused women.

The Violence Against Women Act incentivizes fraud in housing by allowing people who have been evicted from government-funded housing because of criminal activity to claim, after the fact, they are domestic violence victims in order to keep their housing.

The Violence Against Women Act also allows prisoners to pick their gender and be treated and assigned by their specific preference. This isn’t fair to women who are in prison. Biological men should not be allowed to decide they are a woman and decide to tell people that they are a woman so they can be put in a women’s prison.

The Violence Against Women Act provides no exemptions for religious organizations whose employees. That destroys religious freedom.

Democrats also refuse to support amendments to help women receive firearm safety training and self-defense courses to protect them against their abusers.

Republicans have introduced amendments having to do with gun rights. If you want to help protect women, make sure women are gun owners and know how to use a gun properly in order to protect themselves. That is the greatest defense for women.

Democrats want to use abused women to take away guns from everyone. Unfortunately, gun rights groups know how to pay attention to Democrat bills that affect Americans’ gun rights.

Democrats want to completely dismantle housing contracts and leases in order to justify their hypocritical ‘believe all survivors’ agenda, except when it comes to Governor Cuomo.

Democrats want to create a Violence Against Women czar at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Now that they have destroyed the family and housing law, they want to push a progressive gender ideology through housing policy. That doesn’t fit. Make no mistake, Democrats want to create an authoritarian woke state where neighbors, partners, citizens, and employers are afraid to do anything in order to avoid the draconian policies imposed under the guise of protecting women.

We already know of many high-profile men who abuse women. Why don’t we look in the mirror and take a hard look at the real abusers? I think Governor Cuomo would be a good one to pay attention to, rather than trying to criminalize every church in America for not following the advice of the transgender coalition of gender dysphoria.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I reiterate my opposition to H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

Democrats filled this legislation with politically charged, highly controversial provisions that dramatically expanded its scope, and erased the bipartisanism that originally passed this bill.

Many of those points were pointed out by the speakers on the Republican side, and unfortunately, it does nothing to address the domestic violence, it threatens religious freedom and undermines the legislation’s original intent.
Resources should be targeted to help women affected by the horrors of domestic abuse and help prevent further abuse. This bill does neither.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, every year approximately 7.9 million women are victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner. An average of three women are killed every day by a current or former intimate partner. These grim statistics underscore the crucial need for us to act without delay to reauthorize VAWA, and to enhance and expand the Act so that it is even more effective.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for this critical bipartisan legislation today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, today I will vote to approve the Violence Against Women Extension Act (VAWA) of 2021—historic landmark legislation with a proven track record of assisting abused and battered women—a bill authored by Congresswoman ELISE STEFANIK of New York.

As a matter of fact, I was the prime author of the key provisions for the first reauthorization of the VAWA in 2000—a five-year $3.3 billion comprehensive program that was part of my anti-trafficking law, the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Prevention Act (PL 106–386/TVPA).

Important VAWA programs include: legal assistance for victims; addressing housing needs for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking; grants to combat violent crimes on campuses; grants to encourage arrest policies and enforcement of protection orders; grants for enhanced training and services to end abuse later in life; the critical STOP grants to educate and train law enforcement personnel to address sexual assault; the CHOOSE grants, i.e. Creating Hope Through Outreach, Options, Service, and Education, for victims and Youth; training and services to end violence against people with disabilities; the sexual assault services program; rural domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking and child abuse enforcement assistance; and grants for strengthening the healthcare system’s response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; as well as extending other key programs.

This is consistent with my long record of support for VAWA.

I strongly supported passage of VAWA when it was first introduced in 1993, and again in 1994, when this crucial legislation was signed into law for the first time. I have supported multiple reauthorizations of VAWA, and I continue to strongly support this law as it was originally intended.

As I said earlier, I was the prime author of the law that provided for the first reauthorization of the VAWA in 2000 when I included the five-year $3.3 billion comprehensive program in my Victims of Trafficking and Violence Prevention Act (PL 106–386/TVPA).

I also cosponsored the 2005 reauthorization, fought to ensure these programs are fully funded to assist the maximum number of victims, and voted for seven of the first seven VAWA reauthorization bills offered through 2012.

Two versions of VAWA reauthorization are under consideration by the House today. As I noted, the version I will support extends the VAWA until 2022. The other—H.R. 1620—weakens some of the carefully crafted protections for women and girls.

By granting biological men—who self-identify as women—access to women’s shelters, H.R. 1620 removes the hard-fought gains to protect women and girls from abuse and to provide them with physical, emotional and psychological security.

Under H.R. 1620, women will no longer have a safe place of their own as they flee from male-inflicted physical and emotional abuse and intimidation.

Rather, these heroic women will now have to share their place of refuge—a shelter previously reserved for women seeking protection from male abusers—with biological men who self-identify as women.

These brave women and children deserve a place where they can feel protected and secure, the result of healing as they deal with post-traumatic stress. Forcing them to share a shelter and its facilities, including showers and sleeping areas, with biological men who self-identify as women will cause these women and children to experience discomfort, confusion, and fear of additional assault.

VAWA has always prioritized the challenges and unique needs of battered women and children but this version, if passed, no longer will.

These women’s shelters—there are about 1,500 nationwide—offer a safe space where a woman does not have to fear or worry about violence and intimidation and instead allows her to take steps toward rebuilding her life.

We must first and foremost protect victims of violence.

I oppose this provision of H.R. 1620 out of genuine concern for the women and children who are forced to flee to domestic abuse shelters and base my concern on evidence from California.

In late 2018, nine female victims residing in a women’s shelter in Fresno, California—Naoim’s House, operated by Poverello House—filed a lawsuit against the shelter for admitting a biological man because he had self-identified as a woman. These victims stated that they had been sexually harassed by this biological man. They said that he had made “sexual advances” on them and would “stare and leer” and make “sexually harassing comments about their bodies” while they were forced to undress in the same room with him.

After repeatedly confronting the staff of Naoim’s House, residents of the shelter—to address their extreme discomfort, these women were told that they would be expelled from the shelter if they refused to comply.

If we allow biological men who self-identify as women to receive access to women’s shelters, abused women and children will lose the ‘safe space’ they so desperately need.

These victims deserve better. They deserve our protection and support. We must work to ensure the safety of women, girls, and children.

Other shelters designed to help victims of diverse sexual orientations and identities who are victims of domestic abuse ought to be considered by separate legislation. We can, and we must create bipartisan legislation which seeks to protect all women and girls, as this law originally intended.

We can, and must, do better.

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

The Violence Against Women Act is a decades-old law that helps protect some of my most vulnerable constituents from abuse. Unfortunately, the law has been expired since 2018.

At a time when the pandemic has forced many women in unsafe domestic situations to stay home, we owe them action. And I came to Congress to get results.

Today, I’ll be proud to vote to advance strong and bipartisan legislation to reauthorize and update the Violence Against Women Act.

The bill is going to extend the protections the law has in place while improving violence prevention and victim services. It will ensure communities of color are well served by the law.

And what’s more, the bill is forward-looking. It designs studies to assess the challenges survivors face with things like achieving economic security and paying off their student loans. Today, I’m offering an amendment to make sure these studies consider how these forms of disparity can have disparate impacts by race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the bill before us today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. H alla nan). All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117–12 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 239, 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 for the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of House Report 117–12, 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 the Judiciary 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 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER OF NEW YORK

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 239, I offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.
Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, and 41, printed in part B of House Report 117–12, offered by Mr. NADLER of New York:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. RUBGUES OF TEXAS
Page 226, insert after line 22 the following: SEC. 1406A. STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE COORDINATION OF SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC NURSE EXAM TRAINING AND PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services shall issue and disseminate guidance and best practices to improve sexual assault forensic nurse exam training and program sustainability. Such guidance shall include technical assistance and best practices with respect to—

(1) aspects of performing the medical forensic exam, including anogenital photography, other photographic documentation, forensic documentation record management, and quality assurance peer review;
(2) training and certification;
(3) leadership development;
(4) examiner program sustainability and examiner retention;
(5) education of community stakeholders, including law enforcement officials, victim advocates, and prosecutors; and
(6) use of telehealth for both training examiners and conducting the exams, including the Project ECHO model and other models.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH OF MISSOURI
Page 78, line 16, strike “;” and “and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 78, after line 16, insert the following (and redesignate the following subparagraphs accordingly):

(P) the program under Chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (18 U.S.C. 13551 et seq.)

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH OF MISSOURI
Page 224, line 5, insert after “submit to Congress” the following: “and make publicly available on the Department of Justice website”.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CASE OF HAWAII
Page 168, after insert after line 5, insert the following:

(16) Native Hawaiians experience a disproportionately high rate of human trafficking with 64 percent of human trafficking victims in the State of Hawaii identifying as at least part Native Hawaiian.

Page 219, insert the following before line 4, and conform the table of contents accordingly:

SEC. 1204. REVIEW ON NATIVE AMERICAN INTERACTIONS WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) REVIEW OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AFFECTING NATIVE HAWAINIANS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall conduct a comprehensive review of law enforcement and other crime prevention programs targeting criminal offenses that affect Native Hawaiians, including child sexual exploitation, child abuse, intimate partner violence, human trafficking, missing or murdered individuals, and substance abuse. The review shall include for each such program the amount of Federal funding for the program that is received by Native Hawaiian-serving organizations as a percentage of the total amount disbursed by the program. The review shall also include recommendations relating to—

(1) social, educational, economic, and any other factor that may contribute to a Native Hawaiian becoming a missing or murdered Native Hawaiian; and
(2) legislation to reduce the likelihood that a Native Hawaiian may become a missing or murdered Native Hawaiian.

(b) REVIEW OF NATIVE HAWAIIAN VICTIMS OF VARIOUS CRIMINAL OFFENSES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall conduct a comprehensive review of programs that provide services to victims of criminal offenses affecting Native Hawaiians, including child sexual exploitation, child abuse, intimate partner violence, human trafficking, and substance abuse. The review shall include for each such program the amount of Federal funding that is received by Native Hawaiian-serving organizations as a percentage of—

(1) the total amount disbursed by the program; and
(2) the total amount of Federal funds disbursed by the program.

(c) REPORT ON NATIVE HAWAIIANS IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.—

(1) CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall conduct a comprehensive review of programs that affect the interaction of Native Hawaiians with the criminal justice system, including the Bureau of Justice Statistics, shall report on the interaction of Native Hawaiians with the criminal justice system, including the percentage of persons who are Native Hawaiians out of the total of—

(A) all persons arrested;
(B) all persons detained in Federal, State, and local jails;
(C) all persons subject to pretrial supervision;
(D) all persons subject to post-conviction supervision;
(E) all persons incarcerated in Federal and State prisons; and
(F) all persons subject to post-release supervision.

(2) PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.—The report shall also include the programs and services available to and used by Native Hawaiians in various jurisdictions, including diversion programs, in-prison education programs, and reentry services. The report shall also include programs and services available to Native Hawaiians who interact with the criminal justice system. The report shall data on the number of Native Hawaiians who are incarcerated and placed in Federal and private facilities more than 200 miles from their place of residence.

(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report shall also include recommendations relating to—

(A) social, educational, economic, and any other factor that may contribute to a Native Hawaiian becoming involved in the criminal justice system; and
(B) legislation to reduce the likelihood that a Native Hawaiian may become involved in the criminal justice system.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA
At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2103. GRANTS TO STATE AND TRIBAL COURTS TO IMPLEMENT PROTECTION ORDER PILOT PROGRAMS.


(1) by redesignating sections 2103, 2104, and 2105 as sections 2104, 2105, and 2106, respectively; and
(2) by inserting after section 2102 the following:

SEC. 2104. GRANTS TO STATE AND TRIBAL COURTS TO IMPLEMENT PROTECTION ORDER PILOT PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this section, the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State or tribal court that is part of a multidisciplinary partnership that includes, to the extent practicable—

(1) State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency;
(2) a State, tribal, or local prosecutor advocate group;
(3) a victim service provider or State or tribal domestic violence coalition;
(4) a nonprofit program or government agency with demonstrated experience in providing legal assistance or legal advice to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault; and
(5) the bar association of the applicable State or Indian Tribe;

(6) the State or tribal association of court clerks;
(7) the State, tribal, or local association of criminal defense attorneys;
(8) not fewer than 2 individuals with expertise in the design and management of court case management systems and systems of integration;
(9) not fewer than 2 State or tribal court judges with expertise in—

(A) the field of domestic violence; and
(B) issuing protective orders; and
(10) a judge assigned to the criminal dock- et of the State or tribal court.

(b) ELIGIBLE AGENCIES.—In general.—In addition to grants authorized under section 2101, the Attorney...
(D) any other information the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(2) NO OTHER APPLICATION REQUIRED.—An eligible entity shall not be required to submit an application to carry out a grant under this section.

(f) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding section 40062(b)(11) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 12291(b)(11)), as enacted under section 2106 of this part, not less than 5 percent and not more than 8 percent of the total amounts appropriated to carry out this section shall be available to the Attorney General for technical assistance relating to the purposes of this section.

(g) REPORT TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after receiving a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the Attorney General a report that details the plan of the entity for implementation of the program under subsection (c).

(2) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after implementing the program under subsection (c), and not later than 2 years thereafter, an eligible entity shall submit to the Attorney General a report that describes the program implemented under subsection (c), including with respect to—

(i) viability;

(ii) cost;

(iii) service statistics;

(iv) challenges;

(v) analysis of the technology used to fulfill the goals of the program;

(vi) analysis of any legal or due process issues resulting from the electronic service method described in subsection (c)(1)(A); and

(vii) best practices for implementing such a program in other similarly situated locations.

(B) CONTENTS OF FINAL REPORT.—An eligible entity shall include in the second report submitted under subparagraph (A) recommendations for—

(i) future nationwide implementation of the program implemented by the eligible entity; and

(ii) usage of electronic service, similar to the service used by the eligible entity, for other commonly used court orders, including—

(A) a description of the process that the eligible entity uses for service of protection orders at the time of submission of the application;

(B) to the extent practicable, statistics relating to protection orders during the 3 calendar years preceding the date of submission of the application, including rates of—

(i) successful service; and

(ii) enforcement;

(C) an initial list of the entities serving as the partners required under subsection (a); and

(D) other information the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(2) NUMBER.—The Attorney General may award not more than 10 grants under paragraph (1).

(c) MANDATORY ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds, in consultation with the partners required under subsection (a), to—

(A) develop and implement a program for proposal and legal services for protection orders through electronic communication methods to—

(i) modernize the service process and make the process more effective and efficient;

(ii) provide for improved safety of victims; and

(iii) make protection orders enforceable as quickly as possible;

(B) develop best practices relating to the service of protection orders through electronic communication methods;

(C) ensure that the program developed under subparagraph (A) complies with due process and any other procedures required by law or by a court; and

(D) implement any technology necessary to carry out the program developed under subparagraph (A), such as technology to verify and track the receipt of a protection order by the intended party.

(2) TIMELINE.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall—

(A) implement the program required under paragraph (1)(A) not later than 2 years after receiving the grant; and

(B) carry out the program for no fewer than 3 years.

(d) DIVERSITY OF RECIPIENTS.—The Attorney General shall award grants under this section to eligible entities in a variety of areas and situations, including—

(1) a State court that serves a population of not fewer than 1,000,000 individuals;

(2) a State court that—

(A) serves a State that is among the 7 States with the lowest population density in the United States; and

(B) has a relatively low rate of successful service with respect to protection orders, as determined by the Attorney General;

(3) a State court that—

(A) serves a State that is among the 7 States with the highest population density in the United States; and

(B) has a relatively low rate of successful service with respect to protection orders, as determined by the Attorney General;

(4) a court that uses an integrated, statewide case management system;

(5) a court that uses a standalone case management system;

(6) a tribal court; and

(7) courts that serve a culturally specific and underserved population.

(e) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General that includes—

(A) a description of the process that the eligible entity uses for service of protection orders at the time of submission of the application;

(B) to the extent practicable, statistics relating to protection orders during the 3 calendar years preceding the date of submission of the application, including rates of—

(i) successful service; and

(ii) enforcement;

(C) an initial list of the entities serving as the partners required under subsection (a); and

(D) other information the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(2) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after implementing the program under subsection (c), and not later than 2 years thereafter, an eligible entity shall submit to the Attorney General a report that describes the program implemented under subsection (c), including with respect to—

(i) viability;

(ii) cost;

(iii) service statistics;

(iv) challenges;

(v) analysis of the technology used to fulfill the goals of the program;

(vi) analysis of any legal or due process issues resulting from the electronic service method described in subsection (c)(1)(A); and

(vii) best practices for implementing such a program in other similarly situated locations.

(f) CONTENTS OF FINAL REPORT.—An eligible entity shall include in the second report submitted under subparagraph (A) recommendations for—

(i) future nationwide implementation of the program implemented by the eligible entity; and

(ii) usage of electronic service, similar to the service used by the eligible entity, for other commonly used court orders, including with respect to viability and cost.

(h) NO REGULATIONS OR GUIDELINES REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding section 2105, the Attorney General shall not be required to publish regulations or guidelines implementing this section.

(i) AUTHORITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise made available to carry out this part, not less than 5 percent and not more than 8 percent of the total amounts appropriated to carry out this part, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for fiscal years 2019 through 2024.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. LUCILE OF MICHIGAN

Page 29, after line 18, by inserting the following:

“(G) certify that the laws, policies, and practices of the State in which the eligible entity resides provide for the protection of a minor under the age of 18 with respect to prostitution; and”; and

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

Page 192, insert after line 24 the following: (f) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women shall—

(1) in consultation with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, report to Congress on actions taken to prevent suicide amongst survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking; and

(2) in consultation with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, establish best practices to prevent suicide amongst survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW YORK

Page 33, line 14, by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon.

Page 33, line 16, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”.

Page 33, after line 16, by adding the following:

(3) by adding at the end the following:

(h) CULTURAL RELEVANCE.—Any services provided pursuant to a grant funded under
this section shall be provided in a culturally relevant manner.”.

Page 158, after line 13, add the following:

(c) CULTURAL RELEVANCE.—Any outreach or education campaign conducted pursuant to this section shall be conducted in a culturally relevant manner.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 19, strike line 11 and all that follows through line 15, and insert the following:

In paragraph (8)—

(i) by inserting “protection policies” in place of “protection policies,”

(ii) by inserting “protection policies, such as implementing a vertical prosecution system,” and

(iii) by inserting “and” at the end.

Page 198, after line 21 insert the following:

The term “commercial pornographic content” means any material that is subject to the record keeping requirements under section 2337 of title 18, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. NEWMAN OF ILLINOIS

Page 231, insert after line 17 the following:

Section 1411. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON WORKING TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSISTANCE FOR MICROBUSINES.

Page 231, insert after line 17 the following:

Section 1410(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12501(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting after “State” and “local governments” the following: “, employers with fewer than 20 employees”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, which materials shall include a website with resources for employers with fewer than 20 employees, including live training materials.”

Page 151, line 5, insert “credit history.” after “health care access.”

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR OF MINNESOTA

Page 151, line 24, strike “and”.

Page 152, line 4, strike the period at the end and insert “and”.

Page 152, after line 4, insert the following:

The term “small business” means a business that has the ability to pursue legal action, including legal costs and filing fees, and complexities of the jurisdiction of law enforcement agencies.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MICHIGAN

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE XV—PROTECTIONS FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRANTS

SECTION 1701. PILOT PROGRAM TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publish an interim final rule establishing a six year pilot program allowing nonimmigrants authorized for employment under section 106 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1165a), and their children, to apply for lawful temporary status and travel authorization independent of the current nonimmigrants to which their current status or visa is or was issued. This interim final rule shall be published and take effect not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. FLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 231, insert after line 17 the following:

SEC. 1411. CIVIL ACTION RELATING TO DISCLOSURE OF INTIMATE IMAGES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) CONSENT.—The term “consent” means, with respect to an individual, an affirmative, conscious, and voluntary authorization made by the individual free from force, fraud, misrepresentation, or coercion of the depicted individual.

(2) COMMERCIAL PORNOGRAPHIC CONTENT.—The term “commercial pornographic content” means any material that is subject to the record keeping requirements under section 2257 of title 18, United States Code.

(3) DEPICTED INDIVIDUAL.—The term “depicted individual” means an individual whose body is disclosed in whole or in part in an intimate image.

(b) DISCLOSURE.—The term “disclosure” means to transfer, publish, distribute, or make accessible an intimate image.

(c) IDENTIFIABLE.—The term “identifiable” means recognizable by an individual other than the depicted individual from—

(1) the intimate image itself; or

(2) any information identifying the individual other than the depicted individual from—

(II) any other information that identifies the individual.

SEC. 1412. PENALTIES.

(a) PENALTY.—Whoever—

(1) knowingly transfers, publishes, distributes, or makes accessible for a commercial purpose any material described in section 1411(b) that contains an intimate image of a depicted individual; or

(2) knowingly distributes, transfers, or publishes any intimate image of a depicted individual without the consent of the depicted individual; or

(3) knowingly transfers, publishes, distributes, or makes accessible for a commercial purpose any material described in section 1411(b) that contains an intimate image of an identifiable individual;

shall be fined not to exceed $10,000 or imprisoned not to exceed 3 years, or both.

(b) JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over all offenses described in this section.

(c) ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE.—In any criminal proceeding, a district court may, in its discretion, receive as evidence any relevant demonstrative evidence regarding the use, transfer, or dissemination of intimate images and the circumstances of such use, transfer, or dissemination.

(d) JUDICIAL PROTECTION.—Any court of the United States is hereby provided with the power to enjoin any individual, or any entity, from any act of commercial exploitation or disclosure of any intimate image or any material described in section 1411(b) that contains an intimate image of a depicted individual, and to enjoin the reproduction, distribution, or use of any such intimate image or any such material described in such section.

(e) RULES OF EVIDENCE.—Nothing in this section shall affect the admissibility of evidence under any rule of evidence of the United States.
(B) information or text displayed in connection with the intimate image.

(6) INTIMATE IMAGE.—The term ‘‘intimate image’’ means—
(A) a photograph, film, video recording, or digital recording that shows—
(i) the uncovered genitals, pubic area, anus, or female nipple of an individual;
(ii) the transfer of bodily sexual fluids on to any part of the body of an individual;
(iii) an individual engaging in sexually explicit conduct; or
(iv) an individual being subjected to sexually explicit conduct; and

(B) any image described in subparagraph (A) captured or recorded while the depicted individual was in a public place if—
(i) the depicted individual did not voluntarily display the content depicted in the image; or
(ii) the depicted individual did not consent to the sexual conduct depicted in the image.

(7) SEXUALLY EXPLICIT CONDUCT.—The term ‘‘sexually explicit conduct’’ has the meaning given the term in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 2256(2) of title 18, United States Code.

(B) CIVIL ACTION.—

(1) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this section, an individual provided consent to the further disclosure of the intimate image, or (ii) the depicted individual was in a public place if—
(i) the content was produced by force, fraud, misrepresentation, or coercion under clause (i) of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and
(ii) the depicted individual did not consent to the further disclosure of the intimate image.

(ii) the claim of force, fraud, misrepresentation, or coercion under clause (i) of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) was made by a person who acted knowingly or with reckless disregard for the consent of the depicted individual.

(iii) the depicted individual was in a public place if—
(i) the content was produced by force, fraud, misrepresentation, or coercion under clause (i) of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and
(ii) the depicted individual did not consent to the further disclosure of the intimate image.

(iii) an individual engaging in sexually explicit conduct, or
(iv) disclosure of the intimate image.

(ii) the court may, in addition to any other relief available at law, order equitable relief, damages in the amount of $150,000, and
(iii) as part of medical education, diagnosis, or treatment; or
(iv) in the reporting or investigation of—
(I) unlawful sexual activity;
(II) unsolicited or unwelcome conduct;
(C) a matter of public concern or public interest; or
(D) disclosure reasonably intended to assist the depicted individual.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY OF MASSACHUSETTS
Page 51. insert after line 18 the following:

SEC. 206. LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENERIC SPECIFIC SERVICES PROGRAM.

(a) Establishment.—The Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Violence Against Women Office, shall make grants to eligible entities to enhance LGBTQ+ specific services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

(b) Purpose of Program and Grants.—

(1) General Program Purpose.—The purpose of a grant provided under this section is to promote the following:

(A) The maintenance and replication of existing successful LGBTQ+ specific programs for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking; (B) The development of innovative LGBTQ+ specific strategies and projects to enhance access to services and resources for LGBTQ+ victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and
(C) The enhancement of innovative LGBTQ+ specific programs for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(2) Purposes for Which Grants May Be Used.—The Director shall make grants to community-based programs for the purpose of enhancing LGBTQ+ specific services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Grants under the program shall support community-based efforts to address distinctive LGBTQ+ specific responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including—

(A) providing or enhancing services for LGBTQ+ victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including services that address the safety, emotional, well-being, economic, housing, legal and workplace needs of LGBTQ+ victims;
(B) supporting programs that specifically address the needs of LGBTQ+ communities, including culturally specific communities, to provide specific resources and support for LGBTQ+ underserved victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and
(C) working in cooperation with the community to develop education and prevention strategies addressing LGBTQ+ specific issues and resources regarding victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(D) conducting outreach activities to ensure that LGBTQ+ people who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, or sexual assault receive appropriate assistance;

(E) providing training for victim service organizations, governmental agencies, courts, law enforcement and other first responders; and nongovernmental organizations serving the LGBT community about risk reduction, intervention, prevention and the nature of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault for LGBTQ+ individuals;

(F) developing and implementing LGBTQ+ specific programming that addresses alternative justice responses that are focused on victim autonomy, agency and safety in order to provide resolution and restitution for the victim, and

(G) providing LGBTQ+ specific programs for LGBTQ+ parents of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; (H) examining the dynamics of anti-LGBTQ+ bias and its impact on victimization and healing.

(b) Eligible Entities.—Eligible entities for grants under this section include—

(1) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(2) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and that provide technical assistance from a program with LGBTQ+ specific expertise.

(d) Reporting.—The Director shall issue a biennial report on the implementation of this section.

(E) Providing training for victim service organizations, governmental agencies, courts, law enforcement and other first responders; and nongovernmental organizations serving the LGBT community about risk reduction, intervention, prevention and the nature of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault for LGBTQ+ individuals;

(F) developing and implementing LGBTQ+ specific programming that addresses alternative justice responses that are focused on victim autonomy, agency and safety in order to provide resolution and restitution for the victim, and

(G) providing LGBTQ+ specific programs for LGBTQ+ parents of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; (H) examining the dynamics of anti-LGBTQ+ bias and its impact on victimization and healing.

(b) Eligible Entities.—Eligible entities for grants under this section include—

(1) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(2) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and that provide technical assistance from a program with LGBTQ+ specific expertise.

(d) Reporting.—The Director shall issue a biennial report on the implementation of this section.

(E) Providing training for victim service organizations, governmental agencies, courts, law enforcement and other first responders; and nongovernmental organizations serving the LGBT community about risk reduction, intervention, prevention and the nature of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault for LGBTQ+ individuals;

(F) developing and implementing LGBTQ+ specific programming that addresses alternative justice responses that are focused on victim autonomy, agency and safety in order to provide resolution and restitution for the victim, and

(G) providing LGBTQ+ specific programs for LGBTQ+ parents of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; (H) examining the dynamics of anti-LGBTQ+ bias and its impact on victimization and healing.

(b) Eligible Entities.—Eligible entities for grants under this section include—

(1) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(2) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and that provide technical assistance from a program with LGBTQ+ specific expertise.

(d) Reporting.—The Director shall issue a biennial report on the implementation of this section.

(E) Providing training for victim service organizations, governmental agencies, courts, law enforcement and other first responders; and nongovernmental organizations serving the LGBT community about risk reduction, intervention, prevention and the nature of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault for LGBTQ+ individuals;

(F) developing and implementing LGBTQ+ specific programming that addresses alternative justice responses that are focused on victim autonomy, agency and safety in order to provide resolution and restitution for the victim, and

(G) providing LGBTQ+ specific programs for LGBTQ+ parents of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; (H) examining the dynamics of anti-LGBTQ+ bias and its impact on victimization and healing.

(b) Eligible Entities.—Eligible entities for grants under this section include—

(1) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(2) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and that provide technical assistance from a program with LGBTQ+ specific expertise.

(d) Reporting.—The Director shall issue a biennial report on the implementation of this section.

(E) Providing training for victim service organizations, governmental agencies, courts, law enforcement and other first responders; and nongovernmental organizations serving the LGBT community about risk reduction, intervention, prevention and the nature of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault for LGBTQ+ individuals;

(F) developing and implementing LGBTQ+ specific programming that addresses alternative justice responses that are focused on victim autonomy, agency and safety in order to provide resolution and restitution for the victim, and

(G) providing LGBTQ+ specific programs for LGBTQ+ parents of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; (H) examining the dynamics of anti-LGBTQ+ bias and its impact on victimization and healing.

(b) Eligible Entities.—Eligible entities for grants under this section include—

(1) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(2) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and that provide technical assistance from a program with LGBTQ+ specific expertise.

(d) Reporting.—The Director shall issue a biennial report on the implementation of this section.

(E) Providing training for victim service organizations, governmental agencies, courts, law enforcement and other first responders; and nongovernmental organizations serving the LGBT community about risk reduction, intervention, prevention and the nature of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault for LGBTQ+ individuals;

(F) developing and implementing LGBTQ+ specific programming that addresses alternative justice responses that are focused on victim autonomy, agency and safety in order to provide resolution and restitution for the victim, and

(G) providing LGBTQ+ specific programs for LGBTQ+ parents of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; (H) examining the dynamics of anti-LGBTQ+ bias and its impact on victimization and healing.
section 88,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026. Funds appropriated under this paragraph shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MS. ROSS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 121, insert after line 21 the following: **(26) To develop of statewide databases with information on where sexual assault nurses are located.**

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. ROSS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 81, insert after line 25 the following: **(2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:**

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered housing provider shall prioritize the safety of victims when making housing and housing-related decisions, including admissions, evictions, termination of assistance, evictions, transfers, referrals, family break-ups, and income determinations.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 30, insert after line 13 the following (and redesignate succeeding paragraphs accordingly):

**(3) subsection (c)—**

**(A)** in paragraph (2), by striking "and" at the end;

**(B)** in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and adding "and";

**(C)** by adding at the end the following: 

"(4) to implement, expand, and establish efforts and projects to provide legal representation for post-conviction relief proceedings, including any proceedings relating to vacatur, expungement, record-sealing, or other post-conviction relief measures.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 8, line 4, strike "or" at the end.

Page 8, after line 4, insert the following (and redesignate succeeding paragraphs accordingly):

"**(4) without an objectively reasonable belief that such distribution touches upon a matter of public concern.

**(c) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (b) is not an individual—

**(1)** does not prohibit any lawful law enforcement, correctional, or intelligence activity;

**(B)** shall not apply in the case of an individual acting in good faith to report unlawful activity or in pursuance of a legal or professional or other lawful obligation; and

**(C)** shall not apply in the case of a document production or filing associated with a legal proceeding.

**(2) SERVICE PROVIDERS.—This section shall apply to any provider of a communications service with regard to content provided by another information content provider unless the provider of the communications service intentionally solicits, or knowingly and predominantly distributes, content that the communications service actually knows is in violation of this section.

**(e) QUESTIONS.—Any person who intentionally threatens to commit an offense under subsection (b) shall be punished as provided in subsection (c).

**(f) VENUE AND EXTRATERRITORIALITY.—A prosecution under this section may be brought in a district where the defendant or the defendant's communications service is located, in any district where the communications service is operated, in any district where the communications service is located, or in any district where the communications service's operations are located.

**(2) SERVICE PROVIDERS.—This section applies to any provider of a communications service with regard to content provided by another information content provider unless the provider of the communications service intentionally solicits, or knowingly and predominantly distributes, content that the communications service actually knows is in violation of this section.

**(c) CRIMINAL SANCTIONS.—Any person who intentionally threatens to commit an offense under subsection (b) shall be punished as provided in subsection (c).

**(A)** does not prohibit any lawful law enforcement, correctional, or intelligence activity;

**(b) OFFENSE.—Except as provided in subsection (d), it shall be unlawful to knowingly use any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce to distribute an intimate visual depiction of an individual—

**(1)** with knowledge of or reckless disregard for—

**(A)** the lack of consent of the individual to the distribution; and

**(B)** the fact that the individual had a reasonable expectation that the depiction would remain private; and

**(2)** without an objectively reasonable belief that such distribution touches upon a matter of public concern.

**(c) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (b) shall be punished as follows:

**(1)** perfects, in a timely manner, any such investigation and the duration and final resolution of such an investigation.

**(2)** whether the incident reported the incident conducted an investigation and the duration and final resolution of such an investigation.

**(3)** whether the entity to whom the victim reported the incident conducted an investigation and the duration and final resolution of such an investigation.

**(v) Questions regarding contextual factors, such as whether force, incapacitation, or coercion was involved.

**(6) Questions designed to determine whether an accused individual was a student at the institution.
(vi) Questions to determine whether the victim
reported the incident to a law enforcement
agency, or to the institution or State, local, or
campus law enforcement.
(vii) Questions to determine whether the vic-
tim consented to the incident.
(viii) Questions to determine whether the vic-
tim reported the incident to a law enforce-
ment agency, or to the institution or State, local, or
campus law enforcement.
(ix) Questions to determine whether the vic-
tim engaged in any form of resistance to the vio-
tation, including any non-resistance, such as
exiting a room, reporting the incident to a law
enforcement agency, or to the institution or State,
local, or campus law enforcement.
(x) Questions to determine whether the vic-
tim engaged in any form of resistance to the vio-
tation, including any non-resistance, such as
exiting a room, reporting the incident to a law
enforcement agency, or to the institution or State,
local, or campus law enforcement.
(xi) Questions to determine whether the vic-
tim engaged in any form of resistance to the vio-
tation, including any non-resistance, such as
exiting a room, reporting the incident to a law
enforcement agency, or to the institution or State,
local, or campus law enforcement.
(xii) Questions to determine whether the vic-
tim engaged in any form of resistance to the vio-
tation, including any non-resistance, such as
exiting a room, reporting the incident to a law
enforcement agency, or to the institution or State,
local, or campus law enforcement.
(xiii) Questions to determine whether the vic-
tim engaged in any form of resistance to the vio-
tation, including any non-resistance, such as
exiting a room, reporting the incident to a law
enforcement agency, or to the institution or State,
local, or campus law enforcement.
(xiv) Questions to determine whether the vic-
tim engaged in any form of resistance to the vio-
tation, including any non-resistance, such as
exiting a room, reporting the incident to a law
enforcement agency, or to the institution or State,
local, or campus law enforcement.
(xv) Questions to determine whether the vic-
tim engaged in any form of resistance to the vio-
tation, including any non-resistance, such as
exiting a room, reporting the incident to a law
enforcement agency, or to the institution or State,
local, or campus law enforcement.
(xvi) Questions to determine whether the vic-
tim engaged in any form of resistance to the vio-
tation, including any non-resistance, such as
exiting a room, reporting the incident to a law
enforcement agency, or to the institution or State,
local, or campus law enforcement.

(4) SEC. 1411. TASK FORCE ON SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN EDUCATION.
(a) Task Force on Sexual Violence in Education.—Not later than September 1,
2022, the Secretary of Education, the Sec-
cretary of Health and Human Services, and the
Attorney General shall establish a joint
interagency task force to be known as the
"Task Force on Sexual Violence in Edu-
cation." The task force shall—
(1) provide pertinent information to the
Secretary of Education, Attorney General,
Congress, and the public with respect to
sexual violence prevention, investiga-
tions, and responses, including the cre-
ation of consistent, public complaint proc-
tesses for violations of title IX of the Edu-
cation Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et
seq.); and section 485(f) of the Higher Edu-
cation Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C.
1092(f));
(2) provide recommendations to edu-
cational institutions on providing sexual
assault prevention and response teams;
(3) develop recommendations for edu-
cational institutions on providing survivor
resources, including healthcare, sexual as-
sault kits, sexual assault nurse examiners,
culturally responsive and inclusive standards of
care, trauma-informed services, and acc-
sucess to confidential advocacy and support
services;
(4) develop recommendations in conjunc-
tion with student groups at greater statisti-
cal representation to provide training, such
as fraternities and athletic departments for
best practices for responses and prevention
with respect to sexual violence and dating
violence, including taking into consideration
an institution's size and resources;
(5) develop recommendations for edu-
cational institutions on providing victim
appropriate, training for school staff, and var-
ious equitable discipline models;
(6) develop recommendations on culturally
responsive and inclusive approaches to sup-
sporting survivors, which include consider-
ation of race, ethnicity, national origin, immi-
gration status, sexual orientation, ability, disabili-
sity, socio-economic status, exposure to trauma, and other
compounding factors;
(7) procure input from a diverse group of survivors, trauma specialists, advo-
cates from national, State, and local anti-
sexual violence advocacy organizations, in-
stitutions of higher education, and other
public stakeholders; and
(b) Personnel Details.—
(1) AUTHORITY TO DETAIL.—Notwith-
standing any other provision of law, the head
of a Federal agency may, without the prior
consent of such individual, detail an officer or
employee of such component to the Task
Force, on Sexual Violence in Education, for
the purpose of assisting the Task Force with
the duties described in subsection (a), as jointly agreed to
by the head of such component and the Task
Force.
(2) BASIS FOR DETAIL.—A personnel
detail made under paragraph (1) may be made—
(A) for a period of not more than 3 years; and
(B) on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable
basis.
(c) ADDITIONAL PLAN.—Not later than 90
days after the date on which the Task
Force on Sexual Violence in Education is estab-
lished under subsection (a), the Task
Force shall submit to Congress recommendations
for recruiting, retaining, and training a
highly-qualified workforce employed by the
Department of Education to carry out inves-
tigation of complaints alleging a violation of
title IX of the Education Amendments of
1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) and the advis-
ability of additional remedies for such non-
compliance, in addition to the remedies
already available under Federal law; and
(d) an examination of best practices for
making educational institutions aware of
the most effective campus sexual violence
prevention, investigation, and response prac-
tices and identifying areas where more re-
search should be conducted; and
survivors the rights, at a minimum, under
sexual assault

situations; and

situations are handled in domestic violence
practices on how child neglect and custody

with the Secretary of Health and Human

SEC. 1611. STUDY ON CHILD CUSTODY IN DOMES-
tic violence cases.

The Attorney General, in coordination with
the Secretary of Health and Human Services,
shall—

(1) conduct a study on the direct and col-
ateral economic costs and risks of divorce
on the economic situation of survivors and of
victims of domestic violence, including the payment of al-
imony, legal fees, spousal support, or the di-
vision of property, disaggregated on the basis of
whether the individual has higher earnings than their partner; and
(2) include recommendations based on the
study conducted under paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF
CALIFORNIA

Page 231, insert after line 17 the following:

SEC. 6. INCLUSION OF DISPARATE IMPACT IN
STUDIES.

Any study conducted under this Act or an
amendment made by this Act shall include
an analysis, to the extent practicable, of
any disparate impacts of the matter studied,
including, by race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation,
and gender identity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant
to House Resolution 233, the
gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER)
and the gentlewoman from Minnesota
(Mrs. FISCHBACH) each will control 10
minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I
yield 30 seconds to the gentleman
from New York.

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I rise
today in support of my amendment,
based on the bipartisan Documents for
Continued Safety Act that I introduced
with Resident Commissioner Gonzalez-
Colon of Puerto Rico.

This amendment would allow
allowing a State seeking a grant
under this section shall submit an applica-
tion and the underlying bill.

No one—and I mean no one—should
be forced to stay in an abusive rela-
tionship because they fear deportation.
Under current law, if a domestic violence victim
travels to the United States with someone on a temporary visa and that
relationship turns abusive, they are
trapped.

My amendment to the Violence
Against Women Reauthorization Act
would create a pilot program for victims
of domestic abuse to apply for
independent immigration status. It is
that simple, and it is that important.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I
yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from
New Mexico (Ms. LIEBER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LIEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam
Speaker, in New Mexico, one in three
women have experienced domestic vio-
ence. We must act swiftly to reauthor-
ize the Violence Against Women Act.

SEC. 708. STUDY ON COSTS OF DIVORCE IN DOM-
estic violence cases.

The Attorney General, in coordination with
the Secretary of Health and Human
Services, shall—

(1) conduct a study on the direct and col-
ateral economic costs and risks of divorce
on the economic situation of survivors and of
victims of domestic violence, including the payment of al-
imony, legal fees, spousal support, or the di-
vision of property, disaggregated on the basis of
whether the individual has higher earnings than their partner; and
(2) include recommendations based on the
study conducted under paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF
CALIFORNIA

Page 158, insert after line 21 the following:

Madam Speaker, this amendment
requires the Department of Justice and
the Department of Health and Human
Services to issue guidance on the issues
identified by a Government Accountability
Office report and the use of telehealth.

In 2018, the Energy and Commerce
Oversight and Investigations Sub-
committee held an eye-opening hearing
on sexual assault forensic examina-
tions that highlighted gaps in training
and access to sexual assault foren-
sic examinations. The Government
Accountability Office testified at this
hearing on its 2016 report on sexual assa-
ult forensic exams, which identified
gaps in aspects of performing exams,
training, leaders to demand that, ex-
aminer program sustainability, and
education of community stakeholders.

This amendment is simple, and it is
common sense. The Department of
Justice and the Department of Health and Human
Services must issue guidance
on addressing the gaps identified by
GAO.

In Texas, there have been efforts to
utilize telehealth, including the
present ECHO model to provide
sexual assault forensic examinations and
training. The nurses involved in these
programs have established their suc-
cess. I am sure States have employed
other useful telehealth models that
should be further explored as well.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate that
this amendment is endorsed by the
International Association of Forensic
Nurses, signaling its importance, and I
urge support for this amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I
yield 1 minute to the distinguished
gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHIL-
LIPS).

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I
rise today in support of my amendment
and the underlying bill.

No one—and I mean no one—should
be forced to stay in an abusive rela-
tionship because they fear deportation.
Under current law, if a domestic violence victim
travels to the United States with someone on a temporary visa and that
relationship turns abusive, they are
trapped.

My amendment to the Violence
Against Women Reauthorization Act
would create a pilot program for victims
of domestic abuse to apply for
independent immigration status. It is
that simple, and it is that important.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I
yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from
New Mexico (Ms. LIEBER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LIEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam
Speaker, in New Mexico, one in three
women have experienced domestic vio-
ence. We must act swiftly to reauthor-
ize the Violence Against Women Act.

The protections in this bill are a mat-
ter of life and death.

Ms. LIEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam
Speaker, in New Mexico, one in three
women have experienced domestic vio-
ence. We must act swiftly to reauthor-
ize the Violence Against Women Act.

The protections in this bill are a mat-
ter of life and death.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I
yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from
Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I
thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I
do have one of the en bloc amendments at the desk.
It also recognizes that our diverse communities must receive culturally relevant legal aid and outreach programs. Let's work to end gender-based violence in all of our communities.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this has been a long journey, and I think it is important to take note of the many women who have helped us and to do this in the name of so many women who have lost their lives.

I take this moment on the floor to support the en bloc amendment but, as well, to encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle of how somber and serious a moment this is that we do not take lightly to the floor because so many of us in our own congressional districts have seen the scourge of domestic violence.

We have seen the rise in domestic violence in the pandemic manner under COVID–19. It is rabid and rampant in all our cities. Our law enforcement officers have told us it is the most dangerous call that they can possibly make.

I am particularly concerned about sex trafficking victims, and I am very glad the manager's amendment has language in there that indicates that sex trafficking victims experience sexual violence and assault, and that the Federal recognition of their recovery is important.

We look at all aspects of this important issue in our country. The en bloc amendment represents Members' concerns for improving the treatment of women and men, the LGBTQ community, Native Americans, and immigrant women who are culturally diverse.

Madam Speaker, to the 200-plus organizations of the coalition, I want to say thank you to you for advocating with us. Writing this bill in 2018 and never giving up has been the challenge that I have taken up.

I am very grateful to the many women who have joined me. Even though it was not passed when there was a Republican President, Republican Senate, and Republican House, and then it was blocked by the Republican Senate, we have now come with a fully robust and comprehensive bill that responds to the concerns of those who cannot help themselves.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Housing and other aspects of the provisions that are in this bill pointedly speak to needs that have been brought to our attention by victims. This bill deals with victims, Madam Speaker, so when you are fleeing your home because your name is not on the lease or the mortgage, we now have provided an expedited process for you to get housing with your children.

We introduced with cultural sensitivity training for men and boys. We have a cultural sensitivity office inside the office of domestic violence so that women of different cultural backgrounds can be responded to, along with focusing on culturally sensitive advocacy groups up to help those women.

Yes, we do prevent a convicted person who has perpetrated a stalking or sexual assault from getting a gun, but this bill is controlled by due process in the Constitution.

Let's pass this bill. Women are waiting. They can't wait any longer. Men are waiting. Many communities are waiting. We can't wait any longer, and we must pass this bill to be signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5 1⁄2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, this has been a long time coming. The gentleman from Minnesota has 8 1⁄2 minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the 39 amendments packed into one little grouping called en bloc.

The reason why I am opposed is that while some of these amendments are noble and worthwhile proposals on their own, they do not outweigh the underlying problems of the legislation or some of the truly bad amendments in this bloc.

These amendments include provisions that would further inject identity politics into the Violence Against Women Act, which we have heard over and over in this debate. There are studies about disparate impacts and measures that unnecessarily differentiate how we treat different groups of people.

This entire bloc of 39 amendments includes amendments that further encroach on the affairs of State and local governments by creating new grants and pilot programs and spending more of the American taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

One amendment in this bloc is designed to incentivize States to legalize prostitution engaged in by minors to help sex trafficking victims. How does this make any sense? It doesn't.

Of course, we all want to stop sex trafficking, but this proposal has not been thought through and could have disastrous unintended consequences. I am going to say disastrous consequences.

We need to return the Violence Against Women Act to its original intent that Congress passed in an overwhelmingly bipartisan manner almost 30 years ago.

H.R. 1620 will expand and alter the fundamental nature of the Violence Against Women Act by imposing the trans agenda of putting biological men in women's shelters and prisons. It does more to advance the Democrats' progressive agenda than it does to protect women and girls.

Also concerning is the fact that this legislation did not undergo committee consideration. One would ask: Why not?

There has been no committee hearing for any of these en bloc amendments. Why not?

There has been no committee mark-up for this in Congress. Why not?

Rather than rushing to pass this bill, we should have taken the time to truly examine the issues and determine what, if any, additional resources, reviews, or studies are necessary.

We all stand in opposition to any violence against women. Unfortunately, the government lockdowns during the COVID–19 pandemic resulted in an increased amount of domestic violence, increased depression, increased suicide, and increased suffering. We have an urgent need to address violence against women—and we should at all times—but not like this, by changing this so radically and including biological men.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose these amendments and the underlying bill, H.R. 1620.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for his tireless work and the work of so many women of this Caucus, including Speaker PELOSI, to bring this bill to fruition and to bring this bill to the floor.

We know, and we all believe, that violence against women and the support necessary to impede that from happening is necessary and should be reauthorized.

I rise today in strong support of the en bloc amendment. The Nadler amendment en bloc is the culmination of a yearslong effort to authorize explicit Federal legal action against the nonconsensual disclosure and public transmission of intimate visual imagery, following the lead of dozens of the States.

Nobody, under any circumstances, should have private intimate imagery shared on the internet without their consent. The pain that is caused by perpetrators who knowingly share sexually explicit or nude images of someone without their consent has ruined lives and, in many instances, the lives of their family as well. It is weaponized to humiliate, harass, intimidate, and even exploit people who are primarily women.

I am proud to support this amendment that will give prosecutors and victims important tools to bring perpetrators to justice and further deter
AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. STEFANIK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to offer the amendment No. 36 printed in part B of House Report 117–12.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all that follows after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the “Violence Against Women Extension Act of 2021.”

SECTION 2. STOP GRANTS

Section 1001(a)(18) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(18)), is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “; and for fiscal year 2022.”

SECTION 3. GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES AND ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION ORDERS

Section 1001(a)(19) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(19)), is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “; and for fiscal year 2022.”

SECTION 4. LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS

Section 1201(f)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12101(f)(1)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “; and for fiscal year 2022.”

SECTION 5. GRANTS TO SUPPORT FAMILIES IN THE JUDICIAL PROCESS

Section 1301(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12454(e)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “; and for fiscal year 2022.”

SECTION 6. SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT

Section 40152(c) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12091(c)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “; and for fiscal year 2022.”

SECTION 7. COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATES

Section 219(a) of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 15914(e)(a)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “; and for fiscal year 2022.”

SECTION 8. RURAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOL- ENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, STALKING, AND ABUSE ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

Section 4228(e)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12431(e)(1)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “; and for fiscal year 2022.”

SECTION 10. GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENT CRIMES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS

Section 304(e) of the Violence Against Women Act (34 U.S.C. 12421(e)(b)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “; and for fiscal year 2022.”
of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 2122(e)) is amended by inserting after ‘‘for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018’’ the following: ‘‘, and for fiscal year 2022’’.

SEC. 21. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 41501(f)(1) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12651(f)(1)) is amended by inserting after ‘‘for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018’’ the following: ‘‘, and for fiscal year 2022’’.

SEC. 22. RAPE SURVIVOR CHILD CUSTODY.

Section 409 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (34 U.S.C. 21308) is amended by inserting after ‘‘for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2019’’ the following: ‘‘, and for fiscal year 2022’’.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, more than one in three women in this country have experienced some form of physical violence by their partner; and each year, millions of women, sisters, daughters, and friends are victims of domestic violence and sexual abuse.

Tragically, new evidence shows that lockdowns, social isolation, and economic insecurity caused by the COVID–19 pandemic has led to a hidden surge in domestic violence and abuse. So now, more than ever, we must come together to combat this crisis.

In fact, Congress has a history of doing so on a bipartisan basis. The enactment of the Violence Against Women Act in 1994 and the reauthorizations that followed were noncontroversial and overwhelmingly bipartisan. Congress worked together to establish a coordinated community response to support the balance of the justice system with the necessary resources to address these heinous crimes.

Yet, in 2019, House Democrats allowed VAWA’s authorization to lapse when they shuttered the bipartisan history of VAWA and advanced a bill filled with controversial provisions, rejecting Republican offers to work in good faith and prioritize the well-being of women and children.

At the time, I led the Violence Against Women’s Extension Act of 2019 to extend VAWA and provide certainty to victims, survivors, families, and crisis centers, but House Democrats put scoring political points ahead of the interests of vulnerable women and refused our efforts to prevent VAWA’s programs from going unauthorized.

This year, here we are again. Democrats are rushing their controversial bill back to the floor, bypassing committee consideration, and ignoring opportunities to work with Republicans to address the problematic provisions. They now have an opportunity to contribute to the bill, including a record number of new Republican women, Representatives whose own lives and districts have been deeply affected by these issues.

So, once again, this House, rather than pursuing bipartisanship, is again considering a bill that promotes unproven methods of supporting victims, infringes upon Second Amendment rights, fails to provide adequate due process, and imposes new barriers to prosecuting domestic violence cases.

My amendment is simple. It provides a clean extension of the Violence Against Women Act programs for the upcoming fiscal year without the controversial provisions added by Speaker PELOSI. Most importantly, it will ensure funding for critical programs that fight domestic violence and sexual abuse for the American people. A clean extension provides us the opportunity to work together to pass a truly bipartisan, long-term reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The gentlewoman is right, her amendment is simple. It does nothing. It provides no increased funding. It does not provide for women who are desperate—and men and our indigenous community—at all.

Among other things, this amendment would merely extend for 1 year, which is disastrous, rather than reauthorize for 5 years, essentially gutting the bill’s most critical grant programs. Some of the programs left out of this so-called extension are as follows:

Outreach in services to underserved populations.

The rape prevention and education grant, $110 million, a 50 percent increase from the existing bill.

Transitional housing assistance grants for VAWA victims. Women fleeing, men fleeing, victims fleeing, children fleeing without having housing, we expedite that;

Authorizing funding for the Tribal Access Program and; Child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners.

By leaving these programs out, this amendment fails to recognize the range of needs that victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking face. It simply fails the most desperate and needy people.

This amendment also omits all of the improvements to VAWA that are contained in the underlying bill, H.R. 1620, which is a product of years of consultation with a range of stakeholders, and the failed efforts of Republicans year after year not to reauthorize. This is built on hard work, many of whom worked directly in the field with survivors and have a deep knowledge of VAWA’s programs.

Relying in part on their expertise, this legislation contains dozens of important improvements to the range of programs contained in VAWA to make it an even more effective tool in addressing domestic violence.

But this amendment dismisses the needs of the victims and survivors whose voices were our guide in developing H.R. 1620. It is shameful.

For example, the underlying legislation enhances and expands victims’ services. It improves the criminal justice response to gender-based violence, and it expands legal assistance. It makes additional investments in prevention. It improves access to housing for victims and survivors.

It ends impunity for non-Native perpetrators of sexual assault, which has gone on for years. Go to the reservation of Pablo, assault a Native American woman, and have no accountability.

It supports communities of color and LGBTQ individuals. It protects victims of dating violence and firearm homicide. It improves the healthcare system’s response to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

But the Stefanik amendment would eliminate all of these vital programs. In essence, it would leave women and victims helpless and without hope.

Do not be fooled. This amendment does not demonstrate support for VAWA. It demonstrates a lack of commitment to ensuring that the programs contained within VAWA can best serve and protect the survivors and victims who rely on them.

Since VAWA’s enactment in 1994, Congress has repeatedly enhanced the prior versions of the law, including in reauthorizations in 2000, 2005, and 2013. Since the last reauthorization, there has also been an uptick in demand for the essential services under VAWA due to the Me Too movement and women coming forward out of the shadows.

There has also been an uptick in victims’ and survivors’ and children’s needs for services due to the financial strain imposed by the COVID–19 pandemic. That is why H.R. 1620 both reauthorizes and improves the law. This amendment would effectively do neither.

Victims and survivors deserve better than this half measure, and they would look to the women of this Congress to be sensitive to their plight.

Domestic violence providers and survivors all have spoken loud and clear with hundreds of organizations supporting and endorsing H.R. 1620. They have asked for the underlying bill, not a bait-and-switch that is fatally flawed and makes no meaningful improvements to the bill or to the law.

Finally, this amendment will not help the legislation pass in the Senate. We have spoken with the leaders in the Senate on both sides of the aisle on this issue and they agree that we must
improve the Violence Against Women Act. It is greatly needed in order to stop the scourge of domestic violence, which is surging in our Nation, and not freeze it, as the Stefanik amendment would do.

Therefore, I urge opposition to this amendment, which would undermine H.R. 1620 and years of work, years of building on this with so many collaborators. I thank our chairman, the many women who helped me with writing this legislation, and those who offered substantial amendments to improve it, even those in the last Congress.

We don’t want to freeze that behavior that will be positive. This amendment would seriously damage the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Madam Speaker, among other things, this amendment would merely extend for one year, rather than reauthorize for five years, some of the programs under the Violence Against Women Act, essentially gutting the bill’s most critical grant programs. Some of the programs left out of this so-called extension are:

- Outreach and services to underserved populations;
- The rape prevention and education grant;
- Transitional housing assistance grants for VAWA victims;
- Authorizing funding for the Tribal Access Program; and
- Child abuse prevention programs for judicial personnel and practitioners.

By leaving these programs out, this amendment fails to recognize the range of needs that victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking face.

This amendment also omits all of the improvements to VAWA that are contained in the underlying bill. H.R. 1620 is the product of years of consultation with a range of stakeholders, many of whom work directly in the field with survivors and have a deep knowledge of VAWA’s programs.

Relaying in part on their expertise, this legislation contains dozens of important improvements to the range of programs contained in VAWA to make it an even more effective tool in addressing domestic violence. By this amendment dismisses the needs of the victims and survivors whose voices were our guide in developing H.R. 1620.

For example, the underlying legislation enhances and expands victims’ services; it improves the criminal justice response to gender-based violence and expands legal assistance; it makes additional investments in prevention; it improves access to housing for victims and survivors; and it ends impunity for non-Native perpetrators of sexual assault.

It protects vulnerable populations of color and LGBTQ individuals; it protects victims of dating violence from firearm homicide; and it improves the healthcare system’s response to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

But the Stefanik Amendment would eliminate all of these vital provisions. Do not be fooled—this amendment does not demonstrate support for VAWA, it demonstrates a lack of commitment to ensuring that the programs contained within VAWA can best serve and protect the survivors and victims who rely on them.

Since VAWA’s enactment in 1994, Congress has repeatedly enhanced the prior versions of the law, including in reauthorizations in 2000, 2005, and 2013. Since the last reauthorization, there has been an uptick in demand for the essential services under VAWA due to the “MeToo” movement and women coming forward out of the shadows. There has also been an uptick in victims’ and survivors’ needs due to the financial strain imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic.

That is why H.R. 1620 both reauthorizes and improves the law. This amendment would effectively do neither. Victims and survivors deserve better than what this half-measure provides.

Domestic violence providers and survivors all have spoken loud and clear with hundreds of organizations endorsing H.R. 1620. They have asked for the underlying bill, not a bait and switch that is fatally flawed and makes no meaningful improvements to the bill or to the law.

Finally, this amendment will not help the legislation move in the Senate. We have spoken with leaders in the Senate on this issue on both sides of the aisle, and they agree that we must improve the Violence Against Women Act, not freeze it as the Stefanik amendment would do.

Therefore, I urge opposition to this amendment, which would undermine H.R. 1620 and would seriously damage the Violence Against Women Act.

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, make no mistake, VAWA’s authorization lapse last year is due to House Democrats’ decision to ram through their partisan version of this bill rather than work on a bipartisan basis.

When my colleague across the aisle talks about conversations with the Senate, we know last year that there were no effective bipartisan conversations with the Senate, which is why they didn’t take up the Democrats’ partisan version.

My amendment is a clean extension of VAWA. It ensures that there is certainty and funding for these programs. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” for this amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the gentleman from Missouri (Ms. WAGNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I believe we have a sacred responsibility to protect and empower women, end abuse and assault, and hold perpetrators of violence against women accountable for their crimes.

However, we need to be sure that our efforts are effective. The Department of Justice Inspector general has consistently revealed fraudulent and wasteful uses of VAWA grant funds. Congress should demand accountability so that every dollar marked for helping victims and preventing violence against women actually goes to help the most vulnerable.

My commonsense amendment would prevent those who commit fraud and misuse from receiving VAWA funds. Madam Speaker, they are stealing from the victims that they are supposed to be helping by these efforts and should face the consequences.

Democrats and Republicans should agree that this amendment will advance prevention efforts and victim services. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment.

Madam Speaker, however, I want to take this opportunity to touch on something that is even more important. I am ashamed that Democrats would bring this legislation to the floor without my amendment that would allow sex trafficking victims to receive grant funding through the Creating Hope Through Outreach, Options, Services, and Education for Children and Youth Against Trafficking.

My amendment was removed, stripped in a partisan fashion from VAWA this Congress, stripping vital...
sex trafficking funding for victims and children.

Also not allowed, Madam Speaker, was my amendment that bans the horrors of sex-selection abortions that have killed millions of girls around the world and right here in the United States. It is an unhinkable tragedy that little girls are targeted for death even before they are born solely because of their sex, and I am grieved that Democrats would not allow a vote on that subject unborn girls.

These two amendments are at the very core of what it means to protect women and girls, and I am outraged that Democrats have chosen to move forward in a partisan manner without these critical provisions.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment.

While I believe it is well-intentioned, and we all want to prevent the misuse of Federal funds, I am concerned about the effect that it may have on small service providers that provide crucial services to victims and survivors.

It is also unnecessary since the underlying bill maintains existing accountability provisions, which have proven to work very well.

This amendment imposes a mandatory bar on receiving grant funds up to 5 years if the grant recipient is found to have fraudulently misused such grant funds. Smaller providers, many of whom are run on a voluntary basis, are more likely to make financial errors because they lack the accounting, financial, and compliance expertise that larger organizations have.

Many of these small providers are culturally specific, rural, and Tribal programs that play a crucial role in their communities. Banning such groups from receiving funding for 5 years in these circumstances could have an unnecessarily punitive effect and could be detrimental to the victims and survivors who rely on them.

For many small service providers who rely on Federal funds to support their operations, such as a severe penalty, such a severe penalty could make a difference between continuing to serve victims and survivors in need and shutting their doors forever.

Accountability is vital in all forms, and I appreciate the spirit behind this amendment. But, for these providers, I fear it could end up doing more harm than good. It is because of these concerns that this amendment is opposed by the National Network to End Domestic Violence, among other organizations, and I must reluctantly oppose the amendment as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, this amendment will improve the underlying bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment, and join me, along with the Department of Justice and the inspector general, to make sure that we are not preventing fraud and abuse in these grant programs and making sure that every dollar marked for helping victims and preventing violence against women actually goes to help the most vulnerable.

Nevertheless, Madam Speaker, the underlying bill fails to give trafficking victims and children the resources they need and was purposefully stripped from this partisan piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I oppose H.R. 1620, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman as we look forward to expanded resources and expanded response to those who have been sex-trafficked and human-trafficked, because that scourge continues.

This legislation responds to those little girls in this amendment, to protecting unborn girls, to supporting survivors, and to continuing to work with the gentlewoman as we look forward to expanded resources and expanded response to those who have been sex-trafficked and human-trafficked, because that scourge continues.

I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have also worked with, over the years—really starting from the time that I stood alongside of then-Senator Joe Biden as this bill was presented for reauthorization. It went all the way through my time on the Judiciary Committee and the writing of this bill in 2018, when, unfortunately, there was no effort by the Judiciary Committee to put this bill forward for a hearing, there was no effort by the Senate Republicans, and no effort by the Republican President in 2018 to do anything about the scourge of violence against women and men and many groups.

I have worked with the 200-plus organizations that are involved in the coalition that stand against sexual assault and rape and stalking and domestic violence. They are in many different categories and sizes, but they are vital in their service.

I am concerned that this amendment would undermine those smaller organizations, who are unique in their service that they provide. They are in places where large organizations may not be. They are working with indigenous populations, Native Americans, immigrant women, LGBTQ. They are saving lives.

People of color, Hispanic, African American, we have a very sizeable portion of them and in this legislation, we are reaching out to people who cannot respond and help themselves; housing provisions, in case you have to flee, expediting your ability to get housing.

Then I am as concerned about sex trafficking as my good friend is. I have worked on this legislation. As a former member of the Houston Area Women’s Center, I am also well aware of the crisis it relates to the need for this bill. But in the manager’s amendment, we do not have language that says that we should have a placeholder for sex trafficking victims who experience sexual violence and assault; that the Federal recognition of their recovery is important.

Throughout this bill, there are provisions that will help individuals who are sex-trafficked. We have that in the bill in relationship to the particular actions that are generated if you are sexually assaulted while you are sex-trafficked.

So we know that this bill is sensitive. There is more that can be done. We look forward to a freestanding bill that deals in specifics, as we have done in the past.

I held the first hearing in my congressional district on human trafficking. I have worked with advocates and continue to work with them, and so I take issue that this bill is not sensitive to sex-trafficked individuals, and I look forward to working with the gentlewoman as we look forward to expanded resources and expanded response to those who have been sex-trafficked and human-trafficked, because that scourge continues.

This legislation responds to those little girls. This amendment, to protecting unborn girls, to protecting survivors, and to continuing to work with the gentlewoman as we look forward to expanded resources and expanded response to those who have been sex-trafficked and human-trafficked, because that scourge continues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Mississippi (Mrs. WAGNER).

The question is on the amendment.

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

Mrs. WAGNER. 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. 1620 is postponed.

REMOVING THE DEADLINE FOR THE RATIFICATION OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the ratification resolution (H.J. Res. 17) removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.
The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 204, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS—222</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Halleran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Al (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pappas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delgado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delgado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delgado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1630) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments in bloc, printed in part B of House Report 117–12, on which further proceedings were postponed, and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will designate the amendments in bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments in bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments in bloc offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 197, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS—228</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Halleran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Al (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pappas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delgado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delgado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delgado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Messes. BAIRD, GROTHMAN, and BOST changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on passage of H.J. Res. 17—Removing the Deadline for the Ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 82.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RULE 8, 11TH CONGRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alford</th>
<th>Allen</th>
<th>Amodei</th>
<th>Arnold</th>
<th>Arrington</th>
<th>Artin</th>
<th>Austin</th>
<th>Avello</th>
<th>Baird</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adair</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Amodei</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Arrington</td>
<td>Artin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Avello</td>
<td>Baird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (NC)</td>
<td>Bishop (NC)</td>
<td>Bishop (NC)</td>
<td>Bishop (NC)</td>
<td>Bishop (NC)</td>
<td>Bishop (NC)</td>
<td>Bishop (NC)</td>
<td>Bishop (NC)</td>
<td>Bishop (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adair</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Amodei</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Arrington</td>
<td>Artin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Avello</td>
<td>Baird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adair</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Amodei</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Arrington</td>
<td>Artin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Avello</td>
<td>Baird</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments in bloc, printed in part B of House Report 117–12, on which further proceedings were postponed, and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will designate the amendments in bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments in bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments in bloc offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 197, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]
AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STRICKLAND). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on Amendment No. 49, printed in part B of House Report 117-12, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the vote and the nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 174, not voting 13, as follows:

[Vote Listing]

YEARS—242

[Vote Listing]
Ms. MATSUI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. McCOLLUM, Messrs. VEASEY, BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. SCALONI changed their vote from "yea" to "nay." Mrs. MCBATH, Messrs. POSEY, ROGERS of Alabama, and BABIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HERRELL, Madam Speaker, I missed this vote because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 84.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 84.

Mr. GARBARINO, Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 84.

Mr. BOST, Madam Speaker, I was unavailable to vote in the House on March 17, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 84: "yea."
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

Allied (David) (KS)    Axne (Stevens)    Barragan (Bayer)    Bera (Aguilar)    Bishop (GA)    Blumenauer (Beyer)    Buchanan (Gomez)    Garbarino (Joyce) (OH)    Grijalva (Garcia) (IL)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LAWRENCE). The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 172, not voting 174, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—244


The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

A motion to reconsider was laid on Roll No. 86.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 86.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, I am using a proxy to vote on my behalf (pursuant to House Resolution 8, in accordance with House Rule C.6). Regrettably, my proxy was unable to arrive at the House floor within the allotted time to cast my vote for H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 86 (H.R. 1620—the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021).

Stated against:

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 86, I would have voted "nay."
AWARDING THREE CONGRESSIONAL MEDALS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE AND THOSE WHO PROTECTED THE U.S. CAPITOL ON JANUARY 6, 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1651) to award three congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. G. Berkley Jackson) as above recorded.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 12, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—413


A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay.

Messes. HICE of Georgia, NUNES, CARL, and WELCH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea.

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed. The result of the vote was above recorded.
The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 38, not voting 7, as follows:

| Roll No. 89 | YEAS—384 |

| Messrs. BAIRD and DUNCAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.” |

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The Speaker declared the question on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE
March 17, 2021

[Members recorded pursuant to House Resolution 8, 117th Congress]

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE Corrections in EN- GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1620, VIO- LENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHER-IZATION ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the en- grossment of H.R. 1620, the Clerk be au- thorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-ref- erences, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTING A CERTAIN MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COM- MITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, by di- rection of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as fol- lows:

H. RES. 244
Resolved, That the following named Mem- ber be, and is hereby, elected to the fol- lowing committee of the House of Repre- sentatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker, I proudly stand with all my sisters this evening.

CONDEMNING WEST COAST VIOLENCE

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, we have witnessed unac- ceptable acts of violence across our country. We have watched lives and livelihoods being destroyed.

Even now, after one of the most chal- lenging years Americans have faced in recent history, the violence continues. In just the past few days, in both Port- land and Seattle, rioters smashed the doors and windows of local small busi- nesses, violently assaulted police offi- cers, and firebombed the local court- house.

In January, I called on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take a stand against political violence. But rather than condemning these appall- ing acts, politicians and the media con- tinue to turn a blind eye. They ignore, downplay, and even defend these des- picable and violent actions. It is inex- cusable.

When we see this violence, we must condemn it for what it is: domestic ter- ror.

Mr. Speaker, I stand firm against all acts of violence, and I continue to call on this body to do the same.
INVESTING IN PROGRAMS TO SUPPORT SURVIVORS
(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. I am proud to cosponsor this bill, and I want to thank my colleagues Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE and Chairman JERRY NADLER for, once again, their leadership and bold efforts to bring this bill to the floor.

This reauthorization bill builds upon the landmark 1994 legislation by expanding protections and services for survivors, while also working to prevent violence from occurring in the first place. It makes vital investments in preventing sexual assaults and stalking and increases victims’ access to safe housing and economic stability. It also increases funding of programs for culturally specific services.

An estimated one in three women experience domestic violence in this country. I personally know what strong and consistent support means to emerge as a survivor.

When I was in the California State Legislature, I authored the Violence Against Women Act for the State of California. And today, I am so proud, along with Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, that we passed the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act with bipartisan support. When I was in the California State Legislature, a Republican Governor signed my bill into law, so I thank the gentlewoman very much for her leadership.

CELEBRATING WOMEN’S HISTORY MONTH
(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate and commemorate this historic month, Women’s History Month, and to celebrate the passing in the House of the equal rights amendment, as well as VAWA, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, H.R. 1620.

How grateful I am that this bill, H.R. 1620, addresses the need of sex trafficking victims while creating a demonstration program on trauma-informed training for law enforcement. It increases access to grant programs for culturally specific organizations and ensures culturally specific organizations are included in the development of programs.

It is supported by the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, a coalition of over 200 groups.

VAWA expired on September 30, 2018. We, as a body, are called upon by survivors to do our job. I am delighted to celebrate ANN KUSTER, GWEN MOORE, JACKIE SPEER, BRENDA LAWRENCE, LOIS FRANKEL, DEBBIE DINGELL, and KAREN BASS, and the name of Sojourner Truth, the abolitionist suffragist, and Ivalita Jackson, my mother, a modern-day abolitionist and suffragist. They know that to get the job done, we must get the job done.

This bill is on to the other body, and now it is to be signed by the President. It is also for Americans, regardless of our sex, our race, or our sexual orientation. It is the right policy, and we had co-operative agreements with those countries to begin to halt the messaging that it is proper or appropriate to come here illegally. Of course, this feeds human trafficking and children being left alone.

It is unjust. We need to return to the previous policy in which we are cooperating with those countries.

PROVIDING EQUAL PROTECTION FOR ALL
(Mr. CASTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, during my visit to Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, I visited the Family Shelter Service, an organization that provides lifesaving counseling, victim protection, and a 24/7 hotline to women and children in northern Illinois. They provide nearly 11,000 nights of shelter for abused women and children every year.

To their staff, to their recipients, and to the one in three women in the United States who experience domestic violence and the one in five women who are raped, the Violence Against Women Act has been a lifeline since 1994. But it needs to be updated and renewed, and that is what we have done today.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 makes crucial updated to this law to address its gaps, expand protections, and meet increased needs. We have expanded protections to make the law more inclusive of our LGBT communities. We have closed loopholes to better protect victims from gun violence, improved victim services to help survivors heal and access justice, and increased funding for programs to help children who are exposed to domestic violence in the home.

We have made vital new investments in prevention and victim services, including an amendment that 1 introduced to train healthcare providers on college campuses so they can better meet the needs of the one in four under graduate women who are victims of sexual assault.

This is for our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, and our friends. But it is also for Americans, regardless of their gender, who aspire to live in a country that truly provides equal protection and equal opportunities for all.

We have done our work here today. It is now crucial that the Senate do theirs and send this bill to the President’s desk.
We honor these military women’s achievements today that women succeed, America succeeds, as our amazing Speaker of the House reminds us.

I am so glad to share this hour with Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include material on the subject of my Special Order in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. Speaker, as a co-chair of the Democratic Women’s Caucus, I am pleased to lead this Special Order in celebration of Women’s History Month. Throughout March, we recognize the women leaders, trailblazers, and pioneers who come before us.

We have charted a path forward that will lift up and empower young women and girls. The soul and moral compass of our Nation rests on the shoulders of women throughout this history.

I am proud to fight every day so that we can improve the quality of life for women and girls in Michigan and across this country.

As the co-chair of the Democratic Women’s Caucus and the co-chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have made it a mission to put women issues and Black women issues front and center in this Congress.

But before I go into the work that we have done and are doing in this Chamber, I want to recognize the inspirational women in my life who helped shape who I am.

First and foremost, I want to acknowledge my grandmother, who, without a high school education, taught me the value of education, taught me the value of being a woman, of being a wife, of being a mother. She is my rock and my foundation. She taught me that being a woman and being a Black woman in America “is to be fearless, Brenda,” to never apologize, and be accountable for everything that I do, and that I work hard, get my education, and keep my faith in God. There was no door I could not knock through or no table that I did not deserve to sit at. She had strength and confidence in something I carry with me every single day.

Then there is my shero, Shirley Chisholm, who paved the way for Black women like me to be in Congress. She proved every day the power that women had to change their community. Shirley Chisholm always said: “If they don’t give you a seat at the table, bring a folding chair.”

Additionally, the majority of women who represent us here in Congress are carrying their own folding chair.

So we have our first woman, our first Black American, our first Asian-American, our first Asian-American-Asian American vice president who has coined the phrase: “The first, but not the last.”

We stand on the shoulders, all of us, of giants. We continue to build that foundation so that the next generation of girls and young women can stand on our shoulders. Look at this Congress. There are over 140 Democrat and Republican women in the House and the Senate, the most ever in the history of our country.

That translates to the work we are doing in this Chamber to better the lives of women and girls. If you look at today, we voted to pass the equal rights amendment resolution and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. These are the steps in the right direction. We have come a long way, way, way, for full equality, but we still have work to do.

We, unfortunately, have a system in America that suppresses women and does not support women. But we know that, “A woman is like a tea bag,” like Eleanor Roosevelt said, “you never know how strong she is until she gets in hot water.”

And I know for a fact that women have continued to stand up against every barrier. You point to this pandemic and you see how women, especially women of color, have borne the brunt of this health and economic crisis. But women of color and I know that we will continue in this Congress to fight for the women in America.

This is our responsibility, and I am glad that we have women leaders across the Federal, State, and local governments that we have looked up to. Every woman in this Congress today recognizes that the next generation is looking at us and asking us to stand up.

Our Vice President of the United States, our Speaker of the House, as half of President Biden’s Cabinet, and even on the other side of the aisle, the chair of the House Republican Party, all are women. We are making success, and I know that we can do so much more.

I continue to work, and I want to know that when women succeed, America succeeds, as our amazing Speaker of the House reminds us.

I am so glad to share this hour with some of our amazing women leaders who will continue to tell us, while we have a month dedicated to women’s history, we make history every single day.

I would like to ask for my first speaker to come to the podium.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Speier).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, my friend, my colleague, my co-chair of the Democratic Women’s Caucus.

I rise tonight in honor of Women’s History Month and the heroics, trailblazing women of our military, who have risked their lives for our country in the advancement of women’s equality and equity.

Women have been on the front lines fighting for America’s values and freedom since the founding of our Nation. Our foremothers blazed a trail for women, like Louisa Wolcott Walsh, who, in 1917, as America teetered on the brink of entering World War I, heard and answered the call to serve. Loretta became the first woman to enlist in the U.S. military in a position other than nursing and was our first female chief petty officer.

I also want to recognize Captain Kristen Griest and Lieutenant Shaye Haver, the first women to graduate from the Army Ranger School; Marcela Hayes, America’s first Black female fighter pilot; and Mary Edward Walker, the first female U.S. Army surgeon who served in the Civil War and the only woman to receive the Presidential Medal of Honor.

The strength and courage of these women and so many more like them reinforce what we already know: There is nothing women cannot do.

When women are in positions of leadership, our country is in better hands. I believe that this is especially true in our military.

I honor General Ann E. Dunwoody, our Nation’s first female four-star general; Admiral Michelle Howard, the Navy’s first female four-star admiral and first African American to command a U.S. naval ship; and Air Force General Laura Richardson, the first female commander of a combatant command.

These women have served our Nation honorably. They now must open new doors for a generation of women to fulfill their dreams to serve our country under safe conditions, free from sexual assault and harassment.

All of these women warriors volunteered for duty and risked their lives for our country—our rights, our voice, our freedom, our democracy, our safety, our nation. They have fought rampant misogyny, including attacks from talking heads on national TV—who have never served our country—and racism for the women of color. Their unflinching courage has paved the way for thousands of women serving in our Armed Forces today. Our military is stronger and this country is safer because women serve.

We honor these military women’s achievements today on the House floor. May we never forget their sacrifice, their courage, and dedication. May they elevate a new generation of women in the military, free from bias, racial discrimination, and sexual assault.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my amazing co-chair for everything she does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Wasserman Schultz).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my amazing co-chair for everything she does.

I rise today to honor our foremothers who first demanded equality in and outside the home, along with the sheroes.
of today who still battle for it amidst this deadly pandemic both on and behind its front lines.

The onset of COVID–19 pushed so many brave women into the deadly viral fires. It also foisted upon too many the impossible share of unpaid caretaker and teacher roles once they were safe at home.

Throughout all of history, it is women, especially those of color, who bear the heaviest health and economic burdens and fallout from such national crises.

The data is clear: Only a full recovery that prioritizes women can reverse this “shecession” we are in.

That is why I proudly supported the American Rescue Plan, which provides much-needed help to women across this country. This relief package includes historic expansion of the child tax credit to help lift children and families out of poverty, and provides paid-leave tax credits to help more women stay in the workforce.

It also makes the investments needed to safely reopen schools and keep the childcare industry afloat so women and families can pay for care and get back to work.

And with the inclusion of $1,400 stimulus checks per family member and extended unemployment assistance, women can finally regain their footing as equal partners and breadwinners.

Yet, even among these many challenges women have faced over this last year, we cannot overlook that, for the first time in history, we have sworn in a Manhattan District Attorney. The historic inauguration of Vice President Harris will inspire countless girls to higher ambitions, and it marks a milestone for all women of color whose work, ambitions, and it marks a milestone in the inauguration of Vice President Harris, a Madam Vice President. The historic inauguration of Vice President Harris will inspire countless girls to higher ambitions, and it marks a milestone for all women of color whose work, ambitions, and it marks a milestone in the inauguration of Vice President Harris, a Madam Vice President. The historic inauguration of Vice President Harris will inspire countless girls to higher ambitions, and it marks a milestone for all women of color whose work, ambitions, and it marks a milestone in the inauguration of Vice President Harris, a Madam Vice President. The historic inauguration of Vice President Harris will inspire countless girls to higher ambitions, and it marks a milestone in the inauguration of Vice President Harris, a Madam Vice President. The historic inauguration of Vice President Harris will inspire countless girls to higher ambitions, and it marks a milestone in the inauguration of Vice President Harris, a Madam Vice President. The historic inauguration of Vice President Harris will inspire countless girls to higher ambitions, and it marks a milestone in the inauguration of Vice President Harris, a Madam Vice President. The historic inauguration of Vice President Harris will inspire countless girls to higher ambitions, and it marks a milestone in the inauguration of Vice President Harris, a Madam Vice President. The historic inauguration of Vice President Harris will inspire countless girls to higher ambitions, and it marks a milestone in the inauguration of Vice President Harris, a Madam Vice President.
I just want to close by saying that our Smithsonian Women’s History Museum will inspire visitors of all ages and all genders for generations to come. I am so glad to join my colleagues for tonight’s Special Order to celebrate the historical achievements of women and to look forward to creating a more equal future for all and preserving this history and the contributions of women in the new Smithsonian women’s museum, which is now going to be built due to this Congress and this Women’s Caucus.

I thank all of my colleagues that helped this happen and helped the passage of the ERA today.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I can’t wait for that museum.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), another leader and fighter for women’s rights.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the Democratic Women’s Caucus, Congresswomen Frankel, Speier, and Lawrence, for hosting this Special Order on Women’s History Month. I want to thank Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE for insisting that Black women and women of color be seen in this body.

Last year, we celebrated the centennial of the ratification of the 19th Amendment, which gave some women the right to vote. I know that women of color were not able to vote until decades later, and Black women fought until they got suffrage in 1965.

I am proud that this January, my bill, with the support of both Republicans and Democrats here in this body and in the Senate, passed. It is called the Women’s History and Nineteenth Amendment Centennial Quarter Dollar Coin Program Act, and it was signed into law. This measure will ensure that prominent women from American history can be honored on our circulating quarter dollar coins.

The currency we use is one of the most important shared ways that we have in memorializing what is important to us as Americans. Making sure that prominent American women are featured on our coins is an important step in recognizing the contributions women have made in furthering civil rights and making our country a more equitable place.

As the mint solicits public input for these coins, it is my hope that diverse American women will be chosen and depicted, celebrating our Nation’s leaders, thinkers, and innovators.

Last election also brought a record number of women to Congress, and there are, I believe, 120 women in the House. I know my mentor, the first African-American woman elected to Congress, Congresswoman Shirley Chisolm, would be so proud. Yes, we brought our folding chairs, but I have to just tell you, we are here to stay.

I salute my late mother, Mildred Parish Massey tonight, who blazed so many trails. She instilled in her three girls that women are equal to men, from day one. She was one of the first 12 Black students to integrate the University of Texas at El Paso. She was the first Black female to work at Fort Bliss, Texas, to work there for years, and she was the first in so many segregated places.

But you know what? She told my sisters and me ‘t’s’ is not in any dictionary and that we can fulfill our dreams. But in doing that, we have to break these barriers so that others can enter, and she insisted that we open the doors for other women and girls.

It is so important that we celebrate Women’s History Month and honor the women trailblazers who came before us. Not only should we celebrate women, but we should also ensure that they are protected and granted equality. That’s the kind of a better way to honor Women’s History Month than for this body to pass bills to guarantee and enshrine women’s equality. It is a shame we have to do that.

One important action we can take to do that is to remove barriers to ratifying the equal rights amendment. I have to thank my good friend, Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, for her leadership on these efforts. It is way past time we do that.

For 24 years, women have not been able to claim the full protections and opportunities afforded by the Constitution. Women and girls face a devastating wage gap, gender-based violence, access to healthcare, reproductive rights, discrimination, sexual harassment, the list goes on. Yet, our Constitution does not explicitly protect women and color have had to fight twice as hard.

I thank Congresswoman BREnda LAWRENCE for leading the Special Order tonight. It is an important moment for women in this country.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman LEE for being a voice for women year after year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAOKWSKY), who has been one of our fighters from the beginning.

Ms. SCHAOKWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks about Women’s History Month with a little quiz. Who was the first woman of color to serve in this body, in the United States House of Representatives?

I think I hear somebody saying it was Shirley Chisolm. Shirley Chisolm certainly was a groundbreaking leader, but she was not the first woman of color. It was a woman named Patsy Mink.

Patsy Takemoto Mink was born in the territory of Hawaii in 1927. She became a lawyer at the University of Chicago. That is my hometown. Not frequent for women to do that. In fact, she couldn’t get a job, so she set up her own practice.

But she got really interested in politics, and she served in the territorial House and Senate. And guess what? She was the first woman ever to be in that body. She was a groundbreaker.

In 1964, 5 years after Hawaii became a State, Patzy ran for the United States Congress, the first woman of color and the first Asian American and the first woman to represent Hawaii.

She championed early childhood education, introduced the first childcare bill in Congress, and she was a groundbreaker by introducing title IX. This was legislation that itself was groundbreaking. An amendment to the Higher Education Act, title IX, ensured that women could not be excluded from participating in school activities or participating in collegiate athletics. Believe me, this was not an easy bill to pass.

That same year, she actually did run for President. That was about 2 years before Shirley Chisolm did. A very short race. She was an anti-Vietnam war candidate. Then she dropped out to run for Senate and lost.

But she came back to the United States Congress to serve once again. I have to tell you that I had the pleasure—when I came here in 1999, Patsy Mink was here, a fierce and tiny woman whom you can’t see. I just want to say today that we need to lift the name of Patsy Mink higher. People don’t know who she is or who she was or what she accomplished for women. I am determined that we will lift the name of Patsy Mink higher. Gentlemen, Representatives to acknowledge and honor the great work of Patsy Mink.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), who has been a trailblazer in her own right.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan and all of the chairs and the co-chairs of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the women of the United States House of Representatives for Women’s History Month. This Women’s History Month marks the 101st year of women’s suffrage in the United States.

Despite the fact that women have had the right to vote for 101 years, we still don’t have equal justice under the law. That is why earlier today, we passed a resolution to remove the arbitrary deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, because there is no expiration of this equality.

Yet, to this day, women are still paid less for our work, face workplace harassment, and are discriminated against, simply because of who we are.

Women who work full-time, year-round, still make 82 cents on the dollar for men’s earnings. Fighting against these disparities and ensuring our Federal Government and policies are reflective of the whole country is why having women at every level of government is so important, in our House, Senate, White House, and, yes, even in the White House.

So this month, in particular, we draw strength and inspiration from those
who came before us and those remarkable women working among us today, from Shirley Chisolm, the first Black woman to serve in Congress; to NANCY PELOSI, the first and only woman Speaker of the House; to KAMALA HARARI, the first female, first African American, and first South Asian American Vice President in United States history. She was sworn in by the late Latina Supreme Court Justice, Sonia Sotomayor.

A hundred years ago, only one woman, Alice Mary Robertson, was elected to serve in Congress. Currently, a record 144 women were elected to this Congress, with 120 women in the House of Representatives alone.

I am proud to say that when I was elected and sworn in in 2013, I became the 100th woman. However, there is still a lot of work to be done; 44 out of 535 Members is just 25 percent. That is just not what our country looks like. Women make up over 50 percent of this Nation.

Women's History Month is a reminder of the importance and the urgency of that work and the need for us to continue breaking those glass ceilings.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I want Mrs. McBATH so much for gathering us all here tonight in celebration, because celebration is what we must do. We must celebrate not just Women's History Month, but everything we did today. We must celebrate that we passed the extension of the ERA, that we passed the Violence Against Women Act, our culture and the American Rescue Plan with all of those wonderful provisions that will lift women and children out of poverty.

I come from a place where for many years they didn't give us the vote, they didn't give us statehood, and there was much discrimination. But it was also a place where women and women of color had a long and proud history of transformational leadership, and I honor a few of them today.

One hundred years ago the suffragist Adelina Otero-Warren helped lead the charge to ratify the 19th amendment in New Mexico. After her success, she became the first Latina to ever run for Congress. Unfortunately, she wasn't successful; a few years later I am the first Latina to represent my district.

In my family, my grandmother, Isabel Lopez Leger helped to integrate the segregated city of Las Vegas, New Mexico, refusing to move when the neighbors realized she was a small, Brown, Spanish-speaking Hispana.

My big grandma, as we called her Ganga, Abelina Romero Lucero, understood how central the vote was to achieving equity and representation for our communities, making calls to mobilize voters from her hospice bed. She was a Democrat until she died.

My mother, Manuela del Atocha Lucero Leger was punished for speaking Spanish in the schoolyard. She took this bigotry and turned it into advocacy, and she and my father helped pass the 1973 New Mexico Bilingual Multicultural Education Act because she knew that language was so essential to "our culture and heritage, nuestra cultura y herencia, and identity."

New Mexico also claims Dolores Huerta, who proudly taught us that, "yes, it can," "si, se puede."

I close with New Mexico’s beloved daughter, Secretary Deb Haaland of the Pueblo of Laguna. New Mexico has shed tears of joy over her confirmation. She takes to the Department of the Interior a fierce voice borne of resilience and the love of land and our Earth which she inherited from the 34 generations of New Mexican women before her.

Women's history is still unfolding, for we have hard work ahead of us, particularly for women of color, who are disproportionately impacted by the pandemic, health disparities, and economic hardship. So I am so thankful to be here with my "sisters," "hermanas" to celebrate our history and to recommit ourselves to the hard work we have ahead of us.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a community organizer who put her boots on and walked the trenches for the people that I love the most.

Mr. Speaker, this month we celebrate the amazing and just absolutely inspirational women that are all around us. As it has been said over and over again, you know, so many amazing women reside right here in this body, and I have to personally say, I have never met in my lifetime a greater number of courageous and intelligent and just amazing women that are so committed to democracy and protecting their constituents and their communities, and I feel very humbled and honored to actually get to serve with each and every one of them.

Whether it be a mother or a scientist, a Congresswoman or the Vice President of the United States, we are eternally thankful for the work that women do to help us thrive here at home and across the globe.

This week I had the opportunity to speak with four amazing women who are fighting for change in my community in Georgia’s Sixth Congressional District.

Cobb County Chairwoman Lisa Cupid has become the first African American and first woman to serve in her position on the Board of Commissioners.

Aixa Pascual has dedicated her career to engage and advocate for Georgia’s Latino population.

And after 15 years of teaching, Chrissie Davis joined the Cobb County School Board to implement ideas that she learned from her experience as an educator.

Dr. Colleen Kelley, a physician at Emory University School of Medicine, has worked on the Moderna vaccine trial at Grady Hospital.

I truly want to thank these incredible women for all of the amazing work that they have done in our community, because it not only serves my community, my district, Georgia, but also the rest of the Nation.

I wish everyone a truly happy, happy Women’s History Month. But I have to honestly say, as I am sitting here today listening to all of my colleagues talk about the amazing women that we know and amazing women who have done so much work throughout the course of history, I would be remiss if I did not mention my own mother, Wilma Cecelia Holman. I owe her such a great debt of gratitude because she was one of the very first women, Black women in Illinois to receive a master’s in nursing and to actually teach nursing. So I know that everything that I am, all of my courage, my strength, my imagination, my creativity, my drive, and my willingness to put my boots on and get down in the dirt, in the trenches for the people that I love and care for in my community comes from her.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LAWRENCE for bringing this Special Order hour today, in honor of Women’s History Month, but everything we did today listening to all of my colleagues talk about the amazing women that we know and amazing women who have done so much work throughout the course of history, I would be remiss if I did not mention my own mother, Wilma Cecelia Holman. I owe her such a great debt of gratitude because she was one of the very first women, Black women in Illinois to receive a master’s in nursing and to actually teach nursing. So I know that everything that I am, all of my courage, my strength, my imagination, my creativity, my drive, and my willingness to put my boots on and get down in the dirt, in the trenches for the people that I love and care for in my community comes from her.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia.

I know there is a tradition that says, as long as you say the names of your forefathers, they will never leave you. So I just want to introduce into the RECORD Etta Cranford, who was my grandmother. At the age of 55, she inherited a 3-year-old and 5-year-old when my mother died, and she gave everything she had until her death to ensure that I would be a strong Black woman in America.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.
In recent years, the League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania has worked to combat 21st century voter suppression tactics, including strict voter ID laws and extreme gerrymandering.

In 2015, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court issued a decision in the League of Women Voters v. Pennsylvania that declared our congressional districts had been so extremely gerrymandered that they violated our State constitution. In doing so, that decision created districts, including mine, that are more compact, contiguous, and constitutional. The League of Women Voters’ decision paved the way for the election of four women, myself included, to serve in our State’s congressional delegation at a time when there were none.

From the first suffragists through the present day, I want to applaud the League of Women Voters for its ongoing work to empower voters and defend our democracy.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. MANNING), a woman who has made a difference. I am looking forward to the brilliance of her future.

Ms. MANNING. I would like to thank my colleague from my hometown for holding this Special Order and for all she does on behalf of women.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to celebrate Women’s History Month by highlighting the multiple and irreplaceable roles that women play in our communities.

Generations of women have worked to balance jobs with raising children and caring for aging loved ones. This isn’t new. Women have always disproportionately shouldered the burden of caring for family. But for the first time, this pandemic has highlighted the toll these various roles take on women, as so many have been forced to leave the workforce to care for others. Over the last year, 2.3 million women have left the labor force, a nearly 4 percent drop in female participation in the labor force. Several factors have contributed to this drop, but none more than the closing of childcare facilities and schools.

The American Rescue Plan is helping women recover from this pandemic and return to work by bolstering the childcare sector, increasing the child tax credit, expanding paid leave, and safely reopening schools.

I also want to point out that all three women from the North Carolina delegation participated, and that is true sisterhood.

I rise today to highlight an extraordinary North Carolinian in honor of Women’s History Month, Reverend Nancy Petty.

Nancy is a trailblazer in the community. As a member of the LGBTQ community and the faith community, she has championed marriage equality and brought these welcoming ideas to her home church, a historic and progressive Pullen Memorial Baptist Church. I worshipped virtually with Pullen just last Sunday.

A kind and compassionate person, Nancy often preaches inclusivity and understanding. She has focused on facilitating interfaith dialogue with Raleigh’s Muslim community and has partnered with the Jewish community on social justice advocacy.

She truly represents the best of our community, and I am honored to call her a friend and a neighbor. She has inspired a generation by her example to treat others the way you would want to be treated.

I am so pleased to recognize Reverend Petty for this Women’s History Month and the example she sets for us all.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD), our final speaker tonight, who came to Congress with a mission. She has made her voice heard, and she has made such a difference. We welcome her as not only a woman Member of Congress but as an amazing Representative.

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, so many of the leaders we hear about are public figures, well-known people with loud voices in the community, but there are so many other kinds of leaders. In particular, in connection with this month’s Women’s History Month, I rise to pay tribute to some who are not often noticed, the extraordinary women who have battled the COVID pandemic on its front lines in my community and across our Nation.

This historic crisis has devastated my community and communities in every corner of our country. More than 330,000 of our fellow Americans have died. Millions have lost their jobs. Unprecedented numbers of children and families have faced hunger.

Women have experienced a disproportionate share of these converging crises. As a larger share of frontline workers, they have risen to the occasion, putting the health and safety of their neighbors ahead of their own.

One woman in my community, the Greater Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, has done everything she can to ensure children’s historic and our most vulnerable neighbors are not forgotten. Dr. Rajika Reed has served the people of our community for more than 20 years as a counselor, children’s therapist, teacher, public health researcher, and epidemiologist. Most recently, Dr. Reed has served in one of the hospital systems in my community, St. Luke’s University Health Network, first as an infectious disease specialist and now as vice president of community health.

Dr. Reed has been instrumental in keeping our community informed throughout the pandemic. Dr. Reed has been particularly inclusive when speaking about the disproportionate impact of COVID on various communities throughout the Seventh District, helping all of us recognize and understand how rapidly and drastically the stakes can change depending on a person’s life circumstances.

By grounding every conversation in easy-to-understand data, Dr. Reed has made sure that officials at all levels have a shared understanding of communities we have served and the challenges they face, particularly the stark racial and economic disparities that have only grown during the pandemic.

Still, throughout it all, Dr. Reed’s words and calm demeanor have helped soften the blow of what was at times devastating news. Her work has helped mobilize my entire community around the shared mission of taking care of our own and putting the most vulnerable among us first.

To Dr. Reed and women frontline workers in every corner of my community, including many low-wage workers who still don’t have the support or pay they need, I stand with you today and every day.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 14 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment to thank everyone who spoke tonight.

I know everyone here is aware that women are making so many strides. We are currently on target to send women to the Moon. We are on target to make sure that women continue to be leaders in education and healthcare. I am proud to say that not only do we have a woman as our Vice President, but we also have a woman as our amazing Speaker of the House. We have six chairs of our congressional committees headed by women. We also have over, I believe, 194 women in Congress currently.

With Women’s History Month, sometimes the men will roll their eyes in the back of their head and say: Women, why do you need a month? Because, so often when the strides and hard work that it took for us to accomplish what was given to privileged men are often overlooked.

I am proud to stand here today to lead this Special Order hour to honor the women, as Congresswoman Wild said, the ones who often don’t get a platform, don’t get a mic, and they just do the work every day.
Women are the predominant group of educators. If you are educated in America, you were probably touched by a woman. Those who are in hospitals and went through COVID and all the suffering, the caregivers and nurses are predominantly women.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to the mother who gave birth to us. We are often in the kitchens and other places that women are such strong leaders, but now we have women in the C suites. We have women manufacturing and doing what we have women in every area of America working.

The only thing that any woman wants is the opportunity to have a seat at the table to be able to show her brilliance. As my grandmother told me, never apologize for your hard work, your brilliance, or your skills and talents that you have been blessed with. You use them, and you do a good thing with them.

And as John Lewis said, get in good trouble. That is what the suffragists taught us that the good trouble they went through gave us the right to vote in America.

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

MANAGING THE CRISIS ON THE SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Arrington) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I stand here on behalf of the freedom-loving members of the Republican Study Committee, the conservative conscience of the GOP Conference, and the largest caucus with over 150 members and our friend and fearless leader Jn B Wanka from the Hoosier State.

Mr. Speaker, we come to this Chamber with grave concerns, with profound grief over what is happening to this great Nation at the southern border, along the border of States like my home State of Texas. My citizens are on the front lines, and the citizens of the Lone Star State and border States are at ground zero of this self-inflicted crisis.

Just because the President won’t acknowledge that there is a crisis doesn’t mean that it doesn’t exist. Mr. Speaker, it is raging out of control. It is an unmitigated disaster, and as I said, it is self-inflicted.

Reinstating catch and release while we are recovering from a pandemic? Are you kidding me? We have put mandates and restrictions on the American people who have sacrificed by staying at home. Some have lost their jobs. They don’t know how they are going to pay the bills. They are still working at home. Some have lost their jobs. They don’t know how they are going to pay the bills.

Everybody stepped up, Mr. Speaker. They did what they were told to do in some capacity, but they all acted responsibly for the sake of our country and their fellow man and the country that they love. And now, we are just letting people cross our border illegally, violate our sovereignty, break our laws, and then just be released into the interior of our country with no testing and no screening.

In Texas, Mr. Speaker, we are coming back. We had kids in school. Kids are in school. My kids are in school. We feel normal again, and we are blessed to be in a State that puts a premium on individual liberty and personal responsibility. We have worked hard to get to where we are now.

We didn’t have this thing that was done to us by our government. We didn’t like all the protocols and mandates, but we did the best job we could for the sake of our fellow Americans. Now, we have the potential for a flare-up in the pandemic because our hospitals are going to be overwhelmed.

Our schools are already overwhelmed as they try to do right by their students, let them come into the classroom, and have a structure. Knowing that to close your doors on these kids is to close a bright future for them. It is to lock them out of their greatest potential and to give them grief and all kinds of heartache and mental health issues.

We have our police, who have been disparaged with cries to defund the police. They would be dismantled if the bill that passed the House supported by the Democrats ever became law and ripped away the tools that they have to not only keep our community safe but to protect them in the process. We have stripped them—or would if the bill passed—of their legal liability protections. All the while, we are putting more pressure on our local law enforcement to do the job that the Federal Government under this Commander in Chief has failed to do.

The Commander in Chief is supposed to provide for the common defense. He is supposed to be the exemplar for rule of law. He is the chief enforcer of the law. What kind of example is our President setting to just throw caution to the wind and let folks come into this country who are not our citizens, prioritizing them over the safety and health of our citizens?

I got to hear some of my colleagues express concerns over women’s rights and protecting women from abuse. We all support that, and our hearts go out to any victims of abuse in this country or anywhere else. But, we have to be careful to ensure that the policies that have been passed by this President, reinstating catch and release, empowering sanctuary cities, repealing the stay in Mexico policies, halting funding for the border wall, any of these things have sent a message that we are open for illegal business.

If you ask the cartels, business has never been better. We are lining their pockets while they exploit vulnerable people who are hopeless. They are being exploited.

Mr. Speaker, one out of every three women are sexually assaulted on their trek to this country. That statistic is from Doctors Without Borders. Children are used as a passport, trafficked by these cartels. We have empowered these cartels. This is a disaster on so many levels, and I am glad my colleagues are here to express these same sentiments in these few words.

Mr. Speaker, I will end with this. It is clear there is a cause and effect here. It is clear that policies have consequences. They incent behavior, and the behavior is causing chaos at the border.

I believe this President is obsessed. This is just a fundamental question, why our President would allow this to happen. I believe he is obsessed with undoing anything that has the name “President Trump” on it, regardless of its merits. I believe he is equally obsessed with placating the left and their radical agenda. I have come to that conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to speak to the right thing. We are going to tell the truth. We are going to lay out the facts. We are going to call on our President to do the right thing and prioritize the American people and their safety and security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Good).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague and fellow Member from Texas for yielding.

Our country’s future will forever be changed based on how we manage or refuse to manage Biden’s border crisis. And, yes, it is a crisis.

Steady merit-based legal immigration is stabilizing. It provides a talented pool of workers, effectively permits patriotic assimilation, and enriches our culture. We can debate how best to achieve those objectives and what immigration levels or numbers are in the best interests of our Nation and our citizens, but what is not open for honest debate, or at least debate that honestly places the interests, safety, and security of American citizens first, is the need to secure our border and eliminate illegal immigration.

President Biden’s open border policies threaten our security, overtax our resources, jeopardize public health, and turn every town into a border community.

As others have said, without a border, we don’t have a country; we have a landmass, one that is currently under invasion. That is an invasion that is with complicit approval from the President’s policies and the support of the Democratic Party, and this is especially egregious and inexcusable.
our education system, our healthcare system.

We are not stopping illegal immigrants based on whether or not they test positive for COVID.

We are not stopping illegal immigrants based on whether or not they have a criminal record.

We are not stopping illegal immigrants based on whether or not they intend to do us harm.

The bottom line is that we don't even know who is coming, and we don't even know why they are coming.

Meanwhile, the President sends FEMA to the border, not to help prevent the emergency crisis of illegal crossing, but actually to help illegal aliens get into our country.

And how does a Democrat majority respond?

With two new amnesty bills that will incentivize and reward lawless, illegal behavior with amnesty and citizenship.

Memo to the President and Democrat majority: You get more of what you incentivize.

We can only conclude this is what they want.

Mr. Speaker, these two bills combined provide amnesty to some 5 million illegal aliens, including some with criminal backgrounds. These two bills make it more difficult for law enforcement to detain or deport illegal aliens. These bills will facilitate chain migration, leading to more non-merit-based immigration. And these two bills inexcusably provide no provisions to address the Biden border crisis.

Just today, in apparent recognition that the crisis is not playing well with the American people—you know, the forgotten citizens of the country—NBC news—not exactly a conservative news outlet—is reporting that the Biden administration is telling Border Patrol that they can no longer talk to the media or do ride-alongs that enable the media to see firsthand what is happening at the border. Instead, Border Patrol is supposed to let all communication come from Washington.

The American people are not stupid. They know what is going on, and they don't want America to be turned into a sanctuary nation.

Mr. Speaker, we, on the Republican side, are going to fight for them. We are going to fight to protect the country we have today, and we are going to fight to protect the country we want to have tomorrow.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his remarks. He talked about the incentives. We talked about cause and effect, and we talked about the consequences of bad policies.

Mr. Speaker, we have had double the apprehensions this year in January over last year in 2020, well over twice as many illegal crossings in the month of February. We are on pace as a day-by-day basis, 500 a day of illegal minors trafficked here by the cartels. And the CBP tells us that there will be over 120,000 by the end of the year. It will be a record year. Those are the results. And the facts don't lie, whether this President or our colleagues believe it or not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. BABIN), who represents Texas 36th Congressional District.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the House Border Security Caucus, I very much appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor with the Republican Study Committee to talk about the most pressing issue our Nation is facing today, right now; and, sadly, it was entirely avoidable.

There are no ifs, ands, or buts. The crisis on our southern border is a direct result of President Biden's failed immigration and border security policies—miseraably failed.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have predictably done what they do best: Blamed President Trump and his administration.

But anyone with a pulse can see that this border crisis started the very day that President Biden was sworn in. On his first day in office, Biden stopped construction of the border wall, ended the national emergency declaration on the southern border. He stopped the migrant protection protocol so asylum-seekers would have to wait in Mexico.

And rather than utilizing the Title 42 health restrictions to protect Americans during this pandemic, Biden and his administration are releasing COVID-positive illegal aliens into Texas to worsen the pandemic and fan out across this country.

He would go on to stop deportation, stop enforcing immigration laws, bring back “catch and release,” and end the hard-won changes that President Trump had initiated to control our southern border.

He has specifically said that Americans will not be prioritized—repeat: Will not be prioritized—illegal immigrants for access to COVID-19 vaccines, and promised citizenship to millions upon millions of migrants here illegally, which does nothing but incentivize more illegal crossings. All of this in less than 2 months.

Who on earth is surprised that there is a massive border crisis?

Yes, President Biden owns this border crisis. The truly sad reality is this isn’t Biden’s first rodeo. When he was vice president, he argued for opening the border, and he knows full well what exactly that means.

He saw children being used and recycled by smugglers. He saw women and children physically abused, raped, and even mutilated by the cartels, who fully control our southern border now, empowered by President Biden. He even saw American families torn apart after a loved one was killed by a dangerous criminal illegal alien.

Now, he should know better. And you know what? He does know better. Unfortunately, he is controlled by politics and his radical leftwing base, and he won’t turn back now.

The American people deserve to know that President Biden is taking advantage of them through this crisis. And while the American people were locked down for a year because of the pandemic, illegal aliens roamed free. While they worked hard, paid their taxes, and saved last year of Covid, illegal immigrants cost them billions every year with free education and healthcare.

My great State of Texas and the other border States cannot take another minute of Biden’s border crisis. The President of the United States needs to step up and he needs to lead.

Lives are at stake.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks. He mentioned as one of the policies that this current President has put in place through a unilateral action—by the way, he has done more executive orders than the last three or four presidents combined—to repeal or rescind the national emergency declaration. But it is so rich, so rich that at the same time he is doing this, the Democrat leadership of the House under Speaker Pelosi has lined the inside of they are all, not the outside, of the Capitol with the National Guard. The height of hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, the American people aren’t buying this. They are not. The Speaker called the walls at the southern border protecting our fellow Americans and communities immoral, until she erected razor-wire fencing around the people’s House. It is offensive. It is shameful, and it is an outrage. And it is a double standard, if I have ever seen one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN), a good friend of mine, and a colleague representing Oklahoma’s First District.

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Texas for yielding. I appreciate him leading this Special Order on such an important issue in our great country.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to shed light on a situation that is getting worse by the minute. The longer Joe Biden and his White House ignore the crisis on our border, the more challenging it becomes to get it under control.

But one would have to wonder: Is that what he wants by allowing this to continue and?

Under President Trump, border security was a top priority. He was ridiculed for that top priority of securing our Nation, the sovereignty of our Nation. Illegal entries plummeted under President Trump, and over 450 miles of border wall were built at the fighting to scratching every single wall against our Democrat colleagues’ desires.

Mr. Speaker, Biden’s trend has been to reverse and dismantle anything and everything that President Trump touched over the last 4 years, no matter who it may hurt. On day one of his Presidency, he unconstitutionally halted congressionally appropriated funds
meant to secure and strengthen our southern border. He indicated a complete reversal on border policies, refusing to condemn Democrats who call for open borders. This led to thousands of immigrants to believe our borders were open and that Congress was doing nothing to stop them. They even had shirts promoting the idea that Biden should let them in.

Mr. Speaker, it has been less than 2 months since Biden took office and already our southern border has reached unprecedented levels, levels like we haven’t seen in 20 years. Border agents are reporting the number of illegal entries, especially children, is higher than we have seen in decades.

Detainment facilities—what the Democrats have now called reception centers and concentration camps—that is what they called them under President Trump—are over capacity. Children are being sent to Dallas, hundreds of miles from the border, to be held at the convention center.

Americans returning from abroad are required to take COVID tests before re-entering our own country, but Biden is allowing thousands of migrants into the country without even testing them for COVID, packing facilities way over capacity.

Hypocrisy is nothing new to this administration. In spite of everything I have already said, Biden refuses to call it a crisis. CNN is even calling it a crisis, but Biden doesn’t want to label it. He doesn’t want to own it, calling it an inherited mess from the Trump administration. Every single person in America knows that is not true. To make it worse, House Democrats rejected any amendments on their partisan immigration bills this week.

My amendments asked that known gang members not be eligible for amnesty.

How could you not allow that to be added to this bill?

That we create a tax credit for employers who want to do the right thing and implement E-Verify in their companies to make sure they are hiring legal American workers, and that illegal immigrants who have committed crimes in our country not be eligible for amnesty. Now, everywhere—except for in Congress—any good American would want those in the bill. But not here, not my Democrat colleagues.

These are all commonsense ideas that give us energy independence in America, that gives us energy independence in America, and the price has just gone up more than 50 percent last month driven by huge spikes in meth and heroin, deadly poisons that ravage our families. In what is fast becoming a Washington tradition, the other side has tried to pass the buck and blame the border disorder on the last administration.

This is a tired talking point; one we will hear repeated over and over to explain away the policy failures of the one-party government they control. But facts are stubborn things. This tidal wave of drug and human trafficking is a direct result of White House promises of amnesty, and the rollback of the commonsense border security safeguards put in place by President Trump. That is why it began at the end of January.

So what is their answer to this crisis? It is to pour gasoline on the fire by passing two amnesty bills that will give legal status to at least half of the estimated 11 million illegal aliens already in this country, including criminal aliens who have been convicted of multiple DUIs, drug and weapons violations, and even voter fraud.

One of the bills even includes an unbelievable provision allowing for the reimportation of foreigners who were deported as long as 4 years ago, bringing them back and giving them green cards. This is a slap in the face to the legal immigrants and the hundreds of millions of American taxpayers, millions of unemployed Americans, and countless American families who have lost loved ones to the scourge of drugs like meth and fentanyl.

Even worse, it is a financial bonanza for the human traffickers and foreign drug cartels who prey on the vulnerable and profit from their misery.

So let’s get this straight. The first act of this President was to open the borders and close our schools, or make sure that they stay closed. The first act of this President was to open the borders, the pipeline that brings the drugs and the human trafficking into America, but they closed the pipeline that gives us energy independence in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the administration to stop pretending that this crisis isn’t happening, and to start facing the American people with solutions that work.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is just hard to believe that in the greatest country on planet Earth, that this is what we are allowing to happen. Reimporting people who violate our laws, had due process, and we did what the law says, detain and deport.

Today, under Present Biden’s deluge of executive orders, they are released and rewarded: free healthcare, compliments of the taxpayers of the United States; free education, compliments of the taxpayers of the United States. We spend $12 billion in Texas alone on illegal immigration, and the price has just
climbed higher and higher under this President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP), my dear friend, representing the Ninth Congressional District.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, my friend, Mr. ARRINGTON, for hosting this Special Order, it is an extraordinarily important topic.

Here is another angle on it. Tomorrow, on the floor of this House, Democrats will pass two mass amnesty bills, H.R. 6 and H.R. 1603. Consider that at the very time Democrats are bringing these amnesty bills to the floor, what promises to be the largest surge of illegal immigration on the southern border in at least 20 years, is building toward an unknown climax. The Biden administration has precipitated a humanitarian crisis so big that even they can no longer deny it.

Less than 2 months after terminating President Trump’s declaration of an emergency on the border, Secretary Mayorkas of the Department of Homeland Security, has been constrained to send FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, to facilitate the Nation out of this crisis.

Today, in the Committee on Homeland Security, I asked Secretary Mayorkas about the deliberate and absurd rhetoric used by the administration: Come, but don’t come now. I was unable to secure from Secretary Mayorkas a straightforward acknowledgment that it is always wrong to incite migrants to enter the United States illegally.

And, amazingly, when I asked the Secretary whether he and the Biden administration had been expected or were surprised by the crisis that is now blooming on the southern border, he was caught off guard. He said he had no expectation whatsoever. I couldn’t believe it. And I think the American people can believe it.

Just like the Biden administration’s rhetoric, these bills signal economic migrants that if they make the dangerous trek through Central America and Mexico, they will be met with amnesty, taxpayer-funded healthcare, housing, and anything else you can think of.

Whether it is getting the migrant protection protocols, otherwise known as “catch and release,” and stopping border wall construction, the administration’s message to migrants is clear: Come. Take your lives in your hands, brave the gangs, the coyotes, the smugglers, take the risk of sexual abuse. Come.

Today, the Democrats are augmenting that clear-as-day message with more promises of amnesty, and that will be the bills tomorrow, which everyone here know will fuel more illegal migration.

Let’s face it, Democrats are committed to a regime of open borders, where any person from anywhere in the world has a right to enter the U.S. for any reason, even if that means migrants are assaulted or killed on their way to the border. And Democrats feel better about themselves. They assume a superior moral position by pursuing such a policy.

It is not a wonder, but apparently no cause for reflection by the Biden administration, that the CBP very recently apprehended four individuals on the terrorist watch list crossing the southwest border. Secretary Mayorkas admitted that today, and then went on to say: "That is nothing unusual, more or less. Amazing."

I have heard some of my friends on the other side of the aisle complain that Republicans are not offering solutions.

Let me offer three: End all talk of amnesty. Reinstate the migrant protection protocols that provide more for their safety than the policy does now articulate. And finish building the wall. Let’s resume a responsible border policy if we want to serve the interests of the American people.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, again, I would say that America is the most generous Nation, not only the most powerful, but the most generous. We represent 5 percent of the world population, and we represent 20 percent of the immigrant population. We welcome freedom-loving, law-abiding people who want to make America their home and make a better life for their family, but only if they respect our laws and our sovereignty and the safety of the American people.

Millions of people wait for years to have legal status in this country, and this President has just created lawlessness and chaos, just like that, with a pen and a cell phone. The unilateral actions have been reckless and endangering not only our citizens, but the people that are making this trek on account of his message: Don’t come now, is what he says, but come now. Come one, come all. It is a free-for-all at the border, as to what his policies say loudly and clearly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my dear friend from the great State of Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), he represents Arkansas’ Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican party has historically been, and I believe it is their intent, to be a superior moral position by pursuing these dangerous actions.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas for leading this discussion tonight, for his compassion for people, and for his passion to serve Texas and America.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, I not only rise to address the growing crisis on our southern border, but to be a voice for those who have no voice. We value life and believe all people should be treated with dignity.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas for leading this discussion tonight, for his compassion for people, and for his passion to serve Texas and America.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, I not only rise to address the growing crisis on our southern border, but to be a voice for those who have no voice. In an interview aired this evening, President Biden told migrants not to come to the United States, but still refused to recognize the situation as a crisis. Actions speak louder than words. It doesn’t matter what you say when it doesn’t match what you do.

Such a directive is pointless, considering there are no policy changes to demotivate the migrant surge, the likes of which the United States hasn’t seen in 20 years. Our facilities and agencies are being overwhelmed by the surge.

President Biden offered an open invitation for parents to send their children across the border without fear of being turned away. The result is catastrophic. While the Biden migrant surge hasn’t been seen in the past, there has never been such a prolific number of unaccompanied minors.

These policies are a driving incentive for parents to give their children to coyotes and traffickers who will abuse and use them, causing lifelong trauma. Over 500 children are crossing the border daily, including unaccompanied kids as young as 6 years old. These children are threatened and coerced by cartels to carry drugs over the border and exploited by sex traffickers.

One in three women—one in three women, Mr. Speaker, will be assaulted as they attempt to make the journey.

I just witnessed my colleagues from across the aisle speaking in honor of women’s history. What kind of history are the left’s policies writing for these women? Young women, young women as young as 13 years old are being lured to Texas with the promise of a job in the service industry, and instead, are being sexually abused and trafficked.

What we are seeing now is but a fraction of what we could see in the coming months. This is the Biden administration’s responsibility, and President Biden owes the American people answers.

But President Biden is not alone. The majority party is neglecting their oversight responsibilities and aiding and abetting these dangerous actions.

I am calling on President Biden and congressional Democrats—who I remind you are the majority in both Chambers—to take responsibility for the border crisis and work to fix it and to take responsibility for the trauma these children will endure on the journey across the border.

Customs and Border Protection has informed Congress that four people on the FBI’s terrorist watch list were apprehended at the border. If four were caught, how many got through? What is their intent?

One day, Democrats are the arsonists, and the next week, the firefighters. They have pulled this trick on every issue, including energy, Medicare, and our border. To bring partisan immigration bills to the floor without even an opportunity to amend the bills is bad governance anytime, but is downright insensitive during this crisis.

We are a nation of immigrants, and I support all legal immigration. But...
open border policies are a direct threat to our national security and have created a humanitarian crisis. We should secure our borders and work on bipartisanship legislation to address immigration issues, but Democrats refuse to even enforce existing laws.

Mr. Speaker, is a new immigration law when there is no evidence that it will be enforced?

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his heartfelt comments.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as you have heard from my colleagues, there are many levels and dimensions to this crisis. It is a national security crisis, Mr. Speaker. It is a public health and safety crisis. It is a humanitarian crisis of epic proportions, and it is only going to get worse until this President embraces the reality, resists the left’s influence, and steps up and takes control of the southern border.

During the Obama administration, Mr. Speaker, if you had 1,000 contacts a day with people trying to sneak in this country, that was a lot. We are now at around 3,000 a day. February of this year compared to February of last year is up 173 percent. That is shocking. It didn’t have to be.

What incompetence did it take to get such a massive swing of people coming across our border?

President Trump had something called the migrant protection protocol. When people tried to sneak in here and claim asylum, they were sent back and held by the Mexican Government pending a hearing. This was a great victory for President Trump.

Maybe just because he is President Trump, it means you don’t like him, Mr. Speaker, and you had to get rid of him like the protection protocol. So, we are back to the old days.

Rather than being held south of the border, waiting to see if you can come here, you are escorted into the United States, turned over to some nonprofit organization, and told to disappear somewhere in the United States to show up for a hearing which you don’t show up for. And that is, more than any other reason, why we have this problem.

Another thing they have changed is that President Trump had worked on a deal with Central American countries so that people trying to come up here from South America and other Central American countries were held south of the Mexican border. One more good policy, but let’s throw it overboard and see what happens.

By doing this, not only do we let even more people in the country, but we enrich and empower the drug cartels. The drug cartels are charging about $3,000 for every Mexican they let in here, about $5,000 for every Central American, $8,000 to $9,000 for every Brazilian, and up to $20,000 for every Asian. When you multiply this kind of money, Mr. Speaker, you know very well the drug cartels will recruit as many people as they can to come into this country.

Of course, nowadays, it is unlike years ago when they used to find marijana. Now when people come across the border, it is fentanyl, meth, and heroin. So, in addition to the huge amount of humanity moving across the border, we have that many more drugs to kneel our country. I am sure the American people already remember we are losing about 80,000 people every year to illegal drug use, so much of which comes across the southern border.

As has been mentioned by other speakers, there is an increase in sexual assaults as people try to come across the border and are escorted by the drug cartels.

I want to point out that the drug cartels control that southern border. If you try to come here without their approval, Mr. Speaker, you are in big trouble. I will give you an anecdote from the last time I was down there. Three people tried to escort other people over the border. Two of them were skinned alive and died. The other was partly skinned alive and told to go back south to Mexico and tell everyone what happens if you try to come across the border without going through the drug cartels.

Just as another indication of the huge problem we have at the border, last year, which was an unusually hot year, they found, in the Tucson sector alone, 100 bodies of people who dehydrated trying to come here.

Under President Trump, Mr. Speaker, you know how good it can be. They went from a point where they were letting 100,000 people across the border, which was about 2 years ago, back down to around December, about 10,000 people crossing the border. They did that with the migrant protection protocol, with dealing with Central America, and by being concerned about COVID.

So, what to do now? I am sometimes asked how the United States got in this mess, and I am talking about a whole variety of issues. Where would the Founding Fathers say they screwed up? Until this, I always felt that if I look at the state of the government and say between the legislative, executive, and judiciary, our Founding Fathers would have never believed the judiciary could have such complete lack of respect for the Constitution. But now, I have to answer something else.

The press sometimes considers themselves the fourth estate. There are rumors right now that the Department of Homeland Security has put a gag order on the Border Patrol agents who always made up many thousands of stories down there. If I think of our Founding Fathers now who wanted a free press, as disappointed as they would be in our President, as disappointed as they would be in our Congress, and as super disappointed as my colleagues would be in our judicial branch. I think the area they would be most disappointed is in the fourth estate. The bootlicking sycophants of the fourth estate are just horrible. These toadies are ruining the country.

Wake up. Insist on being able to talk to the Border Patrol. Get down to the Border Patrol and find out exactly what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, my final plea tonight is for the press corps to wake up, get to the southern border, and report what is really going on down there.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this administration and our current President, Joe Biden, would do well to take a page out of President Trump’s playbook, and I mean this with all sincerity.

The reason people by the millions followed this unconventional, non-politician businessman and leader is because they were convinced he would fight for them. It is because they watched as he followed through on what he promised he would do for them. And lastly, Mr. Speaker, it is because he put America first.

Perfect he was not, but I will tell you what, Mr. Speaker, with every fiber of his being and ounce of strength in every waking moment, he was vigilant in keeping those promises, and one of them was to secure the border and stop illegal immigration once and for all.

Politicians have come and gone. They have made the same promises but to no avail. President Trump reduced illegal crossings by 75 percent.

We know what to do in this Chamber. We know the policies that would work to protect our fellow Americans, secure our border, and stop this chaos and madness that has ensued as a result of these reckless, unilateral decisions that this President is making.

We know what to do. Mr. Speaker, but there is no political will to do it. The message, as we have said, is clear. It is demoralizing and insulting that the leadership of this administration and our Commander in Chief have prioritized illegal immigrants over our own citizens.

I am wearing a mask in the people’s House. Most of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have been vaccinated, or have had COVID. We have social distancing, and we are still wearing masks. What a pathetic posture as we just release hundreds every day, thousands upon
thousands—some say the infection rate is upward of 20 percent—into the interior of our country and into our communities while we the American people have spent trillions of dollars and made untold sacrifices to help our country get back to its feet. It is just unbelievable.

Those poor Border Patrol agents, who have had to hear that they too should be defunded, are hamstrung, at best. They see the revolting door.

How would you like to go to work every day, Mr. Speaker, with a clear mission, and a righteous and patriotic mission, to secure the border and protect your citizens and have a Commander in Chief who says come one, come all, and has such little regard for the rule of law and for those who risk their lives every day to enforce it?

These are just the cold, hard facts. It is the truth. I believe, and always have, in the American people's good judgment. While some folks may have had an aversion to the style and personality of the last President—I can appreciate that—they have to look back and say that he achieved unprecedented results that left this Nation safer, stronger, and more prosperous than we have in recent history, if ever.

Mr. Speaker, I pray our country will return to that level of strength, and I pray this President will embrace the facts and reality. I hope he comes to visit border States like Texas and listens to the cries that have gone unheeded, andadministration from the people of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, California, and throughout this land who need him to step up and be our Commander in Chief.

Mr. Speaker, I am done, and I yield back the balance of my time.
unprecedented and extended response to the COVID–19 pandemic. She and her dedicated team at the health department have worked tirelessly to maintain essential public health services during a large-scale emergency response.

She continues to work closely with community partners to mitigate the impact of COVID–19 in Osceola County, Florida. She is a member of the National Association of County and City Health Officials, Florida Public Health Association, Health Leadership Council, AdventHealth Kissimmee Advisory Council, and Osceola County Council on Aging board.

For this and more, Ms. Vianca McCluskey, we honor you.

HONORING RHONDA WILSON

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women’s History Month, I would like to recognize Rhonda Wilson.

Ms. Rhonda Wilson, who has her MS, MBA, and MS, is a victim services administrator over 22 years of professional nonprofit criminal justice and military experience. She has earned three graduate degrees: A master of human services with a criminal justice specialization, a master of business administration, and most recently, as an advocacy services supervisor where she oversees 10 master’s level crisis counselors and interns.

Prior to her work with the Victims Service Center, Ms. Wilson proudly served in the United States Navy for 20 years, specializing in military justice. She took that knowledge and experience and, upon retiring from the Navy, served as the director of an 88-bed residential treatment center helping Federal inmates transition back into the community.

Rhonda has extensive training related to sexual assault and assisting victims of crime. She is a member of the Sexual Assault Response Team and the Florida Crisis Response Team. She was one of the initial first responders in the aftermath of the Pulse mass shooting tragedy and is often called upon to provide emotional support to law enforcement professionals when impacted by violence.

Rhonda is a respected leader and professional in the field of victim services and was recognized as Victim Advocate of the Year in 2017 by Central Florida Victim Services Network.

For this and more, Ms. Rhonda Wilson, we honor you.

HONORING BELINDA JOHNSON-CORNETT

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women’s History Month, I would like to recognize Belinda Johnson-Cornett.

Ms. Belinda Johnson-Cornett is a master of science and master of business administration degree. She is currently pursuing a doctoral degree in business.

During the 2008 through 2017 period, she served as the administrator and health officer and chief executive officer of the combined Florida Department of Health in Osceola County and Osceola Community Health Services. She remained as chief executive officer of Osceola Community Health Services as the agency transitioned in 2017 to a private, nonprofit federally qualified health center.

Ms. Johnson-Cornett is recognized as a dedicated health advocate, having led many initiatives to increase healthcare access for uninsured and underserved populations. She is a strong supporter of decreasing health disparities by improving social determinants of health for at-risk populations.

She has worked tirelessly to advance community partner engagement in collaborative strategies to improve healthcare access and enhance community resources.

Her leadership was the key driver in 2010 in mobilizing community partners from health, business, government, elected officials, community organizations, faith-based and involved citizens in an Osceola Health Summit, which continues as an annual event.

Ms. Johnson-Cornett’s leadership has brought many tangible results into Osceola County, including $3.3 million in Federal capital improvement funding in 2011, $5.5 million in resources for the disadvantaged minority community of Marydia, and many millions in Federal and private grant funding.

For this and more, Ms. Belinda Johnson-Cornett, we honor you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Seeing no other Members seeking recognition, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Soto) for the remainder of the half hour, 14 minutes.

HONORING ANN CLAUSSEN

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women’s History Month, I would like to recognize Ann Claussen.

Ann Claussen has served in various leadership positions for 29 years in Polk County, Florida. During her career with State Farm Insurance Company, she has held many different leadership positions in the life and health industry as a practitioner and healthcare executive.

She has earned a master of science and master of business administration degree. She is currently pursuing a doctoral degree in business.

In January 2014, Ms. Claussen took a leap of faith to start her new career as the CEO of Central Florida Healthcare. Serving in this role has allowed her to focus on her lifelong passion for making a difference in her community by providing a patient-centered medical home to over 56,000 patients.

With growth in 14 clinics and 500 employees, Ms. Claussen’s passion for serving her community is demanding each day by her genuine compassion to be a servant leader. With an understanding of building relationships and partnering for a healthier community, she serves on the United Way board, Junior Diabetes Research Foundation, and other boards.

In 2010 in mobilizing community partners from health, business, government, elected officials, community organizations, faith-based and involved citizens in an Osceola Health Summit, which continues as an annual event.

Ms. Claussen’s leadership was the key driver in 2010 in mobilizing community partners from health, business, government, elected officials, community organizations, faith-based and involved citizens in an Osceola Health Summit, which continues as an annual event.
Ms. Claussen’s goal is to continue to focus on expanding healthcare and creating a positive work environment surrounded by people who share her passion for making a difference in our community. With her caring heart, she leads by example and has been instrumental in partnering with other community leaders who have the same passion to serve.

Ann is married to Jim and has two sons, Justin and Ryan. For this and more, Ms. Ann Claussen, we honor you.

HONORING JENNIE CYRAN
Mr. SOTO. In honor of Women’s History Month, I would like to recognize Jennie Cyran.

Ms. Jennie Cyran, a resident of Haines City, currently serves as a 5th grade English language arts teacher in Polk County Public Schools. She transferred schools to help overcome turn-around status and provide a consistent, quality education to all students.

She is an accomplished visionary leader with 5 years of teaching experience to her credit. She is not just anything to advocate for what is best for her students and teachers all over the State of Florida.

Some of Ms. Cyran’s most notable accomplishments include being named to NPR’s Best Commencement Addresses Ever List in 2014 for her graduation speech from Niagara University; being nominated for the Touchdown for Teachers award in 2010, 2011, 2014 and 2016, given by the National Football League’s Buffalo Bills for dedication to the community in which she lived; the 2018 Distinguished Alumni Award from Niagara University, New York; and the Polk County Teacher of the Year award for 2019.

Since moving to Florida, she became very active in Polk County Special Olympics and has helped coach sports such as bowling, softball, swimming, and bocce. She plays unified sports with her brother, Philip, who has autism. Unified sports gives the opportunity to teach acceptance through competitive play while mentoring athletes who have a cognitive disability so that they can build relationships with others and be more successful in everyday life. In the summer of 2018, she was named Polk County’s Most Inspirational Unified Partner of the Year.

Ms. Cyran is currently completing her doctorate in educational leadership from Florida Southern College and aspires to be a principal someday. She is a living example of Rita Pearson’s quote: “Every child deserves a champion: an adult who will never give up on them, who understands the power of connection and insists that they become the best they can possibly be.”

For this and more, Ms. Jennie Cyran, we honor you.

HONORING AMAYA BRANNON
Mr. SOTO. In honor of Women’s History Month, I would like to recognize Amaya Brannon.

Amaya Brannon is a 10-year-old resident of Auburndale, Florida, and an active, energetic, and personable young woman in the community.

She lives with her aunt Michelle and uncle Brian, along with her sisters, Shianne and Hailey. She enjoys playing soccer, dancing with her sisters, practicing Brazilian jiujitsu with her uncle Brian, and being active outdoors.

As a straight-A student in Code Academy in Lakeland, she participates in multiple school activities, including the Fuel Up to Play 60 program.

Amaya has aspirations of a future career in public relations or reporting, all while honing her skills as an artist. She has a heart for giving and helping others in the world.

Most recently, Amaya represented her community as the NFL PLAY 60 Super Kid Ambassador and the Good Morning America Super Bowl Kid Correspondent. She received VIP access during Super Bowl LIV. Throughout the week, she interviewed players from both teams, hosted a virtual Kids Play Day, was interviewed live on the Taste of the NFL show, practiced with the Buccaneers cheerleaders, and was featured during the second half the Super Bowl. Amaya also reported multiple times throughout the week about her experience live on GMA.

In her heart for helping and leading others, Amaya has pledged to eat healthy and move 60 minutes each day. Despite being a bit on the short side and even bad weather, she has been able to remain active. Amaya believes: “If you are healthy and active, you can achieve great goals in life.”

For this and more, Miss Amaya Brannon, we honor you.

HONORING FRANCISCO H. DE JESUS
Mr. SOTO. In honor of National Borinqueneers Day on April 13, I would like to recognize Francisco H. De Jesus.

Francisco H. De Jesus was born on March 9, 1924, in the small town of Penuelas, Puerto Rico. In 1950, he was one of the Borinqueneers that was deployed to the Korean war on the USNS Marine Lynx. Francisco served for 1 year in the Korean war and then transferred to Panama for a tour as a Military Police member.

Upon completing his active service, Francisco returned to Puerto Rico, rejoining his young family in San Juan. He was an entrepreneur, pursuing numerous business ventures before establishing a very well-known men’s store called Heryck’s Men’s Store in Caparra Terrace.

In 1976, Francisco sold his beloved store and moved his family to Orlando, Florida. For 20 years, Francisco worked for the Orange County School Board as a community liaison in the immigration department. He played a pivotal role in registering migrant families and their children to attend school during the year. Francisco was a beloved husband, father of seven children, grandfather of 14, and great-grandfather of 16. He is still an avid storyteller, loves listening to music, and is a great dominoes player.

Francisco recently celebrated his 97th birthday in Orlando, Florida.

For this and more, Mr. Francisco H. De Jesus, we honor you.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OFFICER KEVIN VALENCIA
Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Officer Kevin Valencia of the Orlando Police Department, who was a courageous and heroic officer, a loving husband, father, son, brother, and friend.

On June 11, 2018, Officer Kevin Valencia was shot and critically injured while responding to a domestic violence call where a deranged individual took his own life after killing four children and shooting Officer Valencia.

Officer Valencia risked his life for people he didn’t even know, a risk that many in the law enforcement profession take every day without question. Since that tragic night, Officer Valenzuela has been fighting for his life with his family by his side.

Regretfully, Officer Valencia passed away this week on March 15, 2021, after succumbing to the injuries he sustained.

Officer Kevin Valencia will be remembered by his loved ones as a hero, who selflessly gave to others and always had the best humor.

He is survived by his wife, Meghan Valencia, and their two sons, Kaleb and Kolton.

Thank you, Kevin Valencia, officer of OPD, for your great sacrifices. We mourn your passing, and may you rest in peace.

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

ADJOURNMENT
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 9 o’clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 18, 2021, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were transmitted from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

EC-612. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Clearing and Risk, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Exemption from Derivatives Clearing Organization Registration (Release No.: 3235-AM55) received February 24, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 668) to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-613. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Clearing and Risk, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s joint final rule—Counter Margin Rules for Security Futures (Release No.: 34-90244; File No.: 87-09-19) (RIN: 3235-AM55) received February 25,
By Mr. DONALDS (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. MANN): H.R. 1954. A bill to amend the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 to clarify that during a lapse in appropriations certain services relating to the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Forecasting System are excepted services under the Anti-Deficiency Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1956. A bill to temporarily modify the application of the sequester under the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. WELCH): H.R. 1957. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to expand and expedite access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY: H.R. 1958. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to provide for the expedited removal of unaccompanied alien children who are not victims of a severe form of trafficking in persons and who do not have a fear of returning to their country of nationality or last habitual residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARR in the name of the Ways and Means Committee: H.R. 1959. A bill to promote and ensure defense access to military care facilities in the District of Columbia; to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to develop policies to provide care for infertility treatment and standard fertility preservation services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MCDONALD: H.R. 1960. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act, by providing that the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall receive in any case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HARWIG, Mr. STANTON, Mr. MOUTON, Ms. RICE of New York, Mr. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. NARDELLI): H.R. 1961. A bill to ensure that individuals with disabilities and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methods meeting their unique learning needs, to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. DEVENISH of South Carolina, Ms. SUAREZ of Florida, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. MAST, Mr. DUNN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. POSHY, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BLIRIKIS, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. GIMENEZ): H.R. 1962. A bill to increase funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic, located at 400 College Drive,
Middleburg, Florida, the “A.K. Baker VA Clinic”; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 1961. A bill to provide procedures for appealing certain Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives rulings or determinations as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1962. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a new employment, training, and services program for unemployed and underemployed individuals, including individuals with barriers to employment and those who are unemployed or underemployed as a result of COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH (for herself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. JACKSON of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FERNSTROM, and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 1963. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to modify certain State uses of funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR of Georgia, Mrs. ROBERTS, Mr. GOTTMER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GOHMER):

H.R. 1964. A bill to direct the State of Arizona to submit a report to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GOHMER (for himself, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. RODGERS of Texas, Mr. BUCY of California, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. BURBET, Mr. TRUCK, Mr. BABBIN, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. GARTZ):

H.R. 1965. A bill to award three congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protect the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GONZÁLEZ-COLON (for herself, Mr. VELAZQUEZ, and Mrs. RADERWAGEN):

H.R. 1966. A bill to require executive agencies to reduce cost-sharing requirements for certain grants with certain nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON:

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to expand the list of diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans served in the Republic of Vietnam to include hypertension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FERNSTROM, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mrs. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. NORMAN, and Mrs. MILLER-MEeks):

H.R. 1971. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Resources to submit to the Congress a report on State child care regulations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORKSPOKE:

H.R. 1974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest income received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KEAPAL and Ms. herself, Mr. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BETTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BRENNAN P. BOYD of Louisiana, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLAIRE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COREN, Mr. DUTCH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DIFAZIO, Ms. DREW, Mr. FAULKNER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOUGETT, Mr. MICHALI, F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CORRINE L. FRANKLIN of Florida, Ms. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GHJALVA, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. KARHULA, Mr. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. Langevin, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. McNICHOL, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENDO, Mr. NADER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGRESE, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAUNITA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAZ, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRESSLY, Mr. ROYAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARABANES, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SARRANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIRR, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WATER, Mrs. WATSON of Georgia, Mr. WILCH, Ms. WILD, WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. FALLONE, and Mr. PEACE of North Carolina:

H.R. 1976. A bill to establish an improved Medicare for All national health insurance program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Rules, Oversight and Reform, Armed Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committees concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. FERNSTROM):

H.R. 1977. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the public reporting of certain contributions received by charitable organizations associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans served in the Republic of Vietnam to include hypertension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

H.R. 1978. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exempt from premium and cost-sharing requirements for vaccines for seniors as part of the Medicare & You handbook and to ensure that the treatment of cost sharing for vaccines under Medicare part D is consistent with the treatment of vaccines under Medicare part B, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committees concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. OMA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1979. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a corporate tax rate increase on companies whose ratio of compensation of the CEO or other highest paid employee to median worker compensation is more than 50 to 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself, Mr. HERRELL, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. ISSA, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BAIR, Mr. BUD, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 1980. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 1981. A bill to require the Inspector General to submit a report on the transfer of student debt functions from the Department...
of Education to the Department of the Treasury, including costs of such a transfer and the mitigation of the duplication of duties by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. PINOKE, Mr. KGANNA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 18. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the time limitation for the use of entitlement by certain veterans under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 19. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to protect beneficiaries with limb loss and other orthopedic conditions by providing access to appropriate, safe, effective, positive, and prosthetic care, to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse with respect to orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 1991. A bill to direct the Attorney General to child custody and divorce in domestic violence cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. SEWELL, and Ms. CHERNEY):

H.R. 1992. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish programs for carbon dioxide capture, transport, utilization, and storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees 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 Ms. VEILÁQUEZ (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1993. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide grants for energy improvements to certain public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELGAIO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KATRO, Mr. KIND, Mr. NEUKESE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. SEIBS):

H.R. 1994. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to review laws relating to the illegal passing of schoolbus, execute a public safety messaging campaign related to illegal passing of schoolbus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1995. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 243. A resolution removing a certain Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H. Res. 244. A resolution electing a certain Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BERA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CONOLLY, Mrs. LAWSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. PRESLER, Mr. OMAR, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. NGSU, and Ms. JACOBS of California):

H. Res. 245. A resolution calling for renewed, decisive, and robust international collaboration and coordination to fight COVID-19 across Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLIRAKIS (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SANCHEZ, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Res. 246. A resolution recognizing the 200th anniversary of the independence of Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BARN, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CHERNOH, Mr. CURIEL, Mr. DODGGET, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. FALLON, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GoHMERT, Mr. TONY GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. VIVIAN GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRANGER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McCAL, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. PFLOUGHER, Mr. ROY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. DUNYNE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas):

H. Res. 247. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Congressman Ronald Wright and extending his devotion to the Nation and its ideals; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LAHOD:

H. Res. 248. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of March 23, 2021, through April 3, 2021, as “National Cleaning Week”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself, Mr. HUISINGA, Mr. CISCA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LUEBREIT, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BARE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. HILL, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MOONSTEIN, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BUDD, Mr. KIEFFER, Mr. MOONSTEIN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STEIL, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H. Res. 249. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should not impose a financial transaction tax on financial and commodity market intermediaries in connection with trades executed on the National Market System or alternative trading systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself and Mr. LOUDERMILK):

H. Res. 250. A resolution requiring each Member, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives to complete a program of emergency preparedness training during
each Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-2. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Legislative Resolution 1, expressing enthusiastic support for the United States Air Force to reestablish the United States Space Command headquarters at Offutt Air Force Base near Omaha, Nebraska, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ML-3. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, urging Congress to enact The Sunshine Protection Act of 2019, which would permanently extend daylight saving time; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. STEIL:
H.R. 1953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8: "To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States..."

By Mr. DONALDS:
H.R. 1954.

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

By Mr. DONALDS:
H.R. 1955.

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

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHester:
H.R. 1956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:
H.R. 1957.

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

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:
H.R. 1958.

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

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 1959.

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

By Mrs. CAMMACK:

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

By Mr. GRENshaw:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 8: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 1962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. FOSTER:
H.R. 1964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Miss GONZÁLEz-COLÓN:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; 

By Mr. HARDER of California:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8.

By Mrs. HINSON:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 18.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ISSA:

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 I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(2) 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, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

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

By Mr. KIND:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Ms. KUSTER:

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . . ”

By Ms. LEE of California: H.R. 1792.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois: H.R. 1890.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARSON of North Carolina: H.R. 1891.

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

Article 1, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. PANETTA: H.R. 1892.

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

Article 1, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. FLEischmann: H.R. 1893.

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. FLEischmann: H.R. 1894.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ: H.R. 1895.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. STEFANIK: H.R. 1896.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE: H.R. 1897.

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

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of Counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Laws of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

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

By Mr. THOMPSON of California: H.R. 1898.

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

Article 1

By Mrs. TORRES of California: H.R. 1899.

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

Article 1

By Mr. VEASEY: H.R. 1900.

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. 1901.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mrs. PALORSKI: H.R. 1902.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ZELDIN: H.R. 1903.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 6: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 18: Mr. REED.

H.R. 37: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 43: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 233: Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 239: Mr. POSTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 245: Mr. KEATING, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 333: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 340: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 350: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. STOKELAND, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VELA, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 396: Mr. LAHAR of Connecticut and Mr. MIRVAN.

H.R. 384: Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 43: Mr. García of Illinois, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 432: Mr. SOTO and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 461: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 477: Mr. TAMM and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 501: Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 508: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 534: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 541: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 543: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 568: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 707: Mr. SABLON, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 712: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 746: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 809: Mr. LUNA.


H.R. 846: Mr. MIRVAN.

H.R. 852: Mr. TURNER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. RYAN, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 911: Mr. McCaUL and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 914: Mr. DINGELL and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 941: Mr. Jonas and Mr. SWALWELL.

H.R. 1035: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. CHRIST.

H.R. 1085: Mr. BAHN and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1146: Mr. KHANNA and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1145: Mr. KIND, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 1194: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1202: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1207: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. Michael P. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1238: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1246: Mr. GALLAGHER and Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1262: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1299: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1238: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1332: Ms. MENDELSON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1344: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. Sires, Ms. MENG, and Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 1346: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 1352: Mr. KILDER and Mr. García of Illinois.

H.R. 1362: Mr. KELLER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BOST, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1366: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 1376: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1384: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1417: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 1448: Mr. GUTERIE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BOST, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HERN,
PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, PT-3. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Redlands, CA, relative to Resolution No. 8159, urging the United States Congress to enact the Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act (H.R. 763); which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable MARTIN HENRICH, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

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

Let us pray.
Father in Heaven, bless our Senators. May they strive to act with integrity. Guide them to listen to the voice of conscience, seeking to please You with their motives as well as their actions. Lord, give them such ethical congruence that their words will be validated by laudable actions. Test their hearts with Your unfailing love, empowering them to become instruments of Your peace. Mighty God, keep their feet on solid ground.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication of Allegiance, as follows:

HEINRICH, a Senator from the State of

Mr. HENRICH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

PPP EXTENSION ACT OF 2021
Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a second, I will move the PPP bill to the floor. I hope—and I ask our Republican colleagues to cooperate—that we can move this bipartisan PPP proposal without delay. It passed the House overwhelmingly. A vast majority of Democrats and Republicans voted for it. I hope we can move it quickly here in the Senate as it expires on March 31, and there are some changes that were made in the ARP that people need time to adapt to and implement. To allow a lapse would not be the right thing to do for so many of our small business people across the country. So I am hoping that our Republican colleagues will move the bill with the same alacrity with which it passed in the House with an overwhelmingly bipartisan majority. I think there were fewer than 10 votes against it.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1799
Mr. SCHUMER. With that, Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:
A bill (H.R. 1799) to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to extend the covered period for the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

GEORGIA SHOOTINGS
Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now let me proceed to my remarks.

First, on the terrible tragedy in Georgia, the people of Atlanta, GA, and the surrounding communities were just shocked last night by a series of shootings that left eight people dead, six of whom were of Asian descent.

The motivations behind this devastation tragedy are still unknown, but there is a legitimate concern that these killings may have been racially motivated. Over the past year, the Asian-American community has faced a rising tide of abuse and violence in the wake of COVID-19, driven by ignorance, by misinformation, and by age-old prejudices against the Asian-American community. Tragically, hate crimes against Asian Americans have skyrocketed.

There is bigotry in the land and far too much of it. These dark forces have always existed in America, but recently, they seem to have been unleashed. The sort of superego that puts
these things down seems to have weakened, and the id seems to have strengthened.

We cannot lose for a moment our vigilance against these forces of hate, intolerance, bigotry, and discrimination. I have come to believe that our Asian-American community, the lives that they have done so much for our community. The Senate is once again making history by confirming President Biden’s nominees. We began the week by confirming a history-making Cabinet member, Interior Secretary Haaland. Yesterday, we confirmed Isabel Guzman as the SBA Administrator. Today, we will confirm another consequential administrative appointment, the U.S. Trade Representative.

President Biden has named Katherine Tai, the daughter of proud immigrants from Taiwan, a veteran of the Office of the Trade Representative, President Obama, and one of our country’s most seasoned experts in international trade. That—Ms. Tai—is what America is all about.

We welcome her. We give her a great position of authority because of her expertise. And maybe—you know, I will leave it at that. It is a great contrast to the tragedy I was talking about a few minutes ago and the ascension of another proud American of Asian ancestry here.

As U.S. Trade Representative, Ms. Tai will play a crucial role in enforcing existing trade deals and making sure that American workers, businesses, and researchers can compete on a level playing field. This is a top priority of this Congress, and I will put S. 1, the For the People Act, on the floor of the Senate.

For too long, we have let really important things fall through the cracks. Unholy dark money flows into campaigns. Special interests have too much influence in Washington. And worst of all, there is a concerted, nationwide effort to limit the right of American citizens, particularly people of color, to vote.

Throughout America’s history, we have seen a continuous cycle of expansions in our democracy being met that often by vehement backlash from those who wish to maintain an exclusionary status quo.

Earlier this year, we witnessed only the latest example in the form of a violent insurrection right here in this Chamber. After the Capitol attack fueled by the insidious lies of the former President aimed at overturning the results of a free and fair election.

In the wake of the November election, one of the safest and most secure countries in the world, the United States, has seen hundreds of bills aimed at tightening voting rules. I will continue to make the case that these bills, sadly, are aimed at Americans of color—Black Americans, Latinos, Native Americans.

Despicable efforts to target these historically disenfranchised communities have become a central component of the electoral strategy of one of America’s major political parties. Shame on them. Shame. It is infuriating. Infuriating.

When you lose an election, you are supposed to win over the people you lost. It is not from voting. That is un-American, autocratic, and against the fundamentals of our democracy, but this is happening in States all across the country—across the country.

I am going to be a top priority this Congress. We will fight and fight and fight to get this done legislatively. Failure is not an option. Too darn much is at stake.

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Now on the American Rescue Plan Act. I would like to continue shining a spotlight on different aspects of ARP. This has helped so many people and so much of the country. It is easy to forget how many crucial parts of the bill. So later today, I will be joining my dear friend Representative Velázquez from New York to talk about how the American Rescue Plan helps Puerto Rico, which is too often an afterthought in Federal legislation.

The American Rescue Plan Act will do three historic things for the people of Puerto Rico, American citizens:

First, it will cut $2 billion dollars to the island’s earned income tax credit for low-wage workers for the first time ever.

These laws and their various cousins in Republican State legislatures across the country are one of the greatest threats to modern American democracy. According to a recent report in the Washington Post, these laws could strain every available method of voting for tens of millions of Americans, potentially amounting to the most sweeping contraction of ballot access in the United States since the end of Reconstruction, when Southern States curtailed the voting rights of formerly enslaved Black men.
Second, it will expand eligibility for residents to claim the child tax credit. Prior to the ARP, only families with three or more children in Puerto Rico could claim the child tax credit. Why those American citizens were treated differently than all the others was beyond me and the American people. But now every family can.

Third, the ARP bill will add $1 billion—$1 billion—in food assistance. Residents of American territories don’t receive traditional food assistance programs such as the SNAP program, but instead their governments receive block grants that have been capped by the Federal Government.

The American Rescue Plan makes sure that Puerto Rico, which suffers devastating rates of poverty, 43 percent, and especially childhood poverty—an unacceptable 57 percent of all the children in Puerto Rico live in poverty. So we want to make sure that Puerto Rico receives its fair share of Federal food assistance.

The American Rescue Plan may be the greatest anti-poverty effort in a generation, and we make sure that Puerto Rico is part of it.

Now, my attention to schools. One of most enduring images of the COVID-19 pandemic will be the empty classroom. For 12 months, teachers have done their level best to keep their students engaged with remote learning, but there have been incredible difficulties. Too many students don’t have reliable internet. Too many parents can’t be there to help young kids log on and keep up with their work. Simply put, there is no replacement for having kids in the classroom. We need to get our schools to reopen as quickly and as safely as possible.

Now, my Republican colleagues have made a lot of noise about reopening our schools, but they don’t want to dedicate any resources to actually getting it done. We need money to do this. There are many more expenses under COVID.

Through the American Rescue Plan, Senate Democrats delivered the single largest investment in American education ever. We are proud of that. Proud. Let me say it again. Through the American Rescue Plan, Senate Democrats delivered the single largest investment in American education ever—ever—ever—$170 billion to repair the damage caused by this pandemic, three-quarters of which will go directly to K–12 education, prioritizing school districts that need it the most. This will help schools update ventilation, hire more nurses and janitors, make classroom sizes smaller, and make getting kids to and from school safe.

In short, the American Rescue Plan will greatly accelerate the safe and effective reopening of schools. Once kids are back in the classroom, the American Rescue Plan will help make sure they can stay there and succeed. After what has been a lost year for too many students, this bill provides significant support for learning recovery programs—after school programs, summer school programs, and other resources to help kids catch up and get back on track.

Through the American Rescue Plan, we have made a life-changing investment in our students. It is one of the many ways this bill will help us recover from the crisis and come back stronger than ever before.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the presence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

**NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Last week, our Democratic colleagues had to resort to a rare tactic to rescue the stalled nomination of Xavier Becerra to run the Department of Health and Human Services.

The distinguishing feature of this nominee’s resume is not his expertise in health, medicine, or administration. That part of the resume is very brief.

What stands out are Mr. Becerra’s commitments to paring down our military, and his far-left ideology.

He has supported the sweeping government takeover of healthcare they call “Medicare for All,” which would actually end Medicare as we know it and rip away families’ private insurance plans.

As the administration’s policies continue to create a border crisis, Mr. Becerra is someone who believes we should not just have blanket amnesty, but that entering the country illegally should not even be a crime.

And even amid a global pandemic, the most significant health-related experience on the nominee’s record is his efforts to wield the legal system against religious Sisters to make them violate their faith and conscience.

Up to now, every person who has ever been confirmed as Secretary of Health and Human Services has either been favorably reported by the Finance Committee or discharged by unanimous consent. There is ample reason why this nominee would be a glaring exception.

I continue to urge a “no” vote.

**NOMINATION OF KATHERINE C. TAI**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, tomorrow, the Secretary of State and the President’s National Security Advisor will have their first face-to-face meeting with Chinese officials. I am glad our officials met with regional allies like Japan and South Korea right beforehand and have been in touch with Australia and European allies as well. It is essential that we and our friends present a united front.

Now, the United States and the whole world need the President’s team to deliver a strong message tomorrow.

During the campaign, President Biden spoke dismissively about the threat from China. But thus far, in office, his team has shown signs they understand that Communist China threatens America, our allies, and the prevailing international system.

The world spent years presuming that welcoming China into the international community would inevitably cause its rulers to play by the rules. Twenty years ago, President Clinton said: “[E]conomic innovation and political empowerment . . . will inevitably go hand in hand. But since then, rather than the rise of the world export of liberty and transparency into China, Beijing has found more success exporting authoritarianism and corruption beyond its borders.
In Japan, on Tuesday, Secretary Blinken called out the “coercion and aggression” that China deploys at home and abroad. He said this administration will push back on Beijing. That clear-eyed talk is certainly welcome, but it is just a step.

Walking the walk will mean actually responding in tough ways to espionage and cyber attacks, to violations of human rights, to military bullying, to stealing intellectual property and cheating on trade. If the administration doesn’t do that, they will end up strong partners in this Republican conference.

Here is one big test: Are they willing to keep investing in our own defense? The financial commitment to defending America is our most important policy lever in this competition with China. Our allies and adversaries do not heed American Presidents because they are charming or good-looking. The world has respected America for our overwhelming military and economic superiority. When that erodes, we invite trouble.

As a share of our economy, American defense spending has fallen significantly, not just from Cold War-era heights but even recently. Meanwhile, China used its growing prosperity to modernize its military, develop new and longer range weapons to hold U.S. forces at risk from further away, and turn a particular eye towards space and cyber space.

Defense spending is about protecting our homeland. It is about projecting power. It is about preserving global influence, supporting our allies. It is really a barometer of our national will.

It is also about innovation and the future. Many life-changing innovations throughout our economy were first rooted in military R&D.

Unfortunately, reports suggest the Biden administration may plan to freeze defense spending. Of course, that means a reduction, after inflation. Dozens of Democrats are pressuring the administration for even steeper cuts than that. If the administration is serious about competing with China, deterring Russia, and preserving American leadership, the most important test will be in the President’s budget submission.

Some of our Senate Democratic colleagues have expressed interest in crafting bipartisan legislation related to China. It is long past time we consider ways to promote and protect American R&D, and for broadly strengthening American R&D.

There is an opportunity for fruitful discussion here. Certainly, this is an area where bipartisanship will be especially valuable because the stakes are huge and the change is likely to be quite different with every election. As one of our Democratic colleagues said in a hearing yesterday, “the U.S. will not out-compete China . . . with short-term legislation and near-enduring uncertainty.”

That is another great argument for not trashing the legislative filibuster. Imagine if every action the Senate takes with national security implications were constantly subject to being wiped clean. While China plans years and decades at a time, our Federal legislation would be reduced to a shelf life of a couple years.

These issues need to be addressed thoughtfully and deliberately. Identifying critical technologies and the best ways to promote and protect advancements needs to be a smart, fact-based process, not a political guessing game or throwing cash at industries with the right connections.

Our work on this front should strengthen our ties with our allies and partners, not try in vain to simply go it alone.

And the Democratic majority must resist the temptation to pile a long list of unrelated policy wishes into a big package and try to label it “China policy.” It would be quite a remarkable coincidence if our Democratic colleagues’ vision for a so-called China package and try to label it “China policy.”

Our work on this front should strengthen our ties with our allies and partners, not try in vain to simply go it alone.

And the Democratic majority must resist the temptation to pile a long list of unrelated policy wishes into a big package and try to label it “China policy.” It would be quite a remarkable coincidence if our Democratic colleagues’ vision for a so-called China bill ends up being indistinguishable from a list of things that just happen to delight liberal interest groups.

Getting America on a stronger footing will not require some sweeping far-left transformation of our economy. It will mean continuing to complement the principles and ideas that are our greatest strengths, and it will mean working on key issues the right way, across the aisle.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Katherine C. Tai, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of ambassador, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary public servant and Michigander, Eric Feldman.

Since my first days serving in the United States House of Representatives more than 12 years ago, Eric has served as my chief of staff. I still vividly remember him coming to my home just a couple of weeks after my election to interview for the chief of staff position.

I was immediately impressed by his extensive knowledge of American politics and his passion to serve the people of the State of Michigan.

But to fully know Eric is to know his family’s story and how it shaped the man he is. All four of his grandparents survived the Holocaust. His maternal grandmother was imprisoned in Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen, among others. His maternal grandfather was in a forced labor camp in Plaszow. His grandparents met and married in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp. They were liberated from there and remained after it was converted to a displaced persons camp following World War II. That camp is where Eric’s mother was born.

His grandparents and mother immigrated in 1949 to Detroit, where his grandfather worked as a janitor at Ford Motor Company during the day and worked as a tailor at night. His grandfather and grandmother never went to high school. Eric’s father was born. Following the war, they immigrated to Israel before settling in Detroit. Eric’s father went to Wayne State University, thanks to the GI bill, after serving honorably in the U.S. Air Force.

If I remember correctly, Eric once said his family’s story was one of “survival and triumph.”

After immigrating to Detroit, Eric’s family worked hard, and they were able to achieve the American dream. There is no question that their life experience and their journey instilled in Eric a sense of service and devotion to country.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I was fortunate to have Eric on my team. He brought with him extensive political and policy experience, having worked for Congressman Joe Armstrong, Congressman John Dingell, and Rahm Emanuel. He built on that experience, leading our office with steady, unwavering leadership, brilliant vision, and wise counsel.

In the 117th Congress, Eric and I worked together on the maximum re-election——including my election to the Senate and re-election last year——and many crises impacting Michigan and our country.

I entrusted Eric to help ensure that we were able to come together, solve tough problems, and ultimately deliver results. I would never finish. I could always count on Eric to work with our team to develop creative ideas to tackle challenges or empower staff to make
March 17, 2021

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S1581

sured that we were on the leading edge of issues critical to Michigan.

He has guided my office through countless high-profile events and crises: the great recession and auto crisis, the Flint water crisis, several government shutdowns, the COVID pandemic, the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol, and two impeachment trials. Through it all, Eric has provided stability and focus—a focus on working in a bipartisan manner to pass important legislation and to make progress for Michigan and for our entire country.

Last week, I was humbled to be recognized by the Center for Effective Lawmaking as one of the most effective Senators in the 116th Congress. Recognition of this sort does not happen without having an incredible team. Eric played a critical role in helping me enact 10 bills into law—the most of any Senator from either party over the last 2 years. And I know that Eric will tell you, without a doubt, that there is no ‘I’ in team. As a leader, Eric has focused on hiring talented staff, both in DC and across Michigan, staff that humbly, selflessly, and effectively serve the people of Michigan each and every day. With Eric’s laser focus on what is best for Michigan, together with our team, we have secured record funding to protect the Great Lakes, worked to increase the safety and security at our Nation’s borders, expanded apprenticeships and skills training, saved taxpayer dollars, and made the Federal Government more efficient, all the while standing up for Michigan workers, including those working in our auto industry.

Eric is always on the leading edge, and he has distinguished himself through his work with Michigan’s auto manufacturers and automotive stakeholders. In particular, Eric has helped drive policy efforts focused on innovation and emerging technologies so that in the near future, self-driving vehicles will not only be safely deployed and save thousands of lives on our high-ways, but also be developed and built in Michigan and in the United States, creating good-paying jobs for the next generation of workers.

At every step of the way, through all of his hard work, Eric has carried him-self with his characteristic enthusiasm and passion. It is only fitting, as an alumnus of the University of Michigan and a fervent—very fervent—Wolverine fan, he has, and I quote, an enthusiasm unknown to mankind. Whatever it is police work, or casework, or an issue important to constituents, there is no doubt that Eric approaches it with keen interest and with high energy and that he will think through every single possibility.

But Eric has been much more than just a chief aide. Colleen and I feel incredibly fortunate not only for all that Eric has done to lead my office and deliver for the people of Michigan; we count on him as a confidant and a dear friend.

Eric, you will be missed dearly as you depart for your next endeavor in the private sector. But I am grateful for what you have built, and I know that it will endure—a culture of teamwork, hard work, productivity, and a commitment to what is best for Michiganders.

Eric, I know and I know that you have devoted countless hours to a job that you love while balancing the two most important roles in your life: being a loving husband and a father. I have been proud to watch you celebrate many milestones over the years, including the birth of your two beloved sons, and I will certainly never forget your eldest son Avi’s birthday on November 4, 2014, the day Michiganders elected me to the U.S. Senate.

Eric, Colleen and I wish you much success, and we hope you enjoy this next chapter with Dena, Avi, and Ethan. Know that Colleen and I will always be thankful beyond measure for your service and for your leadership and that you will forever be part of Team Peters.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks before the vote.

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

{The remarks of Mr. Thune pertaining to the introduction of S. 797 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”}

Mr. THUNE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. And for the information of the Senators, I will speak for about 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you.

GEORGIA SHOOTING

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to start by taking a moment to address the awful violence we saw in Georgia yesterday.

Everyone, especially elected officials, needs to not just speak out but to act against this deadly display of hate.

To the victims and their families and to the Sagainst the administration’s constant attacks on families’ healthcare, are numerous; they are enormous; and they are absolutely urgent.

COVID-19 has killed over a half a million people, and that number continues to rise. When it comes to the hard work ahead to not only end this pandemic but rebuild a stronger and fairer country, it is clear we need an experienced leader at the Department of Health and Human Services. It is clear to me that Eric has absolutely devastated communities and pushed our healthcare system to the brink.

In Congress, he worked to help people get quality, affordable healthcare by passing the Children’s Health Insurance Program and the Affordable Care Act. In California, he has fought in court to defend the Affordable Care Act and time and time again has gone on camera to shout for patients, like when he won a $70 million settlement from pharmaceutical companies for blocking cheaper generic drugs from market, when he won a settlement from opioid manufacturers because of the addiction crisis and joined a bipartisan investigation into whether opioids were unlawfully marketed, when he sued e-cigarette companies for marketing tobacco products to children and led a bipartisan effort with the Republican attorney general of Nebraska to protect kids from tobacco imagery, or when he worked to investigate companies and hold them accountable for putting workers at risk by failing to follow COVID-19 safety measures.

Attorney General Becerra has also worked to acknowledge and address issues driving inequities in healthcare. As leader of California’s Department of Health, he fought in court against the Trump administration rule that undermined care for the LGBTQ community, against the administration’s constant efforts to undermine reproductive healthcare and against its blatant disregard for the well-being of migrant children.

Attorney General Becerra also established a new Bureau of Disability
Rights at his department, as well as a new office focused on environmental justice, including how pollution and public health hazards disproportionately hurt communities of color.

Overall, his record tells a story that is clear: He is a strong advocate for public health, and it shows in his actions. He has fought against pharmaceutical companies, opioid manufacturers, tobacco companies and polluters and for more affordable, quality healthcare for every patient.

I have no doubt as Secretary that he will put special interests on notice and put patients and public health first and put science, data, and experts back in the driver’s seat. And he would also bring an important perspective to this role as a first-generation college student and the first Latino Secretary of Health and Human Services.

He is exactly the kind of leader we need to make sure we make good on the promise of the historic investments we made in the American Rescue Plan to end this pandemic—investments to rapidly scale up testing and tracing and sequencing so we can identify new strains of COVID and slow the spread; investments to quickly and equitably get vaccines into arms, an effort that requires just making vaccines available but breaking down barriers to access, promoting vaccine confidence, fighting misinformation, and engaging community partners; investments to build our public health infrastructure and protect and train 100,000 public health workers.

He will also be a valuable partner to Congress as we work to address challenges that predate this pandemic but have been made all the more urgent, like rooting out systemic racism and addressing inequities in our healthcare system, which have made this pandemic so much more damaging and deadly for communities of color; like addressing the mental healthcare crisis, which has been exacerbated by this pandemic; or like fighting the opioid epidemic, a crisis which was deadlier than ever this past year; and like expanding access to quality affordable childcare, which has become more difficult for families to get during this pandemic.

When this pandemic is over, we will need a strong leader at the Department to deal with the aftermath and with so many other outstanding issues: bringing down prescription drug prices; making sure healthcare in this country is truly a right, not a privilege; undoing 4 years of attacks on reproductive rights and ensuring every woman can get reproductive healthcare, regardless of their race or income or ZIP Code or disability; lowering our unconscionably high maternal mortality rate; reversing the alarming trend of rising youth tobacco use; and ensuring the Office of Refugee Resettlement is upholding its welfare mission by prioritizing the well-being of every child in its care, ensuring they are treated with decency and humanity and kindness; and working to place children with suitable sponsors quickly and safely.

We have our work cut out for us, but in Attorney General Becerra, we have a Secretary of Health who is up to the job. He has the support not only of Democrats but of Republicans, as the Republican attorneys general of both Louisiana and Tennessee have spoken highly of their experiences working with him.

I urge every Senator who wants the Biden-Harris administration to succeed at ending this pandemic quickly, keeping our families safe, and ensuring everyone can get quality affordable healthcare to join me in voting to confirm him.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON TAI NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Tai nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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:

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 the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 37, Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.


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 Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) is not necessarily absent.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) is not necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Baldwin
Barasso
Bennet
Blackburn
Blumenthal
Blunt
Booker
Boozman
Braun
Brown
Burr
Cassell
Capito
Cardin
Carper
Cassidy
Collins
Coons
Cornyn
Cortez Masto
Cotton
Crandon
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Duckworth
Durbin
Ernst
Fischler
Gillibrand
Graham
Hirono
Jackson
NAYs—49

Barrasso
Blackburn
Blinken
Bryan
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Corbyn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Daines
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Johnson
Lankford
Lee
MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nomination of Hirono was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nomination of Hirono was confirmed.
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The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination of Hirono was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.
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The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 50, the nays 49.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, before I begin my formal remarks, I want to pause to condemn the hatred and violence that took eight precious lives last night in Metropolitan Atlanta.

I agree with Georgians, with Americans, with people of love all across the world. This unspeakable violence visited largely upon the Asian community is one that causes all of us to recommit ourselves to the way of peace, an active peace that prevents these kinds of tragedies from happening in the first place.

We pray for these families.

Mr. President, I rise here today, as a proud American and as one of the newest Members of the Senate, in awe of the journey that has brought me to these hallowed halls and with an abiding sense of reverence and gratitude for the faith and sacrifices of ancestors who paved the way.

I am a proud son of the great State of Georgia, born and raised in Savannah, a coastal city known for its cobblestone streets and verdant town squares. Towering oak trees, centuries old and covered in gray Spanish moss, stretched from one side of the street to the other, bend and beckon the lover of history and horticulture to this city by the sea.

I was educated at Morehouse College, and I still serve in the pulpit of the Ebenezer Baptist Church, both in Atlanta, the cradle of the civil rights movement. And like those oak trees in Savannah, my roots go down deep, and they stretch wide in the soil of Waycross, GA, and Burke County, and Screven County. In a word, I am Georgia, a living example and embodiment of its history and its hope, of its pain and promise, the brutality and possibility.

At the time of my birth, Georgia’s two Senators were Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge, both arch segregationists and unabashed adherents of the civil rights movement.

After the Supreme Court’s landmark Brown v. Board ruling outlawing school segregation, Talmadge warned that “blood will run in the streets of Atlanta.” Senator Talmadge’s father, Eugene Talmadge, former Governor of our State, had famously declared: “The South loves the Negro in his place, but his place is at the back door.”

When once asked how he and his supporters might keep Black people away from the polls, he picked up a scrap of paper and wrote a single word on it: “Fistols.”

Yet there is something in the American covenant, in its charter documents and its Jeffersonian ideals, that bends toward freedom. And led by a preacher and a patriot named King, Americans of all races stood up. History vindicated the movement that sought to bring us closer to our ideals, to lengthen and strengthen the cords of our democracy, and I now hold the seat—the Senate seat—where Herman E. Talmadge sat.

That is why I love America. I love America because we always have a path to make it better, to build a more perfect Union. It is the place where a kid like me, who grew up in public housing, the first college graduate in my family, can now stand as a United States Senator.

I had an older father. He was born in 1917. Serving in the Army during World War II, he was once asked to give up his seat to a young teenager while wearing his soldier’s uniform, as they said, to make it easier for the white kids to get in. “That’s the war we fought,” he told me, “for democracy.” But he was never bitter. By the time I came along, he had already seen the arc of change in our country. He maintained his faith in God and in his family and in the American promise, and he passed that faith on to his children.

My mother grew up in Waycross, GA. Do you know where that is? It is way ‘cross Georgia. Like a lot of Black teenagers in the 1950s, she spent her summers picking somebody else’s tobacco and somebody else’s cotton. But because this is America, the 82-year-old hands that used to pick somebody else’s cotton went to the polls in January and picked her youngest son to be a United States Senator. Ours is a land where possibility is born of democracy: a vote, a voice, a chance to help determine the direction of the country and one’s own destiny within it—possibility born of democracy.

This is why, last November and January, my mom and other citizens of Georgia grabbed hold of that possibility and turned out in record numbers, 5 million in November, 4.5 million in January—far more than ever in our State’s history. Turnout for a typical runoff double, the people of Georgia sent their first African-American Senator and first Jewish Senator, my brother Jon Ossoff, to these hallowed Halls.

But then, what happened? Some politicians did not approve of the choice made by the majority of voters in a hard-fought election in which each side got the chance to make its case to the voters. And rather than adjusting their agenda, rather than changing their message, they are busy trying to change the rules. We are witnessing right now a massive and unabashed assault on voting rights, unlike anything seen since the Jim Crow era. This is Jim Crow with new clothes.

Since the January election, some 250 voter suppression bills have been introduced by State legislatures across the country, from Georgia to Arizona, from New Hampshire and Florida—using the big lie of voter fraud as a pretext for voter suppression—the same big lie that led to a violent insurrection on this very Capitol the day after my election.

Within 24 hours, we elected Georgia’s first African-American and Jewish Senators, and hours later the Capitol was assaulted. You see in just a few precious hours the tension very much alive in the soul of America. The question before all of us at every moment is, What will we do to push us in the right direction?

So politicians, driven by that big lie, aim to severely limit and in some cases eliminate automatic and same-day voter registration, mail-in and absentee voting, and early voting and weekend voting. They want to make it easier to purge voters from the voting roll altogether. As a voting rights activist, I have seen up close just how draconian these measures can be. I hail from a State that purged 200,000 voters from the rolls one Saturday night, in the middle of the night. We know what is happening here. People don’t want some people to vote.

I was honored on a few occasions to stand with our hero and my parishioner, John Lewis. I was his pastor, but I am clear: He was my mentor. On more than one occasion, we boarded buses together after Sunday church services as part of our Souls to the Polls program, encouraging the Ebenezer family and other communities of faith to participate in the democratic process. Now, just a few months after Congressman Lewis’s death, there are those in the Georgia legislature—some who even dared to praise his name—that are now trying to get rid of Sunday Souls to the Polls, making it a crime for people who pray together to get on a bus together in order to vote together. I think that is wrong. As a matter of fact, I think that is constitutional, that is what kind of world we desire for ourselves and for our children, and our prayers are stronger when we pray together.

To be sure, we have seen these kinds of voter suppression tactics before. They are part of a long and shameful history in Georgia and throughout our Nation. But refusing to be denied, Georgia citizens and citizens across our country braved the heat and the cold and the rain, some standing in line for 5 hours, 6 hours, 10 hours just exercising their constitutional right to vote—young people, old people, sick people, working people already underpaid and forced to lose wages to pay a kind of
poll tax while standing in line to vote. And how do some politicians respond? Well, they are trying to make it a crime to give people water and a snack as they wait in lines that are obviously being made longer by their draconian actions.

Think about that. Think about that. They are the ones making the lines longer through these draconian actions. And then they want to make it a crime to bring grandma some water while she is waiting in a line that they are making longer. Make no mistake, this is democracy in reverse. Rather than voters being able to pick the politicians, the politicians are trying to cherry-pick their voters. I say this cannot stand.

And so I rise, Mr. President, because that sacred and noble idea—one person, one vote—is being threatened right now. Politicians in my home State and all across America, in their craven lust for power, have launched a full-fledged assault on voting rights. They are focused on winning at any cost, even the cost of democracy itself. I submit that it is the job of each citizen to stand up for the voting rights of every citizen. And it is the job of this body to do all that it can to defend the viability of our democracy.

That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the For the People Act, which we introduced today. The For the People Act is a major step in the march toward respect for the ideals, making it easier, not harder, for eligible Americans to vote by instituting commonsense, pro-democracy reforms, like establishing national automatic voter registration for every eligible citizen and allowing all Americans to register to vote online and on election day; requiring States to offer at least 2 weeks of early voting, including weekends, in Federal elections, keeping Souls to the Polls programs alive; prohibiting States from making anyone undergo a pointless test to vote absentee or by mail; and preventing States from purging the voting rolls based solely on unreliable evidence like someone’s voting history, something we have seen in Georgia and other States in recent years. And it would end the dominance of Big Money in our politics and ensure our public servants are there serving the public.

Amidst these voter suppression laws and tactics, including partisan and racial gerrymandering, and in the face of an avalanche of evidence, we must ensure that all of the people can speak.

But if not, we must still pass voting rights. The right to vote is preservative of all other rights. It is not just another issue alongside other issues. It is foundational. It is the guarantee that any of us have the privilege of standing here in the first place. It is about the covenant we have with one another as an American people: “e pluribus unum,” out of many, one. It, above all else, was the call that Jefferson made. So let’s be clear. I am not here today to spiral into the procedural argument regarding whether the filibuster in general has merits or has outlived its usefulness. I am here to say that this issue is bigger than the filibuster. I stand before you saying that this issue—access to voting and preempting politicians’ efforts to restrict voting—is so fundamental to our democracy that it is too important to be held hostage by a Senate rule that can be easily manipulated and used to restrict the expansion of voting rights. It is a contradiction to say we must protect minority rights in the Senate while refusing to protect minority rights in the society. Colleagues, no Senate rule should overrule the integrity of our democracy, and we must find a way to pass voting rights, whether we get rid of the filibuster or not.

So as I close—and nobody believes a preacher when he says “as I close”—let me say that I, as a man of faith, believe that democracy is the political enactment of a spiritual idea, the sacred worth of all human beings, the notion that we all have within us a spark of the divine, and a right to participate in the shaping of our destiny. Reinhold Niebuhr was right.

[Humanity’s] capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but [humanity’s] inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary.

John Lewis understood that and was beaten on a bridge defending it. Amelia Boynton, like so many women not mentioned nearly enough, was gassed on that same bridge. A White woman named Viola Liuzzo was killed. Medgar Evers was murdered in his own driveway. Schwerner, Chaney, and Goodman, two Jews and an African American, standing up for that sacred idea of democracy, also paid the ultimate price. And we in this body would be stupid and shortsighted if we failed to understand it.

Are the efforts of the For the People Act to prevent voter suppression and protect the right to vote our procedural argument? I say let’s get this done, no matter what.

I urge my colleagues to pass these two bills, strengthen and lengthen the course of our democracy, and preserve our credibility as the premier voice for freedom-loving people and democratic movements all over the world, and win the future for all of our children.

I yield the floor.

(Applause.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, we can be proud of the bipartisan work the Senate has accomplished in recent years to expand veterans’ benefits. Last Congress, we made significant progress with passage of legislation to enhance education, pensions, burial compensation, and landmark improvements to Department of Veterans Affairs care and services for women veterans, in addition to a groundbreaking initiative to prevent veteran suicides.

I am hopeful we can use this momentum to continue turning legislation into law to ensure we fill the promise our country made to the men and women who served in uniform, as well as their families. We know that too many veterans are being left behind because of current VA policies that prohibit them from accessing benefits and healthcare services they have earned.

Veterans like Bill Rhodes of Mena, AR, a marine who served in Thailand during the Vietnam war era, are pleading with Congress to help them get the mental health care and support they need. After developing illnesses linked to herbicide exposure, Mr. Rhodes turned to the VA for help. His claim was denied. He did his homework. He spent time looking for documentation to support his claim and realized this is a problem that needs a legislative fix because the Department’s policies limit benefits for Vietnam war era for Thailand service.

I am proud to join with my colleague and chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Mr. Durbin, to introduce legislation to help Mr. Rhodes and veterans like him who were exposed to Agent Orange and other herbicides while serving in Thailand during the Vietnam war.

The VA accepts that herbicides were used on fenced-in perimeters of military bases in Thailand, but its current policy is too restrictive. Among other things, it prohibits veterans who worked in security-related specialties. It is reasonable to believe that veterans who were exposed to Agent Orange no matter what their jobs were or where their duty stations were.
In an article published in the Dayton Daily News, one veteran who served in Thailand said his barracks were along the perimeter, and at the time of the interview, he still hadn’t received benefits for his VA claim.

The burdens on consideration of a veteran’s claim to toxic exposure are simply wrong. These misguided technicalities and bureaucratic hurdles need to be addressed. Our bill would eliminate the unreasonable burden placed on veterans to prove toxic exposure.

No veteran should be denied benefits due to redtape. These Americans who served our country, and to this day are paying a high price as a result, have been carelessly hindered by the current limitations on the presumption of toxic exposure to Agent Orange, but they aren’t forgotten. We have an obligation to ensure they get the benefits they are due, and I am committed to supporting their case.

I appreciate the determination and tireless efforts of Mr. Rhodes. He said this legislation gives him some hope, but he won’t be proud of his work until the bill is passed.

I encourage my colleagues to support our legislation. I look forward to working with members of the Senate VA Committee to eliminate the barriers that prevent veterans from getting the care and resources they have earned.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ossoff). The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote on the nomination of California Attorney General Xavier Becerra to lead the Department of Health and Human Services. Moving this nomination forward required an additional procedural step and more floor debate than others, so I will make just a few quick points this afternoon.

First, at the same time America has never faced a greater public health challenge than the pandemic we face today, the Department of Health and Human Services is our point Agency, the leading Agency to coordinate the effort to end the pandemic as soon as possible. Right now, for example, it is coordinating the distribution of vaccines. It is working to get PPE, the critical protective equipment, into the hands of nurses and doctors and all those providers who desperately need more of it. The Department supports rural hospitals to keep them afloat so that rural patients have access to care.

The Department’s work includes the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services that I chair for the Senate, the National Institutes of Health, the National Guard, all 50 States and the District of Columbia, as well as private healthcare systems, doctors, and many individuals across the country.

The American people, we all know, are pandemic-tired. They certainly understand that having a person to coordinate the critical efforts of the Department of Health and Human Services confirmed and on the job is part of that effort. There simply is no argument for delaying this confirmation any longer.

Attorney General Becerra has the right leadership experience and the health policy savvy and the leadership experience in both areas to run this Department, no question about it.

Attorney General Becerra has made it clear members of his Senate Committee that he will follow the law. Quaint idea. He said it again and again in response to a barrage of questions. He is going to be accessible to Senators. He is going to work to find common ground on key healthcare issues. I was glad he said it because that is heavy lifting. Most of the time, that is really all you can ask of nominees of the other party.

Healthcare is oftentimes a divisive subject. I think every Senator understands. But it is particularly true when it comes to women’s healthcare. But it is clear to me that Attorney General Becerra wants to bring the two sides together. That is a great place to start after the last 4 years of knock-down, drag-out battles over healthcare issues that clearly took America in the wrong direction.

I am going to close with just one thought about why this position is so important. I don’t know of any prospect more than the American people than ending the pandemic and getting life back to normal as quickly as possible. Parents want their kids back in school. Grandparents want to hug their grandkids. Everybody wants to feel safe and get out in their communities. Getting our country to that point is the essence of what this job is all about. Heading the Department of Health and Human Services focuses exactly on those things people want to have the country come together on. But we need to be able to beat the pandemic, and the Department needs its leader confirmed and on the job now.

I was pleased that there was bipartisan support for discharging Attorney General Becerra’s nomination from the Finance Committee. I hope the Senate gives his nomination bipartisan support once again when it is time to vote on his confirmation.

I look forward to working with him in the months and years to come. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I oppose the confirmation of California Attorney General Becerra to be the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Our future HHS Secretary will be at the helm of rebuilding our country toward normalcy and preparing to address the weaknesses in our healthcare infrastructure, brought to light by the pandemic. It will be no small task, and it will be imperative that we get every dollar we can on America for years to come. It will require a leader at HHS who has the trust of the public and the requisite healthcare experience. Unfortunately, those two factors are missing from the nomination of Attorney General Becerra.

In recovering from a once-in-a-century public health emergency, Americans need to have the confidence that our HHS Secretary understands the intricacies of healthcare policy and has an eye to the future as we improve upon our pre-pandemic vulnerabilities, protecting future generations from experiencing similar pandemic situations.

While Attorney General Becerra served on a healthcare-focused subcommittee as a U.S. Representative, he has no further experience in public health or medicine. He also lacks the executive experience that would be useful in running a complex executive branch Department like HHS, which is involved in the nationwide vaccine rollout and now the regulatory implementation of the recent $1.9 trillion package.

The American people need to trust that their HHS Secretary will work for them, regardless of disagreements over ideology. Like a President, Cabinet officials work for the entire country, and broad public trust is essential. As Mr. Becerra was serving in his current role in California as attorney general, the Trump administration was making significant regulatory changes to protect the sanctity of life. Attorney General Becerra then spent much of his time attempting to overturn or ignore those changes.

Most recently, Attorney General Becerra actively defended a California law prohibiting abortion coverage in insurance plans offered by churches. The Office of Civil Rights at HHS ruled on January 24, 2020, that the State’s abortion mandate violated Federal law, but Attorney General Becerra refused to comply.

I look forward to working with him in the months and years to come. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.
their government is working to find a common ground that will protect all strongly held personal and religious beliefs, including the belief in the sanctity of life.

Thoughtful healthcare policy matters. And Americans are aware of this more than ever. We need a leader at HHS who is eager to serve all of the country, even in the face of disagreements—one who has the necessary healthcare expertise to be successful in this position and will be an asset to our country, not a distraction from the duties of Congress. The effects will be damaging across the country.

I oppose this confirmation and urge my colleagues to join me.

EQUALITY ACT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, today the Senate Judiciary Committee is considering a grave threat to the right of conscience. The House recently passed the Equality Act, which would demolish religious liberty protections, ironically making Americans of certain beliefs decidedly unequal under the law. In other words, for some called religious protections, the Equality Act would diminish the capability to be considered equal under the law.

It is not an accident of careless drafting that permits this outcome. The language is so expansive and explicit that it must be intentional and it must be intentionally hostile to people who hold such beliefs.

The language expands the definition of public accommodations to include prohibiting discrimination by “any establishment that provides a good, service, or program, including a . . . bank, service or care center, or . . . shelter,” and any organization receiving Federal funding. Religiously affiliated entities seeking to put their beliefs into action outside their church, mosque, or synagogue must comply.

The authors know such an expansive definition infringes on the constitutional rights of religious liberty. That is because the legislation would explicitly—explicitly—deny recourse to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or RFRA, a bill that was passed with overwhelmingly bipartisan majorities in both Chambers of Congress before being signed by President Bill Clinton in 1993.

This denial cuts off two legal paths for people of conscience. One, an individual or institution cannot sue the Federal Government to prevent enforcement of this act without statutory—explicit statutory—authority of RFRA. And, two, the individual institution that is sued for discrimination under this bill cannot rely on RFRA as a defense.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the five lines related to RFRA in this bill represent one of the most dramatic assaults against religious faith and conscience that I have seen in my time in Congress. The effects will be damaging to communities in Kansas and across our country.

If passed, people of faith must decide whether to adhere to their deeply held beliefs or to the law. This law effectively says it is better to have fewer doctors in rural Kansas, which desperately needs them, than it is to have doctors of moral conviction; that it is better to shutter social services administered by faith-based groups that fill gaps in our safety net than to allow them to continue their mission; or that it is better to force the closure of religious schools in urban areas, which so often provide a path out of poverty, than to allow them to remain open and teach principles of faith.

In response to the Obama contraception mandate a decade ago, I warned: “If the government can compel an individual or group to violate one’s conscience, then there is no limit to government power.” That remains true now, nearly 10 years later, and remains true into the future.

I will oppose the use of such government power to infringe on matters of religious belief and conscience, and I stand in opposition to the Equality Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is rescinded.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it appears that our friends across the aisle are experiencing an existential crisis when it comes to deciding how to manage their newfound powers in the majority. We are just 2 1/2 months into this new Congress, and already we are hearing the majority leader and many on the other side of the aisle threatening to blow up the rules of the Senate. After decades as a Senator, President Trump called to end the filibuster—and he said: “That would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to the Founding Fathers.” That would be on the right-hand side of this chart. Let us repeat, President Trump called to end the filibuster—and he said: “That would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to the Founding Fathers.”

I agree with Senator DURBIN. I agreed then, and I agree now.

The Senate filibuster was designed to ensure that the two political parties would actually have to work together, which I think the American people believe is a good thing. And it should be hard to do the work of building consensus in a country as big and diverse as the United States.

But the filibuster was designed to make sure that the majority just couldn’t jam things through and deny the rights of the minority to be heard. But when you get 60 Senators to agree on something, it becomes all but impossible for ultrapartisan proposals to become law. That is the nature of the consensus-building process, and that is a good thing for the country.

We are experiencing an instability and unpredictability that would occur if laws changed as quickly as Presidents and Senate majorities do. Just 4 years ago, Republicans controlled both Chambers of Congress and held the White House. Four years ago, our Democratic colleagues controlled all three. The filibuster was designed to encourage, again, consensus building on a bipartisan basis and to provide some stability between those transitory majorities and changing Presidents. And that is a good thing, like I said, in a country where the political party in control is constantly changing, and it ensures that a minority viewpoint cannot be steamrolled.

But now it appears that our Democratic friends have certainly benefited from the protections of the filibuster over the past 6 years. They filibustered countless bills on everything from pandemic relief to police reform.

But now it appears that our Democratic colleagues—at least their leadership—have flip-flopped. The political tides have shifted, and since the radical left wants to get rid of the filibuster, so do they.

In a floor speech earlier this week, this same Senator, Senator DURBIN, our friend from Illinois, said the filibuster is “not the guarantor of democracy”—a pretty dramatic conversion from 2018 to 2021.

The Senate filibuster was designed to encourage and to build consensus on a bipartisan basis and to provide some stability between those transitory majorities and changing Presidents. And that is a good thing, like I said, in a country where the political party in control is constantly changing, and it ensures that a minority viewpoint cannot be steamrolled.

And now when they are in the majority, where the political party in control is the minority. We are just 2 1/2 months into this Congress, and already we are hearing the majority leader and many on the other side of the aisle threatening to blow up the rules of the Senate. After decades as a Senator, President Trump called to end the filibuster—and he said: “That would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to the Founding Fathers.”

President Trump called to end the filibuster—and he said: “That would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to the Founding Fathers.”
now that the shoe is on the other foot. Democrats are ready to hit the big red button and go nuclear. And, I must say, once you go nuclear around here, you certainly don’t go back.

But Senator Durbin’s views aren’t the only ones that have changed on this matter. As I mentioned, former Senator and now President Joe Biden finally changed his views as well. For decades, he was a staunch defender of the institution. When he was asked about removing the filibuster, going nuclear, he answered yes.

This nuclear option is ultimately an example of the arrogance of power. It is a fundamental power-grab by the majority party.

Well, that is certainly not minding your words. And this isn’t some long ago abandoned view of his. In January of this year, President Biden was asked if he could move his agenda with the filibuster rules intact, and he answered yes and explained the opportunities to work together on shared priorities, as he did throughout his career as a U.S. Senator.

He went on to add:

I think we can reach consensus on that and get it passed without changing the filibuster rule. But now the pressure has been put on both President Biden and the Democratic leadership in the Senate to endorse a rules change, not by the ordinary course of rule changes but by the nuclear option. We know that there are unprecedented consequences of changing the rules in a place where your power, where your majority, is never guaranteed. Chipping away at the rights of the minority may help you today, but you will live to regret it when the shoe is on the other foot.

But it won’t take a shift in the majority for our Democratic colleagues to see the disastrous consequences of going nuclear on the filibuster rule because, if anybody needed a reminder, we have a 50-50 Senate: 50 Democrats and 50 Republicans.

Yesterday, Senator McConnell, the Republican leader, somebody who has been around this institution a long time and understands it better than almost anybody I know, reminded our colleagues that “[t]his is an institution that requires unanimous consent to turn the lights on before noon.”

Unanimous consent is literally the grease that helps the machine run. In order to accomplish even the most mundane tasks in the Senate, you need an agreement. Most of the time it is easy because it is not controversial; it is not partisan; it is the right, practical thing to do. But you need compromise, and you need a quorum.

The rules change being proposed wouldn’t clear a path for productivity in the Senate. It is an invitation to futility. If our Democratic colleagues take the unprecedented step of blowing up the filibuster, they can expect to be met with an unprecedented response. Republicans will not sit idly by while Democrats take an axe to the rules in order to advance a partisan agenda.

Democrats go down this road, they will have no one to blame but themselves for the consequences of a horrible miscalculation.

**Nomination of Xavier Becerra**

Mr. President, on another matter, as we know, it has been more than a year since we started to talk about the COVID-19 pandemic, a period that became part of our daily vocabulary. Over this last year, families have lost loved ones, millions of workers have lost their jobs, Main Street businesses have shuttered, and our healthcare workers have endured unimaginable stress and heartbreak.

One year ago, the majority of Americans were hunkered down at home in order to stop the spread of this deadly virus, and today, while we continue to follow the commonsense public health guidelines to stop the spread of the virus, we are finally experiencing some hope. With three successful vaccines now being administered throughout the country, the light at the end of the tunnel gets bigger and brighter every day. I know we are all grateful for that.

More than 27 percent of Americans 18 and up have received at least one dose of the vaccine. That includes nearly 1 in 4 people over the age of 65, one of the most vulnerable cohorts. We have every reason to be optimistic that brighter days are ahead, but we are not out of the dark yet.

In the coming months, we need sound leadership from health officials who have the experience and the expertise to guide us through these final, critical months. Unfortunately, President Biden has nominated someone who is unprepared to lead that charge.

The President has chosen Xavier Becerra to be his Secretary of Health and Human Services. As we know, the Secretary of Health and Human Services is one of the top generals in the war against COVID–19. The Department coordinates the healthcare providers, State and local officials, researchers, and the American public to respond to a crisis like this. For everything from COVID–19 testing to treatment and therapeutics, to vaccinations, HHS is actually in charge.

The Department disburses funding. It determines how many vaccines go to each State. It leads efforts to boost public confidence in the vaccine and so much more, but that is not even including the long list of nonpandemic responsibilities for the Department, including everything from overseeing Medicare and Medicaid to regulating prescription drugs.

So what life experience does Mr. Becerra have that makes him qualified to lead these efforts? Well, he is not a doctor. He is not a public health expert. He has never even worked in a hospital, let alone a COVID hospital. In fact, his only relevant experience is the range of lawsuits he has filed as attorney general of his home State of California.

Mr. Becerra led a group of attorneys general in opposing the Texas lawsuit Texas v. Azar. The case attempted to reinstate the individual mandate penalty which was removed by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. He also led a case attempting to overturn protections for religious groups, such as the Little Sisters of the Poor, concerning their group health insurance plans. He sued them. Well—no surprise—the Supreme Court ultimately ruled 7 to 2 in favor of the Little Sisters of the Poor. And, as we know, Becerra’s radical policy objectives date long before his time as attorney general. As a Member of the House, he took extreme views on abortion. He opposed legislation that would ensure that babies who were born after a botched abortion would receive medical treatment, just like any other patient.

He opposed a bill to prevent taxpayer dollars from being used for abortions, till Wydell amendment, which has been bipartisan consensus for at least since the late seventies. He even opposed legislation to make it a crime to harm or kill an unborn child during the commission of a violent crime. In 38 States, including his State of California, they already have similar protections, but he opposed legislation to do it.

Unlike the majority of President Biden’s nominees who received bipartisan support by both the committees of jurisdiction and the full Senate, there is no bipartisan chorus singing the praises of Mr. Becerra. Put simply, he is a partisan warrior who lacks the experience to lead HHS during normal times, let alone during a pandemic.

We are at the 100-yard line in the pandemic. Now is not the time to give the punter a chance to try out his quarterback just because he happens to be friends with the coach.

I yield the floor.

**Sunshine Week**

Ms. Ernst. Mr. President, it has been a year now since the outbreak of a novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. It put the world into an unprecedented global lockdown, and we are still in the dark about how the pandemic even began.

Folks, this isn’t entirely an accident. The virus emerged in one of the world’s most closed societies, ruled by a ruthless authoritarian regime with no tolerance for truth or transparency. And, after 21⁄2 million people died, after 21⁄2 million people died, after 21⁄2 million people died, the Communist Party of China refuses to fully cooperate with efforts to learn how COVID–19 made the cross-species jump from bats to humans. Finding the source isn’t about assigning blame; it is about understanding the cause and preventing a similar occurrence from happening again.
Here is what we do know: COVID appeared in the vicinity of the Wuhan Institute of Virology, a laboratory where studies were being conducted on bat coronaviruses. After the outbreak began, Chinese officials ordered the destruction of coronavirus samples. In the months just prior to the first case of the new pathogen being publicly identified, researchers at this state-run lab reportedly became sick with COVID-like symptoms.

Years ago, U.S. officials who visited the lab in Wuhan reported warnings back to the State Department that studies were being conducted on dangerous coronaviruses from bats that could be transmitted to humans in a lab which had “serious” safety problems.

Some of that research was even being subsidized by U.S. taxpayer dollars, including a study published less than 2 years before the pandemic that found the first evidence that humans could be infected with coronaviruses from bats. You can bet directly folks, your tax dollars were paying for dangerous studies on coronaviruses in a lab in China that our own government officials had warned was unsafe.

This all raises many questions, the first being: How much were we actually paying for this endeavor? And that should be relatively easy for anyone to discover since a law renewed by Congress every single year requires all projects supported by the Department of Health and Human Services to include a pricetag disclosing the cost paid by taxpayers. But noticeably absent on the study from the Wuhan Institute: the cost.

A review of numerous other projects supported by HHS found that cost information was missing from all of them—all of them. Covering up information that the public has a right to know about might be how things work in Communist China, but it isn’t how it should work in America.

This isn’t China, folks. Our laws aren’t optional, especially for those who are supposed to be enforcing them. Maybe we can’t force China to be forthcoming, but we should be able to expect our own government to be open and transparent. That is why I am asking the HHS Office of Inspector General to launch an investigation to compel the Department to comply with the law.

I am also introducing legislation to require every project funded with your taxpayer dollars to disclose the cost paid by you. This is just one of the bright ideas to shine some light on how your money is being spent that I will work to ban the Department from complying with the law to provide Americans with these tools before we try to throw more government at a broken healthcare system.

Government pays for a portion of healthcare: more is paid through the private sector. If we reform it, it makes it less expensive for both payers. To give you an example, sometimes what you hear here sounds like it is theoretical, hypothetical. I took the 12, 13 years ago in my Main Street enterprise that was just starting to grow, doing the things it was supposed to do, and that is transportation distribution. Then all of a sudden, healthcare becomes a subset of your business, and about the only solution you would get each year is, well, you are lucky it is not going up more than 5 or 10 percent.

I heard that too many years in a row. I was sick and tired of that being what really happened to living wage who had a healthy, successful business other than the healthcare component. What did I do? Healthcare plans are basically made up of three or four features.

You have your deductible. Ours had risen more than I was willing to take it up any higher. The only way you could buy premiums down would be to do that or change underwriters every 2 or 3 years. That gets to be a hassle as you become a larger company, and the premiums were so greatly for people who did it, you could end up bringing your cost down. Well, then you were right back in the old groove of, you are lucky if you only go up 5 to 10 percent the next year on renewal.

You also have coinsurance. Most people don’t worry about that until they get significantly ill or have a bad accident. That is the percentage you have to pay once you exceed your deductible.

When you have those variables, you have one other item that almost everyone loves in their plan, and that is a low copayment. Those copayments are paid for in the high premiums, but it is because they constitute nearly 25 percent of most healthcare plans, and that is to keep skin out of the game for the people who use the system.

Well, I was going to do something different and decided to limit that to exactly how much one is allowed to have in their plan, and that is a low copayment. Those copayments are paid for in the high premiums, but it is because they constitute nearly 25 percent of most healthcare plans, and that is to keep skin out of the game for the people who use the system.

We all benefit when we bring this information to light, especially when it involves how our tax dollars are being spent. That is why I am also working to create an alert system to notify the public whenever a project goes $1 billion or more over budget or falls 5 years behind its budget.

Some good news: My bipartisan bill was just reported out of committee this morning, so boondoggles, you better beware.

Another bill I will be supporting will require hospitals and insurers to reveal rates to patients before they receive their medical care. This commonsense effort would allow patients to know the costs associated with their healthcare in advance so that they can make informed decisions for themselves and their families.

Finally, I am calling for more transparency from the Department of Education when it comes to COVID spending. Taxpayers should be able to see how their school districts are spending their tax dollars to disclose the cost provided to help schools safely reopen.

Knowledge is the power that allows everyone to hold those entrusted to make our decisions accountable. After all, the American taxpayers are in the dark about any of these decisions is because they can’t withstand the scrutiny that results when all of the facts come to light.

With the Sun now setting an hour later and the approach of daylight saving in the months just prior to the first case of COVID, we are all reminded just how much a difference can be made with a little extra sunlight. After all, sunshine is the best disinfectant because to stop waste, we first need to be able to spot it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Indiana.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I have come to the floor several times in the little over 2 years I have been here, and a common theme—and I think we all know it as Senators—is that our healthcare system is broken. It is driven by misaligned industry incentives that promote opaque, behind-the-scenes pricing maneuvers at the expense of patients and healthcare consumers.

Increased transparency is the key to fixing our broken healthcare system. It will allow Americans to have skin in the game and shop directly with their healthcare providers to make informed decisions. They cannot do that very well currently.

Pulling the curtain back on a healthcare system to restore market forces, which aren’t really there now, to increase innovation and competition, particularly in regard to price, quality, and service—you do that with anything else. A consumer is engaged, they are informed, and you have many competitors competing for their business.

In order for Americans to regain their sovereignty in a healthcare system, you need the ability to be able to navigate accordingly. Congress must act to provide Americans with these tools before we try to throw more government at a broken healthcare system.

Lo and behold, it has now been 13 years, and we have been able to keep a good plan in place, lower family healthcare premium contributions, and have not had a premium increase. What is it based upon? It is finding the measure transparency that was out there 12, 13 years ago and enhancing it over time. To give an example, if you pick up the phone, you get on the web, you will find anywhere from 30, 50, 60, 70
percent savings. Procedures like MRIs, CAT scans, colonoscopies can run anywhere from 700 to 3,000 bucks. Your insurance companies seem to always shove you to the most expensive one. They give you these huge discounts, take their margin out of it, and it still costs more than you thought.

When the consumer gets engaged, you will see prices start to come down. LASSIK surgery is the best example, where you have no insurance involved. Ten, fifteen years ago, that could be up to $2,000 an eye. Now, it is advertised heavily, providers go after their customers, and you can probably get it done for as little as $250 to $500 an eye, with better quality. That sounds like a lot of other areas of our economy that actually work.

Last Congress, I put healthcare transparency at the forefront of my agenda and have definitely been the most outspoken Senator that we have a broken system; put almost all the blame on the industry itself because it does not give us transparency. It does not want to compete. The healthcare customer is somewhat to blame because they don’t want to pay for anything. And I don’t think the answer is bringing more government into it until you reform the system.

We need to shine light on the dark corners and the misaligned incentives embedded in the current system. Among the bills I will reintroduce this Congress is the Healthcare PRICE Transparency Act. Every Senator should want to be on that bill to hold the industry accountable. This will empower patients through transparency. It will drive competition among hospitals and insurers by requiring them to publicly disclose their prices so patients can compare between providers and insurers.

Last Congress, a number of my colleagues joined in my effort to bring more transparency and affordability to healthcare consumers. I am excited to reintroduce the Healthcare PRICE Transparency Act soon and hope all of my colleagues will join in so that we can collectively lower healthcare costs before we try to get more government involved.

I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I am proud to join my colleagues in celebration of Sunshine Week and promote the importance of government openness and transparency. Transparency isn’t something you see too much up here in Washington. Being accountable to the American people should be a basic function of government.

In Florida, we have sunshine laws to promote openness and build our citizens’ trust in government. When I came to Washington, I made it my mission to bring the success and transparency we had in Florida to the Federal Government and make this dysfunctional place work for the American people.

Unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues have blocked nearly every single one of my efforts for transparency and requests for information to help Congress make the best decisions for American families.

Last month, I wrote to President Biden’s Acting Director for the Office of Management and Budget requesting any documents related to enacted but currently unspent COVID-19 stimulus funding. The response? None. Total silence.

This month, as we considered the Democrats’ wasteful and partisan $1.9 trillion COVID spending package, I introduced a resolution calling on President Biden to inform the Senate and the American people of how much unspent funds are left over from the previous COVID spending bills, but Democrats blocked it.

When my colleague Senator JOHNSON called for massive, 600-page bill to be read on the floor so the American people could know exactly what was in the bill, Democrats complained and called it a waste of time.

Let me be clear. Being transparent, open, and accountable to the American people is actually never a waste of time; it is our job. That is why I have been working on several measures to bring sunshine transparency to Washington, including my bill to make sure taking office to the American people and actually read bills before casting their votes and my STOP COVID–19 Act to set vaccine distribution reporting and transparency standards for States and create a program for cities and counties to increase funding, testing, contact tracing, and transparency efforts in order to reduce the spread of COVID.

I will never stop fighting to bring sunshine to Washington and working to make sure the Biden administration is transparent, open, and accountable to the American people who elected us to serve.

I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I want to start by thanking Senator ERNST for once again setting up the Government Sunshine Week event and for her commitment, as was just discussed, and the Government Sunshine Week event and for her commitment, as was just discussed, and the Government Sunshine Week event and for her commitment, as was just discussed, and the Government Sunshine Week event and for her commitment, as was just discussed.

Along the way, they have been aided by a lack of transparency in our Federal grant-making processes. In part, through more streamlined unauthorized access and management and Budget to coordinate and report to protect the research investments and report to protect the research investments of our bipartisan PSI investigation. Since our report, prosecutors have taken action in the Federal law enforcement officials at the FBI knew about this years and admitted at our PSI hearing last Congress: “We wish we had taken more rapid and comprehensive action in the past.” I wish they had.

I am pleased the Trump administration chose to follow through on their promise to do better in this regard. Since our report, we have charged at least 13 researchers here in the United States for failing to disclose their ties to the Chinese Government and Chinese Communist Party—researchers at prestigious institutions like Harvard and the Ohio State University. Many of our colleges and universities around the country have been part of this.

The Biden administration must stand by the promises made on the campaign trail to keep the pressure on China, and that includes on this issue. We can also help here in Congress by shining a light on the grant-making process and passing laws to help us keep track and protect these important investments in our research.

In the coming weeks, I will be reintroducing bipartisan legislation called the Safeguarding American Innovation Act, which uses the key findings from our bipartisan PSI investigation and report to protect the research enterprise—in part, through more transparency.

First, our bill creates a cross-governmental council at the Office of Management and Budget to coordinate and streamline unauthorized access and grant-making processes between Federal Agencies so that there is greater transparency in where the money is going and how it is being used.

Second, the Safeguarding American Innovation Act makes it illegal to lie on a grant application about ties to
foreign governments like China. Transparency here will make it clear that researchers are liable for attempting to mislead the government when trying to receive taxpayer funds.

Third, our legislation closes loopholes exploited by China and other foreign actors and empowers the State Department to deny visas to foreign researchers aiming to steal U.S. intellectual property and research.

Fourth, the Safeguarding American Innovation Act requires research institutions and universities to safeguard against unauthorized access to sensitive technology and to be transparent with the State Department about what technologies a foreign researcher will have access to on campus.

Finally, the act requires transparency from our colleges and universities as to what money they are getting from foreign sources. They will have to report any foreign gift of $50,000 or more, and it empowers the Department of Education to fine universities that repeatedly fail to disclose these gifts. Current law requires reporting, but at $250,000. We found that one billion of U.S. universities consistently failed to do even that. Lowering the threshold increases transparency, and adding the penalty ensures the schools will report.

The Council on Education has supported our PSI report's recommendation that research institutions should establish a “know your collaborator” culture.

Greater transparency in our Federal grantmaking processes, great transparency from our research institutions and universities—these are the steps we need to take to ensure that there is proper accountability in place for the $150 billion that taxpayers entrust with the Department of Education every year, while still keeping our fundamental research open and collaborative.

The Safeguarding American Innovation Act will shine a light on the Federal research-masking processes and allow us to maintain our world-class lead in innovations, while protecting our investments from foreign theft.

Again, I want to thank my colleague Senator Ernst, in particular, for this event today to talk about transparency, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation that will provide long overdue transparency in our federally funded research enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, about 4 weeks ago, it got cold in Oklahoma—really cold. My house was at negative 14 degrees. Now, Senator Steve Daines from Montana is used to that, but in Oklahoma we are not used to negative 14 degrees. It was overcast, snowy, cold. Then, the sun broke through, and we had a day when it got up to 30 degrees. It was so nice because the sun was out, even though it was cold.

Sunshine has a great way of making everyone lift and look around and say: Where has that been?

I think that happens in the Federal Government as well.

I thank Senator Joni Ernst for hosting what is going to be “SpringFling” Sun Week to be able to say: What are we doing to put a little light into the Federal process to be able to make sure people can see into some of these programs? Because all the time I hear from people, and when something comes on the news, they will say: Where did that come from?

I will say: That was poking in some bill that probably no one read.

I will give you an example of it. Two weeks ago, when the “COVID” bill passed with almost $2 trillion in spending, I already had folks come back to me saying: I am grateful for that $70 million for the Small Business Administration to increase some of the loans by $70 million.

I said: Congress. Do you know how much the administrative cost was on that $70 million program?

The answer is $390 million in administrative costs, $70 million in loans.

That is in the bill.

Everyone looks at me and says: Oh. I didn’t know that.

In lots of States around America right now, their legislatures are meeting, including mine in Oklahoma. They are suddenly finding out that that bill was for “COVID”-related. I mandated that no State in America could reduce taxes on anyone. Lots of States are saying: Wait a minute; we were planning on reducing taxes on working families in certain targeted areas.

They are finding out that you can’t do that, and they will say things like: I didn’t know that was in the bill because there wasn’t any sunshine on that bill.

I worked for years to pass a bill called the Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act. It is a commonsense bill. It asks a simple question: What programs do we do in the Federal Government? This body has heard about me talk about it year after year after year. Contrary to popular belief, it is not easy to actually move a bill in this place. Some things that are very commonsense take forever.

This was my simple bill. In the Federal Government, every Agency has to start every program that they do, how many employees they hire to do that program, what is the cost of the program, and is the program evaluated? If it is, just put the evaluation numbers with the program.

Why would I say that? Because I talk to Agency heads that start a new program and they get 2 years down the road from starting a new program and they find out through the General Accountability Office how many employees they hire to do that program, what is the cost of the program, and is the program evaluated? If it is, just put the evaluation numbers with the program.

This was my simple bill. In the Federal Government, every Agency has to start every program that they do, how many employees they hire to do that program, what is the cost of the program, and is the program evaluated? If it is, just put the evaluation numbers with the program.

Why would I say that? Because I talk to Agency heads that start a new program and they get 2 years down the road from starting a new program and they find out through the General Accountability Office how many employees they hire to do that program, what is the cost of the program, and is the program evaluated? If it is, just put the evaluation numbers with the program.

Before you think that doesn’t happen, oh, yes, it does. It happens all the time. Not only that, but I want to ask a simple question to say: How many options do we have for whatever it may be? How many programs do we have for STEM education, for instance? How many different incentives have we put out there, and how many Agencies are there to oversee providing STEM education? The Agencies can’t tell me. They could eventually tell me what is in their Agency, but they don’t know what other Agencies are doing.

And when I go to the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, they don’t know, and ask them, their answer is: I will get you an answer back in about 18 months-months—18 months before they can tell me how many STEM programs we have in the Federal Government. I should be able to do an internet search and get that in 18 seconds, not 18 months.

The Taxpayers Right-To-Know bill requires the Office of Management and Budget to actually work with every Agency to get a master list of every program across the Federal Government—how many employees they have, if it is evaluated, and what it does.

It is pretty simple. It is basic transparency, but it allows any American and all Members of Congress to be able to see what we do and if we have duplication in government.

Again, you may think that is simple and straightforward. It is, but it took years to actually pass. We finally got that passed and signed into law last December.

I met with Gene Dodaro, who heads up GAO, and asked him about it because he has also been an advocate of that for years. He said: We need an unequivocal commitment from the Office of Management and Budget to implement it properly” because we have to actually get this done.

Sunshine helps. We can see how money is spent. We can see how duplication actually functions. We can’t reform what we can’t see.

I worked for years to pass a bill called the Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act. It is a commonsense bill. It asks a simple question: What programs do we do in the Federal Government? This body has heard about me talk about it year after year after year. Contrary to popular belief, it is not easy to actually move a bill in this place. Some things that are very commonsense take forever.
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The Taxpayers Right-To-Know bill requires the Office of Management and Budget to actually work with every Agency to get a master list of every program across the Federal Government—how many employees they have, if it is evaluated, and what it does.

It is pretty simple. It is basic transparency, but it allows any American and all Members of Congress to be able to see what we do and if we have duplication in government.

Again, you may think that is simple and straightforward. It is, but it took years to actually pass. We finally got that passed and signed into law last December.

I met with Gene Dodaro, who heads up GAO, and asked him about it because he has also been an advocate of that for years. He said: We need an unequivocal commitment from the Office of Management and Budget to implement it properly” because we have to actually get this done.

Sunshine helps. We can see how money is spent. We can see how duplication actually functions. We can’t reform what we can’t see.
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Before you think that doesn’t happen, oh, yes, it does. It happens all the time. Not only that, but I want to ask a simple question to say: How many options do we have for whatever it may be? How many programs do we have for STEM education, for instance? How many different incentives have we put out there, and how many Agencies are there to oversee providing STEM education? The Agencies can’t tell me. They could eventually tell me what is in their Agency, but they don’t know what other Agencies are doing.

And when I go to the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, they don’t know, and ask them, their answer is: I will get you an answer back in about 18 months-months—18 months before they can tell me how many STEM programs we have in the Federal Government. I should be able to do an internet search and get that in 18 seconds, not 18 months.
With $1.3 trillion of spending in Health and Human Services, that Department has the largest budget of the entire executive branch. In fact, if we were to compare the budget—the budget of HHS to other nation’s GDPs—HHS, in fact, would rank among the top 10 list in the world. The size of this Department is significant, and the responsibility is even greater.

Whoever oversees this Department has a big impact on our country, our economy, and the lives of all Americans. This is exactly why I am deeply concerned with President Biden’s pick of Attorney General Xavier Becerra to lead HHS. Mr. Becerra has spent his career propagating far-left ideology and supporting divisive policies that don’t resonate with the majority of Americans.

The Secretary of HHS has massive authority to steer the future of healthcare in our country, and someone who has a career of defending the abortion industry and promoting other liberal policies, like free healthcare for illegal immigrants, should not be at the helm of this Department.

I am concerned that Attorney General Becerra will use the power of this Agency to overstep and impose his radical liberal agenda on millions of Americans. This administration deliberately, intentionally, chose a nominee who has repeatedly attacked the religious freedoms of so many Americans, a nominee who has aggressively pushed a very pro-abortion agenda, a nominee who supports a complete takeover by the government of our healthcare, a nominee who advocates for illegal immigrants to receive taxpayer-funded healthcare.

How do these qualities make Attorney General Becerra the right person to head Health and Human Services? It just doesn’t make sense to me out of the country. It is just another sign that this, unfortunately, is a far-left administration that is outside the mainstream.

Especially now, during a pandemic, it is critical that all Americans can trust whoever holds this position. It is critical that the leader of this massive Department will operate as a good steward of Federal health programs and not use his post to impose a government takeover of healthcare and to eradicate job-based coverage for millions of Americans.

Xavier Becerra is, unfortunately, not that person. He has built his career defending some of the very most extreme stances in our society, and we can expect that he will only take things further at HHS.

When it comes to abortion, Attorney General Becerra doesn’t believe there should be any restrictions—not one. In fact, I had the chance to ask Mr. Becerra some questions a couple of weeks ago at a hearing. I asked if he would support a ban on the lethal discrimination of babies diagnosed with Down syndrome, or, perhaps, what about banning sex-selective abortions, or, at least, a ban on partial birth abortions. His refusal to answer spoke volumes. His inability to name even one restriction that he might think about putting on abortion is chilling. Mr. Becerra’s refusal even go a step further. He has repeatedly bullied and harassed Americans who respect the sanctity of life, like the Little Sisters of the Poor. This order of nuns has dedicated their lives to serving the poor, trying to live their lives according to their Catholic faith. They do not believe in providing abortions or contraceptives.

Attorney General Becerra litigated against these nuns in court and attempted to revoke an exemption that protects religious groups from providing contraceptives, and that goes against their religious beliefs. He has literally sued to impose crippling fines on Catholic nuns for remaining true to their religious beliefs—cripping fines on an organization that is the very definition of Americans’ constitutional right to religious freedom.

He has stated that crossing the border illegally should be decriminalized. Let me say that again. He has stated that crossing the border illegally should be decriminalized. No wonder we are seeing a crisis on our southern border. He has repeatedly pushed for illegal immigrants to receive health benefits on the taxpayers’ dime. As we are seeing Biden’s border crisis play out, it is even more alarming that one of his nominees would seek to incentivize illegal border crossings even more. I guess you could say this is all part of Biden’s “America Last” agenda, but as Secretary of Health and Human Services, Xavier Becerra would have the massive ability to impose a pro-abortion, anti-religious freedom, socialist healthcare agenda. His nomination highlights just how extreme—the Biden administration really is. These views fail to represent the majority of Americans and have no place at the head of the largest Department of our executive branch.

I urge my colleagues to consider the impact that Mr. Becerra would have as the head of Health and Human Services and to vote against his confirmation. Rather, we must stand up for life, for the less fortunate, and under their protection. Again, he wasn’t comprised—he wasDeliberately undermined Americans’ constitutional rights and waged political warfare on those who happen to disagree with his views.

Take, for example, his views on abortion. Instead of supporting laws that protect and sustain the life and health of American women and unborn children, Mr. Becerra has supported laws that violently hurt them in their endorsing legal abortion up until and even during the moment of birth.

As Attorney General of the State of California, he brought 15 felony charges against a reporter for exposing Planned Parenthood’s role in trafficking the body parts of aborted babies and prosecuted that even the Los Angeles Times described as “disturbing overreach.”

He defended a California law that required pro-life pregnancy centers to advertise for State-funded abortion clinics. He has worked against his colleagues to incentivize illegal border crossings and to vote against his confirmation. Instead of supporting laws that protect and sustain the life and health of Americans, this administration decided, even still, to make sure that their rights would be protected. Mr. Becerra still sued the Trump administration to prevent legal immigrants to receive health benefits and to vote against his confirmation. Instead of supporting laws that protect and sustain the life and health of Americans, this administration decided, even still, to make sure that their rights would be protected. Mr. Becerra still sued the Trump administration to prevent legal immigrants to receive health benefits.

The President of describes Becerra as “the legal architect of some of the country’s most strident, sweeping, and brazenly unconstitutional restrictions on church and on worship services, some of which were struck down by the Supreme Court last month, and he even
tried to prevent COVID relief funds from going to religious and other private schools.

Our Founders established the principle of religious liberty—the natural right of all human beings to freely hold and express their religious beliefs because they understood that man is not free unless his conscience is free. They thought that this principle was so important, so fundamental, that it was the first freedom articulated in the very First Amendment to the Constitution. They sought to define and preserve the space of our deepest convictions, a space upon which a State cannot and must never encroach.

In practice, that has meant that the government’s job is not to tell people what to believe or how to discharge their religious duties but to protect the space for all people of all faiths—and of no faith at all for that matter—to seek truth and to order their lives accordingly.

The American people deserve a leader at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services who will uphold and strengthen this monumental tradition. They deserve a leader who will protect their fundamental rights, not trample them. In a word, tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn’t agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trail of failed legislation in govern- ment. Tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn’t agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trail of failed legislation in government. Tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn’t agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trail of failed legislation in government. Tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn’t agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trail of failed legislation in government. Tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn’t agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trail of failed legislation in government. Tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn’t agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trail of failed legislation in government. Tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn’t agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trail of failed legislation in government. Tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn’t agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trail of failed legislation in government. Tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn’t agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trail of failed legislation in government. Tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn’t agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trail of failed legislation in government. Tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise to oppose the nomination of Xavier Becerra for Secretary of Health and Human Services.

There are, unfortunately, numerous nominees in the Biden administration who are either extreme or unqualified for the positions for which they have been nominated, but of all of these nominees, I believe Mr. Becerra is the single worst Cabinet nominee put forward by Joe Biden to serve in the Cabinet.

President Biden has told this country repeatedly that his top priority is defeating the COVID–19 pandemic. The Department of Health and Human Services is on the frontline in fighting COVID–19. Mr. Becerra, by any measure, is woefully unqualified to lead that Department.

Mr. Becerra is not a doctor. Mr. Becerra is not a scientist. Mr. Becerra has no healthcare experience whatsoever. He has no medical experience whatsoever. He has no experience in virology. He has no experience with pharmaceuticals. He has no experience running a State or local healthcare agency. He has no experience in logistics. The Department of HHS is in the process of distributing and administering hundreds of millions of vaccines. Mr. Becerra has never so much as distributed french fries at a McDonald’s.

Mr. Becerra’s only qualification and, indeed, the qualification that earned him this nomination is he is a radical, leftwing trial attorney.

If a Republican President had nominated as the head of the Health and Human Services Agency someone with zero healthcare experience, zero medical experience, zero pharmaceutical experience in the midst of a global pandemic, that Republican President would have been laughed out of the room.

If a Republican President had done that, all of the Democrats would have been lined up here thundering: This is a President that doesn’t care about science. We would have heard Democrats telling us: This is a President for whom defeating COVID–19 is not a priority, is not serious.

“‘This is a President,’” our Democratic colleagues would have told us, “‘for whom defeating COVID–19 is not a priority, is not serious.”

Had a Republican President nominated a nominee as unqualified as Mr. Becerra, I feel confident the Democrats would not have been alone. We would see multiple Republican Senators standing up, saying that actually have an HHS Secretary who knows something about science. We should have an HHS Secretary who knows something about medicine, something about pharmaceuticals.

Both had years and even decades of healthcare experience.

As best I can tell, Xavier Becerra’s only experience with healthcare is...
suing the Little Sisters of the Poor. Frankly, it should be a joke.

If a Republican President did this, a Republican Senate would discover the backbone to stand up and oppose it. And what I would say is sad is not a single Democrat is willing to stand up and say to Joe Biden and say: No. Try again. It is a pandemic. Over a half million Americans have died. How about putting someone at HHS that knows something about healthcare?

In the midst of a pandemic, why does the Senate not have a single Democrat willing to stand up and say: No. Try again. It is a pandemic. Over a half million Americans have died. Subjecting donors to lawsuits based on their religious beliefs is unconstitutional. Government can't force people to do something they don't want to do. It is a violation of the privacy rights of Californians.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this nomination.

Mr. Becerra has not shown that he is actually qualified to protect our health and defeat this pandemic.

Mr. Becerra, who currently serves as the attorney general of the State of California, has demonstrated a consistent pattern of contempt for privacy. While attorney general, he used his partisan power to overcome the individual privacy rights of California. As attorney general, he demanded that thousands of registered charities annually disclose to his offices the names and addresses of major donors, even though California law didn’t require that. Even when people challenged that, he went lockstep with the Biden administration in striking down and saying that the First Amendment law was unconstitutional.

Mr. Becerra has not shown that he is actually qualified to protect our health and defeat this pandemic. Over a half million Americans have died. Subjecting donors to lawsuits based on their religious beliefs is unconstitutional. Government can't force people to do something they don't want to do. It is a violation of the privacy rights of Californians.

Mr. Becerra has not shown that he is actually qualified to protect our health and defeat this pandemic. Mr. Becerra, who currently serves as the attorney general of the State of California, has demonstrated a consistent pattern of contempt for privacy. While attorney general, he used his partisan power to overcome the individual privacy rights of California. As attorney general, he demanded that thousands of registered charities annually disclose to his offices the names and addresses of major donors, even though California law didn’t require that. Even when people challenged that, he went lockstep with the Biden administration in striking down and saying that the First Amendment law was unconstitutional.
is the kind of leader our Nation needs at HHS during this challenging time.

He is a proven leader who spent his career fighting to expand healthcare—to expand it—protecting both patients and consumers and working to strengthen both Medicare and Medicaid.

As a Congressman, as I mentioned, he was instrumental in drafting and working to pass the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the so-called ACA. And as California’s attorney general, he has led the fight to protect it.

Now, my view of the disagreement on the other side of the aisle is just that. This is someone who worked as a Member of Congress and then has worked as attorney general to pass and then uphold the ACA.

On the other side of the aisle, they don’t like that because they have been committed as a party here in the Senate and in the House—both Republican caucuses have been committed to two things on healthcare: destroying the ACA, which means destroying all protections for preexisting conditions and—it is important to add this—they have been dedicated to ending—not limiting, not cutting back ending Medicaid expansion, which, of course, accounted for most of the healthcare gains. Millions of Americans have healthcare today because of the expansion of Medicaid. It is the official position of the Republican Party to end that—end to the all those millions of Americans: You don’t deserve healthcare coverage. That is their position based upon what they have supported in bill after bill that came before the Senate. We know that. That is a fact. And until they move away from that position, they will try to take down the nomination of or oppose anyone who wants to uphold the ACA, uphold all protections for preexisting conditions, uphold and support the expansion of Medicaid, one of the best expansions of healthcare in American history, not just recent history, in all of American history.

So I would support Attorney General Becerra just based upon what he has done on healthcare because it happens to be in the best interests of the American people to expand healthcare and the best interests of the people I represent.

I don’t come across many people in Pennsylvania coming up to me, saying: I want you to lessen the number of people in the United States or in my State that have healthcare. I want you to cut that back. I want you to cut back on the Medicaid Program—which folks on the other side of the aisle want to do as well. They not only want to end Medicaid expansion—end it completely—they want to cut the Medicaid Program by hundreds of billions of dollars over 10 years. That is their official position. It has been their position for years to cut the Medicaid Program and to end Medicaid expansion—cut the Medicaid Program by hundreds of billions of dollars.

So if you are against that, they are going to be opposing you, whether it is for confirmation or anything else, because they are the party that wants to cut Medicaid, not by $100 billion over 10 years, not by $200 billion or $300 billion. Look at their budgets year after year. They want to cut Medicaid by $1 trillion, or $2 trillion. One year they even proposed—here in the debates about the budgets, one year they even proposed cutting the Medicaid Program by $1 trillion. That was the official position of the Republican Party. So if you want to oppose them on that, then they will try to take you down.

The Medicaid Program, by the way, pays for half—almost half—of the births in America. Of the babies born in America, almost half of those births are paid for by Medicaid—the Medicaid Program—the program they want to cut by $500 billion, at least, and sometimes a lot more than that.

So that is why they are against him, because they want to cut back on healthcare.

Now, his leadership of this Agency could not come at a more important time. Our Nation is facing the greatest public health crisis in more than a century, since the horror of 1918. Now we are facing a similar challenge.

We also have a recession. So the faster we put this pandemic behind us, the better it is for creating a lot more jobs and lifting our economy out of the ditch that it has been in the last year.

So we need a strong leader at HHS. We need someone who has the experience, the integrity, to lead us in that Agency to help guide us out of the crisis. I am confident—very confident—that Xavier Becerra is that leader, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Baldwin). The junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, the first thing I would like to do is correct what my colleague from Pennsylvania said with regard to preexisting conditions.

I was here last year. I brought to the floor a bill that would say it didn’t matter what the Supreme Court did; we would make sure that we could keep preexisting conditions if the Supreme Court decided that the Affordable Care Act was not constitutional. The Democrats blocked it.

I have been up here 2 years, and I have never seen once my Republican colleagues want to reduce spending for Medicaid.

What I do think is unfair is, in my State of Florida, what money we receive from the Federal Government is significantly less per person than what a State like New York has. So I would like changes to the Medicaid Program. I would like it to be a fair program in which States like Florida will get treated just as well as States like New York.

We cannot forget that America is in a public health crisis and a crippling debt crisis. Democrats are handing out stimulus checks with your tax dollars to Federal inmates who don’t like it because it benefits their pockets. Food and medical expenses included—paid for by taxpayers, and they do nothing to stimulate the economy.

It simply doesn’t make sense.

My friends and colleagues, Senators BILL CASSIDY, Tom COTTON, and TED CRUZ, tried to fix this by introducing an amendment to strip this out of the Democratic bill, but the Democrats wouldn’t have it.

Senate Democrats voted unanimously to block the passage of that amendment and chose instead to waste even more taxpayer dollars by sending $1,400 checks to inmates.

Let’s talk about what that means for American taxpayers. There are nearly 1.5 million State and Federal inmates. The check would go across the United States. These are people convicted of committing serious crimes and victimizing their fellow Americans.

Under this bill the Democrats passed, American taxpayers are on the hook for $1,400 checks to some of the most heinous people we have ever seen. I am talking about people like the racist Charleston Church shooter, Dylann Roof; serial rapist and predator, Larry Nassar; aspiring terrorist, Muhammad Dakhilhala, who tried to join ISIS and is now in prison in Georgia; convicted serial killer and rapist, Mark Goudeau, who is on death row in Arizona; convicted cop killer, Michael Addison, who is on death row in New Hampshire; and the monster who killed 17 innocent Floridians in Parkland at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018.

How could anyone—anyone—possibly justify sending checks to these people? If we send $1,400 checks to all State and Federal inmates, all 1.5 million, that is more than $2 billion—$2 billion in taxpayer money going to stimulus checks for inmates.

That is $2 billion that could be used to help our small businesses recover; $2 billion that could be used to enhance vaccine development and distribution so that more Americans can get the shots they need to move us forward and away from this virus; $2 billion that could be used to pay down some of our massive debt. There are so many positive uses for these funds that provide a real return for American taxpayers, but sending them to inmates isn’t one of them. It is an unjustified expense that does nothing to fight COVID-19.

Today, I ask for full support of this body to strip this bad policy from law.
Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senator from Oregon.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I wish you and I wish everyone a happy St. Patrick's Day. It is a big day for celebration up in Boston and all of Massachusetts and all across the country and the world. On St. Patrick's Day, everyone is Irish. So I wish every single person a happy St. Patrick's Day today.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Madam President, right now on the floor of the U.S. Senate is a reason not to be in Congress, but I look forward to very soon casting my vote to confirm Xavier Becerra to lead the Department of Health and Human Services, one of the most qualified and forward-thinking minds that will have ever run the Department of Health and Human Services.

But today, Republicans are using this confirmation vote to continue their agenda of obstruction, deflecting attention away from the nominee who will be the head of the chief Federal Agency responding to the coronavirus crisis—all to revive an unnecessary, blatantly political debate on reproductive rights. This ridiculous delay tactic only highlights how out of step with the American people the Senate Republicans are.

Their anti-choice, anti-woman, and anti-health rhetoric is on full display here on the Senate floor, and, sadly, it is not new. They want to roll back Roe v. Wade. They want to criminalize abortion care. They want the government to control women and their bodies. They want to roll back title IX protections for women on university campuses and completely gut the Title X program to fund critical healthcare providers like Planned Parenthood.

Republicans have put in place an anti-choice majority on the U.S. Supreme Court by confirming Justices Neil Gorsuch and Brett Kavanaugh and illegitimately filling Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's seat with Amy Coney Barrett. If there ever were a reason to abolish the filibuster, it is to ensure that we pass legislation to expand the Supreme Court so it cannot overturn Roe v. Wade and set us back decades in the fight for equal access to healthcare in our country.

But here today, the Republicans are attempting to disrupt the nomination of our Secretary of Health and Human Services with a craven political play to their base at the expense of the health of Americans. They would rather play politics than confirm President Biden's nominees. They would rather remain beholden to the right's interest groups than do the work the American people sent us here to do.

For the past 4 years, the Trump administration emboldened these groups by their dangerous rhetoric and right policies. But in November, how did the American people respond? They voted him out and gave the Democrats the Senate majority. Americans entrusted us to serve them, not fringe interest groups who want to turn back the clocks on healthcare and women's rights. That is why I stand on the floor of the U.S. Senate today to say abortion is healthcare. We cannot stand for any more disparities, delays, or denials. More than ever in this country, we need to stand up and raise our voices against the Republican's work to restrict access to reproductive health services. We have a fight ahead of us—a fight to protect reproductive freedom, a fight to make sure that birth control is affordable and available, and a fight for title X to ensure that low-income patients receive quality family planning and reproductive health services.

Voters expect the Biden-Harris administration to take bold steps to protect and expand access to reproductive healthcare and freedoms, to ensure that every person has the fundamental right to make their own healthcare decisions, and they expect it because they want it.

Public support for Roe v. Wade is at a record high. Seventy-seven percent of Americans support the Supreme Court decision. That goes beyond a simple majority to an overwhelming consensus. A couple of years ago, one analysis of polling found that there is not a single State in the United States where a majority of voters support “making abortion illegal in all circumstances.” The American people have moved past that debate that Republicans seem committed to resuscitating on the floor today. They are on the wrong side of history and the wrong side of the American people.

So as Republicans try to hijack this confirmation vote on Xavier Becerra,
all I can say is, enough. Enough with the era of extreme bodily discrimination. Enough with outside entities taking control over what a woman can and cannot do with her body. Enough with mounting barriers to reproductive services and birth control. Enough with criminalization of abortion. Enough with creating roadblocks for poor women, immigrant women, and women of color to get equal access to healthcare. Enough with this offensive debate steeped in misogyny, partisanship, and ignorance.

It is time to guarantee quality, affordable healthcare regardless of race, status, or gender. It is time to rectify the healthcare and reproductive injustices that have cost too many lives for too long. We must move away from the antiquated and ideological debate over women’s bodies and recognize the spaces in which our government can promote equity. We can reshape policy to reflect the constitutional rights of all people.

By delaying Xavier Becerra’s nomination to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, Republicans seem more interested in denying the health rights of half of Americans than in protecting all of Americans.

Plain and simple, Xavier Becerra is exceedingly qualified to be our next Health and Human Services Secretary. He has proven that he prioritizes science and facts, believes in each person’s right to make health and medical decisions about their own bodies, and is dedicated to fighting for those most vulnerable in our society. His record and support for reproductive freedom reflect the will of the vast majority of Americans who support legal access to abortion. He is committed to reproductive freedom and understands the importance of ensuring people have access to the accurate information they need to make the best decisions for their lives and families.

Xavier Becerra knows what is at stake, and I have the utmost confidence that he will lead with conviction, with compassion, and with care, and is ready to undo the damage that has been done by his predecessors.

As America continues to battle the coronavirus pandemic, his confirmation is long overdue. I am proud to support Xavier Becerra today as Secretary of Health and Human Services. He will be one of the best Secretaries our country has ever known.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New Jersey.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss yesterday’s report from the Intelligence Community, a public report, which confirmed what we all suspected last year: that the Russian Federation favored Donald Trump’s reelection and sought to influence the election by amplifying attacks on Joe Biden and his family. While the scale of interference appears to be less than what we saw in 2016, the receptiveness of Trump’s inner circle appears to have been about the same. They were open for business.

I am not here to re-litigate the 2016 or 2020 elections; I am here to raise my concern with the fact that, for two consecutive election cycles now, the Republican Party’s nominee for President sought to normalize foreign interference in our elections. And I want to be clear. It is wrong, it is hostile, it is undemocratic, and it must stop if you want the American people to have the confidence in our democracy and the credibility of our elections going forward.

This is not about party; this is about the durability of our democracy. Everyone in this body has an important role to play in rejecting foreign interference and restoring trust in our election process.

While the contents of the report came as no surprise, its findings were nonetheless breathtaking. Our intelligence agencies are highly confident—the highest assessment they have on any given issue—in its assessment that Vladimir Putin was involved in the operation whereby Andrii Derkach and Konstantin Kliunik successfully manipulated President Trump’s inner circle, including his personal attorney, Rudy Giuliani.

Thankfully, the American people had better sense than Mr. Giuliani and rejected the Kremlin-backed lies about Joe Biden and his family. That, however, does not diminish the fact that the Russian Government undertook this effort and the former President welcomed it. The Russian interference detailed in this report occurred at the very same time the Trump administration sought to publicly downplay the role played by Russia.

This report was mandated by Congress and for good reason. Americans deserve to know exactly who is interfering with our democracy. As I have said before, everyone has a role to play, including the American people. We have to encourage Americans to practice better cyber security and to scrutinize the information they see on the web. Carefully examining social media posts before sharing them must become the new hallmark of a patriotic, active, and informed citizenry. And our social media companies must do a better job stopping the proliferation of foreign disinformation on their platforms.

The health of our democracy depends on this vigilance. The Kremlin will continue to attack our elections and seek to sow divisions among us. We have a responsibility to resist this interference and not make their job any easier.

We live in a media environment where Donald Trump and his Republican allies continue to this day to promote unhinged conspiracy theories that the election was stolen. The intelligence report confirms this is not true.

Some Republican officials have promoted wild conspiracy theories that China supported Democratic campaigns. The intelligence report confirms this was not true.

Former President Trump and his allies still assert that Venezuela manipulated voting machines. A companion report by the Department of Justice and Homeland Security confirmed this is not true.

We must come to terms with the fact that while Russia has aggressively promoted disinformation in our country, the most pernicious engine of lies in the United States is cast by the former President himself.

Knowing the facts sets a foundation for action, and I look forward to engaging with this administration on measures to respond to our intelligence community’s findings. There should be sanctions required in response to this interference, and the administration should move quickly to impose them.

I welcome the approach thus far by the Biden administration as it crafts a Russia policy that addresses Kremlin aggression when it happens and takes strong measures in response. The sanctions imposed in response to the Navalny assassination attempt demonstrate that such reckless and dangerous behavior will not be tolerated. Any attempts by the administration to hold accountable will include close coordination with our European allies.

The package of sanctions announced on March 2 shows how committed the Biden administration is to confronting Russian aggression. This rigorous approach in the development of sanctions packages is a welcome reminder of how our government should work. The Navalny sanctions were a good first step, and I look forward to soon seeing the results of the administration’s review of Russian policy. In my view, we need a strategy that accomplishes four main goals.

One, limiting the Kremlin’s ability to interfere in our democracy as well as those of our allies and partners. This includes a comprehensive plan to counter Russian-generated propaganda and corruption around the world.

Two, standing up for our friends in Ukraine who are literally on the frontlines battling Kremlin aggression. They need our diplomatic support in Europe. They need our security assistance to defend themselves. They need our encouragement to reform democratic institutions. I hope that President Biden will soon speak with President Zelensky to send these important messages.

Three, we have a responsibility to engage with the Russian Government when it is in our national security interests. I supported the extension of the New START agreement and urge the administration to continue to advance arms control policies that advance stability and our national security.

Finally, our Russia policy must extend a hand to the Russian people. Russia is a country that has been grossly turned out by the thousands in opposition to Putin and his government. Their struggle for democracy is theirs,
not ours, but we must make clear that our disagreements are not with them but with Vladimir Putin and his corrupt, autocratic regime.

Defending our elections isn’t just about strong cyber measures, protecting the ballot box, and promoting better practices on social media. It is also about having a foreign policy that clearly communicates our values and interests, one that leaves no room for debate over the openness of any American President to foreign interference. It is about using a foreign policy that recognizes how the Kremlin’s efforts to weaken democracy in Ukraine or in other European countries ultimately threatens democracy here in the United States. It is about a foreign policy that works with allies and partners, not one that denigrates them at every turn.

The intelligence community is getting better at detecting and guarding against interference, but we must remain vigilant. Russia and other foreign actors will continue to attack our democratic process. Their tactics may evolve, but their intentions remain the same, and we need to stay one step ahead of them.

The Biden administration is off to a good start in defending our democracy. As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I look forward to working together to advance policies that reflect America’s time-honored democratic values both at home and abroad.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY
Madam President, parliamentary inquiry: Is there a time limit that we are in the midst of?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The floor is open to any Senator who seeks recognition.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Thank you.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA
Madam President, just switching very briefly, I want to urge my colleagues to join me in support of the nomination of Xavier Becerra to serve as Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

I consider Mr. Becerra a friend. I had the privilege of serving with him in the House of Representatives. In fact, we both came to Congress at the same time, a time, I might add, when there were far fewer Latinos elected to Federal office than we have today.

As a member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health, Mr. Becerra frequently spoke up for the many Americans left behind by our healthcare system: seniors facing sky-high prescription drug bills, patients with preexisting conditions, children, and everyone else. He took on tobacco companies, opioid manufacturers, and polluters. That is another reason Republicans oppose him, because he took on their biggest contributors and their sponsors and the people they came to the Senate and fight for. That willingness to stand up to big drug companies is going to be more important than ever in the years ahead.

The cost of prescription drugs eats away at the budget of seniors and families in Cleveland and Akron and Mansfield and Youngstown and Dayton. I look forward to working with future Secretary Becerra to bring down those drug prices. I also hope we can work together to expand the Affordable Care Act and to make it work even better for the families.

We started this month, and the President from Wisconsin was a part of this, with the American Rescue Plan. People buying healthcare in the ACA exchanges are going to have lower premiums because of the rescue plan. Mr. Becerra will work to undo the vast disparities in healthcare in our country. This pandemic has been the great revealer. It has shown how unequal access to care and pollution and biases in the system and so much else have hurt the health of Black and Brown Americans for generations.

We need to start with getting accurate data on how different communities have been hurt by this pandemic, something I have pushed for over the past year and something I know will be a priority to the new Secretary of Health and Human Services.

I urge my colleagues to join me in confirming him so he can work to help secure America’s future. We need to expand PPE and COVID testing supplies, and to build a stronger healthcare system for the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I rise to speak in favor of Xavier Becerra, as Senator MENENDEZ just did.

Like Senator MENENDEZ, when Xavier and I came, we all were in the first class in 1992 together. I consider him a friend also and have admired the work that he did as a Member of Congress, as attorney general, and the work that he will do at HHS.

In the middle of the worst health crisis of our lifetime, we need someone leading this Department who understands the importance of public health more than he will work harder to protect and improve access to healthcare than he will.

As the first Secretary of Health and Human Services of Latino descent, I know that he will focus a great deal on addressing the health disparities that are harming so many lower income and minority communities nationwide, disparities we saw play out over the past year as COVID–19 claimed a disproportionate number of Black and Brown lives.

Mr. Becerra will also work to undo the damage wrought by the Trump administration to our healthcare system, from weakening nursing home standards that left seniors more vulnerable in this pandemic to allowing health insurers to, once again, sell shoddy, skimpy plans to consumers that failed to protect them from massive medical bills.

And, finally, I want to address some of the criticisms I have heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle regarding Mr. Becerra’s qualifications. The notion that Mr. Becerra has no managerial experience is laughable, given that as California’s attorney general, he has successfully led the second largest Justice Department in the Nation, second only to the U.S. Department of Justice.

And it is not lost on me that those questioning Mr. Becerra’s credentials are the very same colleagues who claim that Congressman Tom Price’s background as a doctor qualified him to lead an Agency that touches the lives of every single person in our great land. Well, he was a disaster and did not lead a full year as Secretary of HHS. And the immediate past Secretary was a lawyer who did a good job in his pharmaceutical firm of dramatically pushing up insulin prices.

So I am confident that both Mr. Becerra’s passion for healthcare issues, as demonstrated throughout his tenure in Congress, and his record as California’s attorney general will serve him well as Secretary of Health and Human Services.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have spoken up for the millions of Black and Brown Americans for generations. As California’s attorney general, he ran a program that expanded coverage to millions of Ohioans and tens of millions of Americans.

I think the Republican opposition, all partisan opposition, to Attorney General Becerra for Secretary of HHS, as Senator CASEY pointed out, is all about their opposition to the Affordable Care Act, their opposition to expansion of Medicaid. I heard one Senator after another say their State isn’t treated right by Medicaid, but they didn’t even expand Medicaid in many of those States.

As State attorney general, he took on tobacco companies, drug companies, opioid manufacturers, and polluters. That is another reason Republicans oppose him, because he took on their biggest contributors and their sponsors and the people they came to the Senate and fight for. That willingness to stand up to big drug companies is going to be more important than ever in the years ahead.

I urge my colleagues to join me in confirming him so he can work to help secure America’s future. We need to expand PPE and COVID testing supplies, and to build a stronger healthcare system for the future.

As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I look forward to working together to advance policies that reflect America’s time-honored democratic values both at home and abroad. Their tactics may evolve, but their intentions remain the same, and we need to stay one step ahead of them.

The Biden administration is off to a good start in defending our democracy. As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I look forward to working together to advance policies that reflect America’s time-honored democratic values both at home and abroad. They are not the greatest contributors and their sponsors and the people they came to the Senate and fight for. That willingness to stand up to big drug companies is going to be more important than ever in the years ahead.

The cost of prescription drugs eats away at the budget of seniors and families in Cleveland and Akron and Mansfield and Youngstown and Dayton. I look forward to working with future Secretary Becerra to bring down those drug prices. I also hope we can work together to expand the Affordable Care Act and to make it work even better for the families.

We started this month, and the President from Wisconsin was a part of this, with the American Rescue Plan. People buying healthcare in the ACA exchanges are going to have lower premiums because of the rescue plan. Mr. Becerra will work to undo the vast disparities in healthcare in our country. This pandemic has been the great revealer. It has shown how unequal access to care and pollution and biases in the system and so much else have hurt the health of Black and Brown Americans for generations.

We need to start with getting accurate data on how different communities have been hurt by this pandemic, something I have pushed for over the past year and something I know will be a priority to the new Secretary of Health and Human Services.

I urge my colleagues to join me in confirming him so he can work to help secure America’s future. We need to expand PPE and COVID testing supplies, and to build a stronger healthcare system for the future.
Mr. BROWN. Madam President, for decades, Ohio workers have watched the spread of a corporate business model where companies shut down production in Toledo or Dayton or Gallipolis and overseas. They have known that their jobs would be outsourced overseas. They have collected a tax break to move jobs to Mexico or China where they can exploit workers only to sell their products back into the United States. Ohioans live with those consequences every day.

Last week, 81 union workers in Bucyrus, OH, had their jobs outsourced to China, where GE-Savant moved production of its high-efficiency light bulbs overseas. Now, 81 union workers are facing tough conversations at the kitchen tables: How will their families survive; will they fall behind on their rent or their mortgage; do they move away with their kids; will their kids have to change schools—all those decisions that families have to make when workers or when plants shut down and move overseas.

The Presiding Officer from Wisconsin has been involved in this fight ever since her career began in the House 20-plus years ago, and I have worked alongside with her to make sure that we have a different trade policy. But when one production line closes, the ripple effect extends, as we know, to the whole community, to other workers and communities in the supply chain.

Yesterday, people in Northeast Ohio, in the Cleveland area, woke up to headlines about yet another American corporation deciding to build things in Mexico instead of Ohio with Ford breaking its promise to invest $900 million in Avon Lake.

I got a call 2 days ago from a smalltown mayor, John Hunter, mayor of Sheffield Lake, OH, a longtime Ford worker, retired, now mayor of Sheffield Village. He talked to me. Ford had promised, at the bargaining table in 2019, that they would invest $900 million in this Avon Lake plant. Ohioans are tired of watching corporation after corporation abandon the workers and communities that have made their businesses successful.

We are being told that production of cheap, simple products will be shipped overseas, while innovative, high-value products will be made in the United States by American workers. I saw in Bucyrus, we see in Avon Lake, that that is just not true, and we are sick of it. Our trade policy has to change.

That is why today was a good day for this country. Katherine Tai was confirmed by this body 98 to nothing. She understands trade policy. She is the right leader to take us in a new direction on trade with American workers at the center. She is a serious expert. She is respected on both sides of the aisle. We saw that in that vote today. She has a proven track record of making progress for workers.

Last year, I voted for a trade agreement for the first time ever in my career because of our work with Senator Wyden to fix the Trump administration’s corporate trade agreement. He said it was a new NAFTA. It was really a tired, old, mostly the same NAFTA, rebranded as USMCA. We went to work. We secured groundbreaking new worker protections. Katherine Tai was one of the key policymakers who worked with us to make that happen. She was in the negotiations. She was in the discussions. She helped Senator Wyden come out with a much better worker bill that people, like a whole lot of us, as progressives, pro-worker Senators, could vote for.

Her work helped us make the first improvement to enforcing labor standards in our trade agreements enforceable, serious labor standards, since we have been negotiating them. We know why companies close factories in Ohio and open them in Mexico. They can pay lower wages. They can take advantage of workers who don’t have rights. American workers can’t compete. We get a race to the bottom on wages and benefits.

The only way of stopping it is raising labor standards in a country we trade with and making sure those labor standards are enforced. That is what Katherine Tai will do. She will enforce the laws we already have. She will stand up for American workers. She will fight for American businesses when countries cheat the rules. She will work with us to level the playing field so steelworkers and autoworkers and communication workers in Ohio and everywhere around the country can compete.

She won’t allow corporate lobbyists to write trade agreements. We have seen it. Since I came to the Congress, we have seen it with NAFTA. We have seen it with CAPTA. We have seen it with PNTR. We have seen it with agreement after agreement after agreement. Corporate lobbyists write trade agreements. Workers are locked out of the room.

Now, with U.S. Trade Rep Tai's confirmation—the nominee, of course—I asked her what she will do to start to regain the trust of Americans in trade. She said:

You start by listening.

She then talked about the Mahoning Valley, Youngstown area in my State, listening to and understanding the concerns of communities that have gotten hurt over and over.

The administration's outline for its 2021 agenda, trade agenda, which Miss Tai will be charged with carrying out, says that "trade policy should respect the dignity of work." Trade policy should respect the dignity of work and valuing Americans as workers and wage earners.

Imagine that; that our trade policy, never before have we seen this respecting the dignity of work and valuing Americans as workers and wage earners. That is the kind of thinking we need leading our trade policy.

As the first woman of color to ever serve as the President's chief trade advisor, Katherine Tai knows how important it is for the people in the room making trade decisions to actually reflect, to actually reflect the diverse workforce that our trade policy affects.

We know one good appointment and one good provision don’t stop outsourcing, but I am always going to be straight with American workers. We have come a long, long way, but we have a long, long way to go to undo the damage our trade policies have done over the past three decades.

As the President said, I have stood up to Presidents of both parties on trade throughout my career. That is not going to change. One of my proudest votes was one of my first votes, and that was against the North American Free Trade Agreement.

I will continue to watch closely what this administration does. If they show any hint of reverting back to the old way of doing things, of letting corporations dictate trade policy at the expense of workers, then I will bear that out from me. This is going to be a constant effort over many years.

As thrilled as I am with Katherine Tai, we know we still have a job to do to reorient trade agreements and trade policy that our emphasis no longer is corporations, but it is American workers. It has to be coupled with real investment in the communities that have been hollowed out because of Washington's and Wall Street's past mistakes to be paired with an overhaul of our Tax Code to end, once and for all, the tax breaks paid for by Ohioans and others to send production overseas.

Trade doesn't happen in a vacuum. Our policies must work together to create a global market where workers are treated with dignity; they are safe on the job; they are paid fair wages; they are able to bargain collectively; they are able to bargain collectively for better wages and benefits.

When you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work. That is what Katherine Tai will do.

I thank my colleagues for the strong vote in support of her confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise today in strong support for the nomination of Attorney General Xavier Becerra, to be the next Secretary of Health and Human Services.

I am absolutely confident that Mr. Becerra has the knowledge, the experience, the skills, and, just as importantly, the values and principles required of this job—a job that will play a key role in beating the coronavirus and tackling the urgent issues of equity and affordability now facing our healthcare system.

I am especially confident in my assessment of Xavier Becerra because I have known him personally for years, both as a former colleague and as a
friend. I first met then-Congressman Becerra in the House of Representatives, where he served for over two decades with myself and the Presiding Officer and others, and where he was a champion for the healthcare rights of the American people. Working together over time, I saw that every American had access to quality, affordable healthcare.

We served together in the House Democratic leadership, and we served together on the House Ways and Means Committee. So I have had an opportunity to see his legislative talents up front and also to witness his love of service to our country.

We worked together to halt a number of proposals that maybe some of our Republican colleagues here in the Senate were pushing for, including the proposal that continuously appeared in the House Republican budget to voucherize the Medicare Program. One of the former Speakers of the House wanted to sell Medicare as an entitlement to buy into Medicare with a voucher and send them out into more of a private marketplace. It would have ended up putting our seniors more at risk. So together we did battle that idea.

We worked together on what was known as the Congressional Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, also known as the “supercommittee,” and known to some as the “not-so-super committee.” I saw him work to try to achieve agreements on some of the biggest challenges facing our country, but, like him, we both agreed that we weren’t going to do that at the expense of protecting Medicare for seniors, protecting Medicaid as an absolutely essential healthcare safety net for tens of millions of Americans, and we were not prepared to provide more tax cuts to the very wealthiest of Americans.

It is in that last effort where Xavier Becerra showed really distinctly himself in the House, when it came to the issue of equity and healthcare. I know the Presiding Officer knows well the battles we all went in together in the development and passage of the Affordable Care Act, and it was that that really defined Mr. Becerra’s legacy in the House.

He championed the Affordable Care Act from the very start. He helped both to write and to pass this landmark law that has saved millions of millions of our fellow Americans, and after leaving the Congress, he led the charge to defend the Affordable Care Act against the Texas case before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now, I know a lot of our Republican colleagues have also spent years fighting the Affordable Care Act. We have seen that play out here in the U.S. Senate within the last couple years. But the reality is the Affordable Care Act is very important to the overwhelming majority of American people who support it and is an essential lifeline to quality, affordable healthcare for tens of millions of Americans. And it is that

that Mr. Becerra fought to pass and which he has fought to defend against constant attacks in the courts.

There is no question that Xavier Becerra fights for what he believes is right, as he should, but that has never prevented him from getting the job done and getting things done. As the attorney general in the State of California, he has repeatedly partnered with Republicans to solve the pressing issues facing our fellow citizens.

His record shows that Attorney General Becerra fights for what is important to the people he represents, not the party he belongs to, and he has demonstrated it by example time and time again with his ability to bridge deep divisions, even during this time of division. He has really worked with it right hard for each and every one of our fellow citizens and will not look to see whether somebody is a Democrat or a Republican or from some other party. What he cares about is making sure he is looking out for the healthcare of every American.

And, at this moment, everyone in this country stands to benefit from an effective leader at the helm of the Department of Health and Human Services. We need a secretary that can contain the spread of COVID-19 and to defeat COVID-19. That requires clear messaging on public health measures. That requires accelerating the distribution of vaccines and treatment and testing and making sure we do all of that in an equitable way. That means safely guiding the opening of our schools, and we all want our students to go back to school as quickly as possible and as safely as possible.

As the attorney general of California, he has led one of the largest departments of justice in the country, and, in that capacity, has stood up for strong consumer and worker protections throughout this pandemic and before, and I trust that he will continue to do so for all Americans as Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, if confirmed.

We know that the public emergency and health crisis has been a blow to our country. It has also laid bare the fault lines in terms of racial inequities, inaccessibility for underserved communities, and underinvestment in our public health infrastructure. These issues, of course, predated COVID-19, but we must tackle them with renewed urgency as we emerge from this crisis.

Mr. Becerra is equipped to root out these disparities, both because of his knowledge and skill and expertise but also because of his lived experience. Xavier grew up in a working-class Latino family. He knows the communities that are hurting most because he has lived in those communities. He would bring to this important office not only his expertise and skill but the empathy and the compassion needed to help those most in need.

Like most of us, Mr. Becerra is also guided and motivated by what makes him most proud: his family. At his confirmation hearing, he spoke movingly about his wife and his children, who are all a part of all that he does. And he spoke about his parents, who traveled to this country from Mexico seeking a better life, with nothing more than Xavier’s words, “their health and their hope.”

It is that health and that hope that propelled Mr. Becerra into a life of public service, and it is that hope that will animate his leadership at the Department of Health and Human Services, should he be confirmed by this Senate.

He was brought up in a family that believed in and sought the American dream for their children and for every one of our fellow citizens. The Department of Health and Human Services, if confirmed by the Senate, will be a place where Mr. Becerra will get to work to make that dream real for families across this Nation. He believes, as I believe, that that mission requires us to care for the health and safety of each and every one of our fellow citizens, and I have full confidence that he is up to the task.

Colleagues, I urge us to confirm the nomination of Xavier Becerra to be the next Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASAN). The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, this past year has been hard on Hoosiers and all Americans across the country. When the economy was shut down, Congress got to work. Given my background as a business owner, I was involved in negotiating the Paycheck Protection Program, known as PPP, as part of the CARES Act, one of five bills that passed in 2020 with overwhelming support, I think 90-plus votes. We worked it out, Democrats and Republicans, together.

Those COVID-related packages totaled $4 trillion, and we didn’t have a penny saved up ahead of time to prepare for it. That is part of a deeper problem with this institution, is that we borrow anything that we spend money on, even 23 percent of our annual operating budget. To put that in perspective, imagine if you had a business doing $100,000 in revenue, and you lose $23,000, and then you go to your banker and expect them to bail you out. It wouldn’t make sense.

We came into 2021 with over $1 trillion from those packages unspent, obligated. Instead of working with us like before, Democrats did shut us out of the process. In fact, the Senate as a whole did not work through committees. It was laid to us, on the Senate, by the House, all $1.9 trillion of it.

Before this, some Republicans went to the White House and talked with the President about a bipartisan plan, knowing all the money would be borrowed again, but nothing came to fruition. Instead, we stayed up all night;
finished the bill at noon the next day, Saturday; spent 29 hours on the floor, and not a single Republican amendment was adopted in this massive spending bill.

Instead of focusing on the virus and getting our economy back on track, this became an exercise in raw pandering, something through that was a liberal wish list. Only 1 percent of the bill—1 percent of the bill—went toward the vaccine. Less than 9 percent goes toward COVID-19 public health issues generally.

While the Congressional Budget Office projects the economy to return to prepandemic levels by midyear, only 5 percent of the $300 billion for K–12 schools gets spent this year, and none of it is tied to reopening our schools, which many States had shut down early and opened up late.

Included in this package is a whopping $350 billion for State and local governments. I had a conversation with our Governor 2, 3 weeks ago. A place like Indiana, and I believe West Virginia as well, probably runs balanced budgets. We do it with the guardrail of a constitutional amendment. Many other States, if they don’t have a constitutional amendment, they have a statutory. In other words, you do what households do. You do what all businesses do. You live within your means. And here, when you run your State governments in a way that in good times you don’t overspend money, and you look to the Federal Government to bail out your bad governance, it is a whole nother issue.

Even left-leaning economists and think tanks are worried about what this is going to do down the road because most of the time, you don’t feel the repercussions until later. And, of course, that could show up in inflation. It could show up in a way similar to what we dealt with in the late seventies and early eighties.

Forty-four States had surpluses last year, when you look at COVID funding. Many places, like California, had surpluses. Then they reconfigured how this was done not based on pro rata revenues as they see fit for their State’s unique needs.

Second, this bill strips out the reporting requirement where States have to tell the Federal Government about every revenue source and amount of money they take in. This place ought to be doing that routinely to all the people, how they make their revenue.

This bill has the support of over 25 groups, including the American Legislative Exchange Council, Americans for Prosperity, Americans for Tax Reform, Citizens Against Government Waste, Club for Growth, FreedomWorks, Heritage Action for America, Independent Women’s Forum, and the National Taxpayers Union, among others. We expect many more to join in coming days. I am sure many stakeholders in Indiana and in West Virginia not mentioned will throw in support as well.

Lastly, I would like to thank the Finance Committee ranking member, Senator CRAPO, for coppingsonorship this legislation and all the others, including Senators BLACKBURN, CAPITO, INHOFE, MARSHALL, RUBIO, RICK SCOTT, TILLIS, and Senator Young from my home State.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 730 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANCHIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, my good friend the Senator from Indiana—I am hoping this is a misunderstanding, and I hope I can explain it because I was very much involved in this process.

First of all, as a former Governor, I know about the budget process. I know about balanced budgets. I used to meet every Tuesday afternoon. As Governor, I would have my finance people come to my office, and we would sit down and look at the revenue estimates. We had to make adjustments because we had a balanced budget amendment. Isn’t that a novelty, a balanced budget amendment? I believe it is something we own in our confines. That is something that no one who has ever been in State government or ever run a business understands. I understand that. But it is something that we did very religiously. And here, when you run your State like Indiana, the only thing this bill does—or that language you were concerned about, the only thing it did—you can cut all you want to. You can manage all your money the way you want. You just can’t take Federal money and use it if you cut your revenue intentionally. That is all. What we try to do is target where the money has gone.

As for the Treasury, you have to go as a State, you go to the Treasury, and you show the need that you have. You show the cost—what COVID has cost your revenue and you are able to have money to replace that because COVID caused you that problem. And here, we have the ability to use this, in your State, for three things: water, sewer, and internet service. So you have infrastructure that can be done.

Also, what we did in this bill is we have it going out to 2024, so you are not having to worry about the overpay, the overheat or overcharge the economy. They can spread that out. The State and local moneys go in two tranches: Half this year, half next year is what you can access. The money to every one of your communities—for the first time, 40 percent of that total money goes directly, so your large cities will get money directly from the Treasury. They have to show how they are using it for their backfill, not, basically, having to go back to the State or the Federal Government to show that you are in good shape. But if you need it for anything else, you can use it for that. You can use it for all these things.

I can tell you—I would assure you that every incorporated city in Indiana, every county in Indiana has to be thrilled. They have to be thrilled for the first time to have control of their destiny. That was our intention.

In the first CARES package, that never happened. The first CARES package, no one has hearing the explanation for it. I think it was a sneaky maneuver when you put it in such a large bill that had other doozies like stimulus checks for undocumented immigrants, for felons, all kinds of stuff that I think, when you look at it, shouldn’t have been in there. But when it is that massive—it takes 10, 11 hours to read out loud—you are going to get some of that. What this does is say that if you want the money, they should be good stewards of their money, and especially a place like this that runs the way it does day in and day out should not be telling States that run their operations responsibly that they cannot do what they want with spending or taxation.

My bill strikes the provision that prohibits States’ ability to change revenues as they see fit for their State’s unique needs.

Second, this bill does something through that was a liberal wish list. Of course, most of the time, you don’t feel the repercussions until later. And, of course, that could show up in inflation. It could show up in a way similar to what we dealt with in the late seventies and early eighties.

Forty-four States had surpluses last year, when you look at COVID funding. Many places, like California, had surpluses. Then they reconfigured how this was done not based on pro rata revenues as they see fit for their State’s unique needs.

Governor Holcomb in Indiana has done a great job balancing the economy with public safety, and that is why my amendment rate is so close to a full employment rate. It was the lowest in the Midwest going into it because we have a good business climate, and we have a low cost of living. Things work there. Sadly, the Democrats’ bill punishes States like Indiana for satisfying reopening. They take a State’s unemployment rate, again, the more bailout money you get proportionately.

But it goes one step further, and this is the part that caught my attention. I am interested in hearing the explanation for it. I think it was a sneaky maneuver when you put it in such a large bill that had other doozies like...
trying to do forever and never had the resources to do it, they can use their money for that.

If they have a sewer project—I have said this: How do we pick water, sewer, and internet? They are not the sexy things. The politicians go out and cut ribbons for a sewer line or a water line that is buried 50 feet down. That is not a sexy thing.

We knew the infrastructure was failing apart city by city and the ages of water lines are over 80 years in most of our cities. So we tried to do something.

They have until 2024, so they don’t have to throw it out. It is not shovel-ready. It is a project you have been wanting to do but never could afford.

I assure you, we do not want to impede good fiscal management to make adjustments to do whatever they want to their tax codes. This does not prohibit that. It just prohibits using and going to the Treasury and saying: I have a loss of revenue because my dear friend from Maine is going to the Federal Treasury and say: I made a mistake. Now I want to have a productive sit-down and say: OK, I made a mistake. Now I need your money.

I am very reluctant to object to any of my Senators, my fellow Senators, but on this one, sir—if I can work with you on this—I am objecting because I want to have a productive sit-down with you and we can work on something together.

I am very reluctant to object to any of my Senators, my fellow Senators, but on this one, sir—if I can work with you on this—I am objecting because I want to have a productive sit-down with you and we can work on something together.

Please tell your Governor that he can cut away if he wants to. He just can’t go back to the Federal Government and say: OK, I made a mistake. Now I need your money.

That is about it in a nutshell. If Indiana can cut and it helps you and grows your economy, God bless you. If you have COVIP expenses, we are going to help you if you have projects—my goodness, just infrastructure projects—then there is no impediment if you have internet services you need, if you have water services, and you have sewer services.

In West Virginia, what we are trying to do right now is put a team together that can basically work from this. The State has money for those three tranches of infrastructure. The counties have it, and the municipalities have it. The unincorporated towns that aren’t able to get money directly are going to count on the county and the State.

There is so much good to be done to make it work for you to make sure they understand. They are elated to now have a project they never could finish, like upgrade your services, finish your water line, have internet service for you. You have never had before. These are all unbelievable opportunities that we have never had.

The bipartisan SMART Act that was filed in May 2020 included both of these guardrails, plus another one required maintenance of effort. We have that in there. Maintenance of effort—we put that back then.

The Bipartisan State and Local Support of Small Business Protections Act that was released last December had the same language. This is not new language, sir. This is the same language that has been there.

They have never been able to backfill for, basically, discretionary cuts that they made themselves. It doesn’t prohibit anybody in their State for having and being a former Governor, I am very partial to the 10th Amendment to the Constitution, States rights. You have those rights. Now you have the assurance also with those rights.

I am hoping to improve everyone’s situation. I know it does in West Virginia. I hope it does in Maine. I hope it does in Indiana, and I think it will.

It is all about making these emergency funds get to the right people. We are trying to target it. It is something we have to keep an eye on. I can tell if we do it and do it right and we are good stewards, this will get us through this COVID challenge that we have because we really don’t know. We are hoping we come out of this guns ablazing in July—we come out of this, and the economy takes off like a rocket. Sometimes when they take off, they tend to level off too.

We want to make sure we are still out there for 2022, 2023, out to 2024. And if they do it and do it right, they can. They can finish their projects and be able to have the moneys as needed for emergencies if it has a dip.

With that, we thought we had worked something, but the language is nothing new. It is not a surprise. It was not anything that was put in; it has been there in basic. Basically, it is language that spells out pretty directly how you can use your money and what money you cannot acquire. That is the only thing we did.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANCHIN. Yes, there is objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Indiana.
Mr. BRAINTON. My friend from West Virginia explained why this won’t impact Governors and legislatures in terms of what they can do with their own fiscal policy. I would say my friend the Senator from West Virginia probably ought to check with Governor Justice to see if they are on the same wavelength there.

When we got input in bringing this up as an issue and when you are talking about the American Legislative Exchange Council, Americans for Tax Reform, they are not based upon penalizing States that are most apt to lower their tax rates because of how good their economies were pre-COVID, it would be a different issue as well.

So I am willing to listen in terms of how we bring this out, but then I am going to view it as something. I think, that is not going to sit well with many States, their Governors, or their legislatures and that has a possibility of being taken to court as being something that might be unconstitutional. If I am off base, I am willing to listen, but I will probably have to bring some other parties in to make sure that this isn’t a case of semantics and is real according to the way you explain it.

Mr. MANCHIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRAINTON. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. MANCHIN. First of all, I did have a nice conversation with Governor Justice. He and I have disagreed on basic issues of legislation, and we are trying to work through all of that. I explained it to him. I said that it doesn’t do a thing in that it doesn’t impede you at all. If you want to cut, go ahead and cut. He is still moving forward with the legislation. He might succeed on that, and he might not.

With that, I will make it very clear that this is not new language. You cannot backfill. You cannot backfill. The only thing you can use your money for is for COVID expenses. If your revenues went down through no fault of your own, business dropped off, and your tax collections were down through no fault of your own, then that is what this is for. COVID caused you a problem. It causes you an immediate and put that to use, but you are basically providing to the people of West Virginia and Indiana.

We want to make sure that your first responders are there and your education is there, that everything is still running the way it is supposed to. That is why we have passed five bills in trying to keep things afloat, and we think we have done that. So it does not impede that whatsoever. We have also looked at it constitutionally, and we are solid on the Constitution.

All we are asking is, does the Federal Government have a responsibility to backfill with Treasury dollars a decision that the Governor of West Virginia made? That is all. You should live with that or my State should live with it or reap the benefits. We are not penalized. Even if your revenues went up, you still had COVID expenses you could offset. Those were legitimate expenses that came out because of COVID-19. The COVID-19 pandemic is what we are talking about. So if your revenues went up after that, we are not penalizing you. If they went down, that is a whole other story because COVID caused that, but you just can’t cause it yourself. I think this is it in a nutshell.

Mr. BRAINTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANCHIN. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. BRAINTON. I think it begs the question in that, by cutting taxes, you are not going to get more tax revenues, and that has been a discussion we have all had for many years.

I know in places like Indiana—and we just had it occur here with the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of the Federal government—we were working with it—was getting close to saying its original forecast of when you had a tax cut, which was $1.5 trillion over 10 years, $150 billion per year, wasn’t working out that way because there is a phenomenon called: When you find the sweet spot of taxation, you can cut taxes and generate more revenue. Then you penalize a good fiscal move by the way you are interpreting your reading.

I am willing to get into the nuance to see if that would matter that particular case, but I don’t think it would.

Mr. BRAINTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRAINTON. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator BRAINTON has always been kind and very reasonable, and I look forward to sitting down with him on this.

What he has said is absolutely correct in that we are not penalizing. We don’t intend to penalize anybody who has made that decision, but the Senator is talking about a State that has a balanced budget amendment year in and year out. There is a time when a Governor has to make a decision and go to his legislature and say: Hey, we are broke. The economy is doing this. He is going to need this. I was working with it—was getting close to saying its original forecast of when you had a tax cut, which was $1.5 trillion over 10 years, $150 billion per year, wasn’t working out that way because there is a phenomenon called: When you find the sweet spot of taxation, you can cut taxes and generate more revenue. Then you penalize a good fiscal move by the way you are interpreting your reading.

I am willing to get into the nuance to see if that would matter that particular case, but I don’t think it would.

Mr. BRAINTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRAINTON. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator BRAINTON has always been kind and very reasonable, and I look forward to sitting down with him on this.

What he has said is absolutely correct in that we are not penalizing. We don’t intend to penalize anybody who has made that decision, but the Senator is talking about a State that has a balanced budget amendment year in and year out. There is a time when a Governor has to make a decision and go to his legislature and say: Hey, we are broke. The economy is doing this. He is going to need this. I was working with it—was getting close to saying its original forecast of when you had a tax cut, which was $1.5 trillion over 10 years, $150 billion per year, wasn’t working out that way because there is a phenomenon called: When you find the sweet spot of taxation, you can cut taxes and generate more revenue. Then you penalize a good fiscal move by the way you are interpreting your reading.

I am willing to get into the nuance to see if that would matter that particular case, but I don’t think it would.

Mr. BRAINTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRAINTON. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator BRAINTON has always been kind and very reasonable, and I look forward to sitting down with him on this.

What he has said is absolutely correct in that we are not penalizing. We don’t intend to penalize anybody who has made that decision, but the Senator is talking about a State that has a balanced budget amendment year in and year out. There is a time when a Governor has to make a decision and go to his legislature and say: Hey, we are broke. The economy is doing this. He is going to need this. I was working with it—was getting close to saying its original forecast of when you had a tax cut, which was $1.5 trillion over 10 years, $150 billion per year, wasn’t working out that way because there is a phenomenon called: When you find the sweet spot of taxation, you can cut taxes and generate more revenue. Then you penalize a good fiscal move by the way you are interpreting your reading.

I am willing to get into the nuance to see if that would matter that particular case, but I don’t think it would.

Mr. BRAINTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRAINTON. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator BRAINTON has always been kind and very reasonable, and I look forward to sitting down with him on this.

What he has said is absolutely correct in that we are not penalizing. We don’t intend to penalize anybody who has made that decision, but the Senator is talking about a State that has a balanced budget amendment year in and year out. There is a time when a Governor has to make a decision and go to his legislature and say: Hey, we are broke. The economy is doing this. He is going to need this. I was working with it—was getting close to saying its original forecast of when you had a tax cut, which was $1.5 trillion over 10 years, $150 billion per year, wasn’t working out that way because there is a phenomenon called: When you find the sweet spot of taxation, you can cut taxes and generate more revenue. Then you penalize a good fiscal move by the way you are interpreting your reading.

I am willing to get into the nuance to see if that would matter that particular case, but I don’t think it would.
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that prosecutors have every tool available to punish those who attack the men and women in blue.

Nationwide in 2020, 47 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty, and over 300 were shot. Three of those law enforcement officers were killed in my home state of North Carolina. So far in 2021, 14 officers have been killed in the line of duty, and over 50 have been shot. Countless others have been assaulted.

This year 2020 saw the rise of radical ideas like abolishing the police, which fueled distrust and disdain for our brave men and women in blue. Even while Americans of all views are calling for transparency and accountability, the ideas of abolishing and defunding the police only serve to deepen the divide in our country and our communities.

It is sad that Congress even needs to consider a bill to protect law enforcement officers. The heated rhetoric and the vocal opposition coming from people that will replace those who have left the profession or retired early. This is sad, but it is not surprising. Law enforcement officers put their lives at risk every single day. They leave their spouses and families every morning, and they don’t know if they are going to come back.

In 2018, before the antipolice rhetoric took hold, the House passed the legislation by an overwhelming vote of 382 to 35—the bill that I am reintroducing—by an overwhelming vote of 382 to 35. The bill that I am reintroducing today, which is why I call on all of my colleagues—Members of the Republican caucus and the Democratic caucus—to join us in support of this commonsense and needed legislation.

Congress must pass the Protect and Serve Act right away and boldly say that there is no escape from justice for dangerous criminals who intentionally assault and kill our hard-working, dedicated, and endangered law enforcement officers.

I urge the American people: Call your Senators. Ask them to support the measure. Tell them that you want this bill passed and our law enforcement officers protected. Don’t be silent. Help me fight for the men and women in blue, because they are counting on us. And along the way, when you see a law enforcement officer, thank them for their service and let them know Members of Congress are fighting for them. The HEROES OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, last month, the American people created 379,000 new jobs across our country. The unemployment rate fell to 6.2 percent. Our economy is recovering. We are actually on our way back to normal.

In early February, the Congressional Budget Office published a report on this. The report says that our economy will reach the same size that it was before the pandemic, and it will do it in just a few months. It says this summer our economy will be back to normal.

Now, the CBO made that projection weeks before the Democrats passed and the President signed into law a $1.9 trillion wish list. In other words, our economy would be back to normal even had they not passed the bill. We would be back to normal without a dime of this incredible high amount of spending.

We didn’t need the liberal wish list. The country doesn’t need it. Yet it is rushed—rushed—their liberal wish list into law. They wanted to stamp their name on the recovery that was coming, no matter what. I have no doubt that that is the goal.

Yet the truth is clear: This is not President Biden’s recovery. President Biden inherited three vaccines—successful vaccines, vaccines that work and are safe. President Biden inherited 2 million tests a day for coronavirus. President Biden inherited falling coronavirus numbers. He also inherited a recovering economy.

Last year, we saw the fastest economic recovery in American history. Had they never passed the bill, we would have been shot. Countless others have been shot. Over 27,000 law enforcement officers were hurt or killed in the line of duty, and over 300 were shot. Three of those law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty.

Madam President, on another matter, I also come to the floor to oppose what I see as a radical agenda of the Democrats in Congress. It has not even been 2 months since the Democrats took over the Senate, and they have already rolled out one of the most leftwing agendas in American history. They have already spent $1.9 trillion in Washington, DC, and put the $1.9 trillion in our tax dollars. Twenty-six Democrats have endorsed amnesty for illegal immigrants. Nearly every Democrat has endorsed giving statehood to Washington, DC, and now Senator SCHUMER has put gun control on the Senate’s to-do list. Democrats have proposed a radical agenda that invades nearly every aspect of American life.

Yet the driving force behind this agenda is not the Senate. It is still the House. House Democrats have gone and voted for Mr. Speaker’s and Mr. Speaker’s—Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker’s—Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker’s right to freedom of religion. They have gone after our Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. They have gone after our First Amendment right to freedom of religion. They have gone after our Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. They have gone after our right to work. When Democrats are in charge, none of our rights are safe.

Neither are our most cherished institutions. House Democrats have gone after our police, gone after our elections. They lecture Republicans about accepting the results of elections. Yet they are trying to overturn an election in Iowa.

Now, the lawyer the Democrats have put in charge of that case was just Operation Warp Speed broke records for vaccine development. A new vaccine typically takes about 10 years from the lab to people’s arms. The previous record for a vaccine was for mumps. It took 4 years. Last year, we achieved two coronavirus vaccines in 10 months. We have passed and put into place 1 billion doses. Yet we weren’t even close. The Food and Drug Administration made dozens of cuts to regulations in order to make this happen.

The Biden administration has not played it straight with the American people about coronavirus. We remember when Vice President Harris said that there was “no national strategy or plan for vaccinations.” They were delivering millions of doses of vaccines in December. President Biden said: “We got into office and there was nothing in the refrigerator”—“nothing in the refrigerator.” The Biden campaign and now the Biden administration has repeatedly lied to the American people about the coronavirus. They have repeatedly taken credit for things for which they deserve no credit.

Mark my words. This summer they are going to try to take credit for our recovery. If they do, they will be flat-out wrong.

Our recovery was booming under the Republican agenda, and it was an agenda of low taxes and fewer regulations. That is the agenda that the American people wanted to get our economy booming again.

DEMOCRATS’ AGENDA

Madam President, on another matter, I also come to the floor to oppose what I see as a radical agenda of the Democrats in Congress. It has not even been 2 months since the Democrats took over the Senate, and they have already rolled out one of the most leftwing agendas in American history. They have already spent $1.9 trillion in Washington, DC, and put the $1.9 trillion in our tax dollars. Twenty-six Democrats have endorsed amnesty for illegal immigrants. Nearly every Democrat has endorsed giving statehood to Washington, DC, and now Senator SCHUMER has put gun control on the Senate’s to-do list. Democrats have proposed a radical agenda that invades nearly every aspect of American life.

Yet the driving force behind this agenda is not the Senate. It is still the House. House Democrats have gone and voted for Mr. Speaker’s and Mr. Speaker’s—Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker’s—Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker’s right to freedom of religion. They have gone after our Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. They have gone after our right to work. When Democrats are in charge, none of our rights are safe.

Neither are our most cherished institutions. House Democrats have gone after our police, gone after our elections. They lecture Republicans about accepting the results of elections. Yet they are trying to overturn an election in Iowa.

Now, the lawyer the Democrats have put in charge of that case was just
sanctioned in Federal court on ethics violations. Yet Speaker Pelosi has made it clear at her press conference on Friday that she supports the effort to overturn the election.

That is not all. Democrats aren’t just trying to overturn the election. They are trying to change all of our elections. They have passed a bill to change just about every aspect of our elections forever.

A recent poll by Harvard shows that 71 percent of voters say they don’t want future elections to be like they were in 2020. If Democrats get their way, every election will be a pandemic election.

To change our elections, Democrats still need 60 votes in the Senate. That is why over the weekend, Democrats’ allies at the New York Times endorsed changing the rules of the Senate. The paper explicitly said that that was the reason. The paper attacked Members of this body—Senator Manchin and Senator Sinema—who have had the courage to oppose changing the rules of the Senate. The editorial board said: “This is a singular moment for American democracy if Democrats are willing to seize it.”

It is dangerous. It is scary. Yet it is true. This is a singular moment. Once they rig the Senate, then they can rig our elections. Once they rig our elections, then there will be nothing to stop them. Then they can go after our religious freedoms. They can go after our rights to keep and bear arms. And they can spend as much of our hard-earned tax dollars as they want.

This certainly is a singular moment for our democracy. It is a moment for Senators on both sides of the aisle to stand up to this radical agenda.

I yield the floor.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, I rise today to speak about a subject that is a point of pride and a source of passion for many individuals.

Visit Indiana, and you are bound to see them: a backboard hammered to an old barn, rows of asphalt courts in city parks, a lone hoop in front of a cornfield or in a clearing, steel poles standing in driveways.

Though basketball wasn’t technically invented in Indiana, Indiana is indeed its epicenter. Even the game’s inventor, James Naismith, once said: “Basketball really had its origin in Indiana, which remains the center of the sport.”

So it is appropriate that this year’s NCAA tournament will be played in its entirety in our State.

Now this, of course, is in part because planning and hosting 68 teams in the middle of a global pandemic presents unprecedented challenges, challenges that Hoosiers in and around Indianapolis are going to be able to navigate. And they will be able to work their respective college campuses in order to host teams from around the country. It is a great source of pride for us.

But it is also fitting because this sport is so important to our State. You see, it is March Madness meets Hoosiers’ Hysteria. The gyms where we play basketball are historic sites. The men and women who have competed and coached back home are Indiana folk heroes, and they are part of our common language: The Big O, Catch, the General, Bird, Wooden.

Memorabilia, artifacts, and sites associated with them are preserved in museums and townhalls. They are in school gymnasiums marked by bronze plaques and other ways to memorialize those who have preceded us. Streets and roads are named in their honor. We can even identify legendary teams and major moments in our basketball history with just a few almost mythic words that are familiar to the ears of Hoosiers: “Franklin Wonder Five.” “Plump’s last shot,” “8 points in 9 seconds,” and, yes, the infamous “chair throw.”

Even the color of the ball—orange, of course—can be traced back to a Hooiser, Tony Hinkle, who thought it was a good idea.

For Indiana, basketball is much more than just a pastime. It is a source of joy. It is a source of our communities, and it brings the people in and across them together. After all, it takes little more than a basket and a ball to play.

That is why wherever you go in Indiana and no matter the neighborhood you might be visiting or passing by, be it affluent or hit by hard times, in the country or in the city, you are going to see basketball played. It almost doesn’t matter what the time of year it is or what the weather is like, you are likely to see basketball if you hit the road for a few hours in Indiana at any given time of year. You are going to hear it discussed. The basketball court and the gymnasium bleachers are great levelers.

I am sharing this with you because there is a larger point at play. Today, it increasingly seems that Americans have less and less in common with one another; that we are defining ourselves not as a diverse nation united by a common set of values with a shared past and a shared future, but we are instead sorting ourselves into tribes based on geography or class or even political affiliation. This has been accompanied by the hollowing out of many of our civic institutions, and we are losing our public spaces and access to these public spaces and institutions that shape our national identity and bind this vast, pluralistic, and beautiful country together.

Now, these are dangerous trends, this separation, this tribalism; ones that we are going to have to work hard to turn back. There is only so much this body can do—I am under no illusions—there is only so much government can do to make America whole again.

That is why we should cherish and celebrate the institutions that do have the power to unite us. And, as any Hooiser will tell you, basketball is one of them.

Even beyond this, as its history in Indiana shows, this shared ritual that brings us joy and brings us together also pushes us to be better individually and collectively.

I think of the persistence of a teenager by the name of Steve Alford, endlessly practicing free throws in his driveway in New Castle, even in the cold rain and the country. Indiana University’s Bill Garrett, who fought segregation and broke the Big Ten color barrier; and then the faith of Little Milan High, enrollment hardly 100, beating mighty Muncie Central, earned an inviolate tradition to win a State championship; the grace of successive generations of graduates at Crispus Attucks. Now, this is a high school built to segregate Black students in Indianapolis, but it then grew into an aspirant and to have the powerhouse whose basketball program was a beacon in the civil rights movement and, to this day, remains a great source of pride not just for Black Hooisers but for all Hoosiers. It was also the first African American team to win a State championship in the Nation; the spirit of the tiny town of Medora, an underdog community featured in a recent documentary, who stood by their team while its players laced up work boots because they couldn’t afford basketball shoes. Then they set out with grit and determination and resolve to end a season losing streak.

So these scenes from Indiana’s history, up to the present day, like the game itself, unite people from different backgrounds, and they foster pride in our places, especially our struggling places. They teach us to draw a line between competition and contempt, to respect an opposing team and to have humility to remember that defeat is never permanent and neither is victory. They help us see and treasure what we have in common. They show us the power of opportunity and empowerment.

Institutions like basketball can’t be taken for granted. They bring meaning and purpose into the lives of people and places that we call home. They encourage our citizens to dream beyond limit, and I would say that they are what we need in this Nation right now.

So as the NCAA tournament tips off and the games begin across our stadiums, field houses, and arenas, Indiana’s hardwood civic temple, as we like to think of them, I know will be a reflection for our love for basketball and an exhibition of our collaborative ability to host such a large event during such a difficult time.

And what will also be on display is the other reason it is right and proper that this event takes place in Indiana. We are devoted to this sport because it brings us hope, and it brings us together. It instills the virtues necessary to preserve many of the other features that make our country so special. It really can help make America whole again.
Now and then, we all need to be gently reminded, I think, of the importance of these very things, and I can think of no better time or place for that than March in Indiana.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me turn to my colleague from Indiana, Senator CORNYN, who is at his desk. Senator CORNYN, came to the floor and raised some questions about my commitment to the filibuster as a rule in the Senate. He quoted me several years ago that a filibuster is not about the Senate over the last 2 years—almost nothing. We can get 60 votes, forget it.

Well, it is rare that that kind of supermajority shows up on anything important. That is what happens when you play out the filibuster tradition to an extreme. As one staffer said to me the other day, the DREAM Act to the floor of the U.S. Senate, after 2 months-plus—well, the impeachment trial—that didn’t require any filibuster votes. The nominations that come before us every day are not subject to a filibuster. And, of course, there is the reconciliation bill—the American rescue program for President Biden—that was under a procedure where you couldn’t use a filibuster.

So now things are quiet on the floor of the Senate again this week and next week because whatever you bring here you are subject to a threat of a filibuster, and you need 60 votes. I have watched this play out on an issue near and dear to my heart. It is called the DREAM Act, which I introduced last year. It basically says that if you were brought to this country as an infant, toddler, or a child—your parents made the decision—you grow up and you need 60 votes. I have watched this play out on an issue near and dear to my heart. It is called the DREAM Act, which I introduced 20 years ago. It basically says that if you were brought to this country as an infant, toddler, or a child—your parents made the decision—you grow up and you need 60 votes—that magic 60 votes that is needed under a filibuster.

Well, I tried. Five times I brought the DREAM Act to the floor of the U.S. Senate, and it was stopped with a filibuster each and every time. I got a majority, but they didn’t have the majority to pass it. I basically said that if you were brought to the Senate as a child, you are not simply spouting hateful, childish rhetoric. He is granting people permission to hate. The sad reality is that racist fear-mongering has always been part of the American story.

Today, we know, by testimony from the FBI Director, that it is a growing danger to every American. Intelligence analysts warn us that White supremacists and other far-right extremists are threatening more than just the far right. They warn of an answer to every problem that you might expect from these people. There is always somebody you could fear and somebody you can hate. The sad reality is that racist fear-mongering has always been part of the American story.

For far too long the Federal Government has failed to adequately address this growing threat. We saw the lethal results of that inattention on January 6, right here in this Senate Chamber. Groups of far-right nationalists and not-so-neutral spokespersons for former President Trump, stormed our Capitol in an attempted insurrection.

I have introduced a bipartisan bill in the Senate that would give law enforcement the resources to address this threat. It is called the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act. It would establish offices to combat domestic terrorism in the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the Department of Homeland Security. Those offices would assess the domestic terrorism threat regularly and allow the departments to focus their limited resources on the most significant threats, like those facing AAPI Americans today.
My bill would also provide training and resources to assist State, local, and Tribal law enforcement in addressing those threats. I am sure communities across this Nation could use that support.

Yet there is the issue of how these terrorist acts are committed. Last night’s attack near Atlanta was a mass shooting, a uniquely American threat. Next week, the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, will hold a hearing on gun violence in America. Too many people get shot in America—not just near Atlanta but in the cities of Chicago and St. Louis and all across our country. How many times have we seen images in those communities like we did last night of another mass shooting? America is better than this.

We need to take action to reduce the number of gun deaths in this Nation. We are going to get to work in the Senate Judiciary Committee to try to find some common, bipartisan ground to address this willful fail. I hope we succeed. We have to try.

It is time for the Senate to stop cow-

We are in the midst of a lethal pan-

demic that has claimed nearly 530,000
American lives. More people are in-
fectected and dying every day. Is this any
time to play politics with the Depart-
ment of Health and Human Services?
I don’t think so.

Xavier Becerra is an effective man-
ger, a smart, thoughtful, passionate
leader. He is the right person to lead
the Department. He served in the U.S.
House of Representatives for more than
two decades. As California’s top pros-
tector in 2017, he took on the tobacco
companies and the opioid manufactur-
ers—three cheers for him in both in-
stances—and... he helped defend and
secure Americans as safely and as quickly as
possible.

When he is finally confirmed this
week, after this unconscionable delay—
and he will be confirmed—he will be
the first Latino to serve as Secretary of
HHS. His historic confirmation will
be especially meaningful at this mo-
time when Latinos are dis-
proportionately affected by the med-
ical and economic impact of COVID.

Delaying his confirmation only hurts
our Nation—still struggling to beat
this virus once and for all. In fact, we need our Nation—still working to get ev-
everyone vaccinated, to get our schools
open, and everybody back to work.

Burdened by that—leading the world?

Each day we are breaking records on
the number of new Americans who are
being vaccinated. After going through
one of the darkest periods in American
history, we are finally beginning to see
the light at the end of the tunnel. But as
we ramp up for actual distribution through-out America and help make sure that all people from rural communities to urban cities—
have equitable access to lifesaving vac-
cines, we need to make sure that the

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Madam President, our Nation is at a
critical moment in our fight against
COVID-19. We have seen declining in-
fecations, declining hospitalizations and
deaths. And thanks to three effective
vaccines—and, perhaps, more on the
way—and adherence to social distancing and mask wearing, this new
administration has put together a com-
prehensive plan to address and defeat
this virus, but we aren’t out of the woods yet.

In the United States, we have less
than 5 percent of the world’s popu-
lation and 20 percent of the COVID
cases and deaths. We can continue to
see 50,000 to 60,000 new COVID cases
every day. Yet we still have approximately 4,700 people hospitalized because of
COVID in the United States. We still
tragically lose 1,200 American lives
each day.

While access is improving greatly, we
still see too many people struggling to
get a vaccine. If we are going to defeat
this virus, once and for all, we need our
top public health officials in place on
the job.

Yet our Republican colleagues con-
tinue to block the nomination of Xa-
vier Becerra to head the Department of
Health and Human Services, the chief
Federal Agency responsible for our
public health response to COVID. Their
campaign to lose the top public health
position in this Nation empty in the
midst of a pandemic is unwise. It has
to come to an end.

It has been 3 months—3 months—since
President Biden announced that
he would nominate Mr. Becerra to
serve as Secretary of Health and
Human Services. A majority of Sen-
ators support his nomination. I do. He
is a personal friend and someone I have
known for years. He is extremely com-
petent and ready for the job.

Yet Republicans continue to delay Xavier Becerra’s nomination day
day by day after day. Their objections to him are all over the map. They say
they oppose him because of his support for the Affordable Care Act. Remember
that one—President Obama’s Affordable Care Act—that half of the people
who were uninsured in America and gave them the protection of health insurance,
maybe for the first time in their lives. It provided health coverage to more than
20 million Americans. It has been a lifeline to families nation-
wide.

Most people would say: Thank good-
ness Mr. Becerra supported it. For a
man who wants to be Secretary of
HHS, you would almost insist on that.
And yet they oppose his nomi-
nation because of that, and they also
do n’t like the fact that he was the at-
torney general of California and he en-
forced the State’s COVID-19 rules.
How can defending public health rules dis-
qualify him from being America’s top public health official?

We are in the midst of a lethal pan-
demic that has claimed nearly 530,000
American lives. More people are in-
fected and dying every day. Is this any
time to play politics with the Depart-
ment of Health and Human Services?
I don’t think so.

Xavier Becerra is an effective man-
ger, a smart, thoughtful, passionate
leader. He is the right person to lead
the Department. He served in the U.S.
House of Representatives for more than
two decades. As California’s top pros-
tector in 2017, he took on the tobacco
companies and the opioid manufactur-
ers—three cheers for him in both in-
stances—and... he helped defend and
secure Americans as safely and as quickly as
possible.

When he is finally confirmed this
week, after this unconscionable delay—
and he will be confirmed—he will be
the first Latino to serve as Secretary of
HHS. His historic confirmation will
be especially meaningful at this mo-
time when Latinos are dis-
proportionately affected by the med-
ical and economic impact of COVID.

Delaying his confirmation only hurts
our Nation—still struggling to beat
this virus once and for all. In fact, we need our Nation—still working to get ev-
everyone vaccinated, to get our schools
open, and everybody back to work.

Sadly, these Republican Senators who
have led this charge against him are
demonstrating obstructionism at its worst and at the worst moment.

I look forward to confirming Xavier
Becerra to be Secretary of Health and
Human Services.

I yield the floor.

MR. SMITH. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. While my colleague
Senator DURBIN is here, there is a real
irony here to say that our Republican
friends are not going to support Xavier
Becerra because of his support of the
Affordable Care Act. One key ingre-
dient of the Affordable Care Act is ac-
tually the exchanges to provide for those who don’t have access to cov-
verage from their employer or some other way to get in a group.

But that was an idea that was intro-
duced in 1993 by 23 Republican Sen-
ators—23 Republican Senators—as an
alternative to HillaryCare, and it never
got anywhere. It never went anywhere until an enterprising Governor from
Massachusetts—I heard about him
said: Here is a way one can enforce this
and provide opportunities for the peo-
ple to get healthcare coverage that
otherwise wouldn’t have it. He said
this might work. And they introduced it in Massachusetts.

And do you know what? It
worked. It made healthcare coverage
available to a lot of people, and it
helped on the affordability side too.

For our Republican friends to say
this is the reason why—his support for
the ACA, a key ingredient of which is
the exchange—is an irony here. So I
hope it is not lost on our friends.

I thank Senator DURBIN for those
comments.

Like my friend Senator DURBIN, I,
too, rise in support of Attorney Gen-
eral Xavier Becerra, a longtime public
servant and President Biden’s nominee
to be our next Secretary of Health and
Human Services.

For a year now, I have been saying to
anybody who would listen that the
only way to really get our economy
back on track, to put parents back to
work, kids back in the classroom, and
life back to normal in the United
States of America is to do all that we
can to put this devastating pandemic
in our Nation’s rearview mirror. That
means vaccinating as many at-risk
Americans as safely and as quickly as
possible.

In fact, under the leadership of our
new President, America is leading the
way in the production and the distribu-
tion of vaccines. How about that—lead-
ing the world?

Each day we are breaking records on
the number of new Americans who are
being vaccinated. After going through
one of the darkest periods in American
history, we are finally beginning to see
the light at the end of the tunnel. But as
we ramp up for actual distribution through-out America and help make sure
that all people from rural communities to urban cities—
have equitable access to lifesaving vac-
cines, we need to make sure that the
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Department of Health and Human Services has the right leader at the helm going forward. And for my money and my judgment, that leader is Xavier Becerra. I believe he is the right person for this job at this point in our Nation’s history.

As a key member of the Biden administration, he will work with the White House. He will work with us in the Congress to tackle the coronavirus pandemic and to coordinate our Nation’s response.

Just as he has done throughout his career, he will fight to expand affordable healthcare, address persistent health disparities, and restore HHS’s mission to protect the health and wellbeing of all Americans.

Madam President, I have heard several of my Republican colleagues calling into question Xavier Becerra’s—Attorney General Becerra’s qualifications to serve as HHS Secretary. Obviously they are free to express their concerns. As Senator and duty to evaluate Cabinet nominees and make sure that we believe they are going to be best able to serve the American people. I take the responsibility seriously.

I know our Presiding Officer does as well. I set the record straight, if I could, on Xavier Becerra. I am confident that with his decades of experience working on healthcare issues in Congress and as California’s attorney general, he will be an invaluable part of President Biden’s administration as we work together to combat the pandemic nationally.

Some of the critics on the other side of the aisle say: What does he know about healthcare? Well, as it turns out, he served for I want to say two decades on the House Committee on Ways and Means. The last time I checked—you may want to double-check me on this—I think the primary responsibility of that committee is Medicare, and for someone who served for a long time on that committee, I bet he knows a thing or two about Medicare. As it turns out, he does.

Throughout his career in public service, Xavier Becerra has shown an unwavering commitment to protecting and expanding healthcare availability for millions of American families and workers, especially those in vulnerable communities who remain underserved.

In the House of Representatives, he was the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which helped to make the Affordable Care Act, which is based on a Republican idea, I think out of the Heritage Foundation in 1993. That, as I mentioned earlier, MITT Romney helped make a household word in the State of Massachusetts when he was Governor there. And I think half of the people who had healthcare coverage—who didn’t have it when we created the ACA have it. They have it today. We cut in half the number of people who don’t have access to healthcare coverage.

In the State of Delaware, the cost of coverage is actually dropping in the exchange. It has dropped by I think 19 percent over the last 2 years alone, as market forces are taking place and taking hold.

As attorney general of California, as has been mentioned, he led the charge for a coalition of states to defend the Affordable Care Act against multiple attempts by the Trump administration to dismantle this landmark legislation altogether.

I once asked somebody—I asked him, I said: What is it about your experience that would suggest you could run a big operation like the Department of Health and Human Services?

He said: Well, I have run the Department of Justice in California. It is the second largest Department of Justice in the country, second only to the Federal Department of Justice. I forget how many thousands—maybe tens of thousands—of employees they have, but it is a huge operation in a huge State with a ton of people.

Xavier Becerra brought together attorneys general from both sides of the aisle to hold opioid manufacturers accountable for the addiction crisis that we are still struggling with.

When the pandemic hit, he went to bat for California and everything from protections for our workers from exposure to COVID-19, increasing transparency in nursing homes, to securing key safeguards for the rights of frontline healthcare personal. His past leadership is a major reason why President Biden is asking him today to accept the responsibilities of overseeing responses to many of our Nation’s most urgent needs, including the distribution of COVID-19 vaccines, restoring the public confidence in vital public health institutions, and boosting family health and financial security in the wake of the pandemic.

With so much of the COVID-19 response being executed at the State and local level, it’s clear that President Biden has chosen as his HHS Secretary Xavier Becerra, a leader with relevant, on-the-ground, State-based experience.

As a former State treasurer, former Governor, former chairman of the National Governors Association, to have somebody with this kind of State-based experience, what a blessing that would be.

As the lead of the largest State department of justice in the Nation, overseeing thousands of employees, Attorney General Becerra has a proven track record and the management experience necessary to take on the massive operations at HHS. He will also make, as Senator Durbin has mentioned, history as the first Latino American to take on this role, providing important perspective as Latinos and other minority communities continue to be disproportionately impacted by the pandemic.

As we try to make sure that about a third of the American people who are saying they are not going to take the vaccine—they don’t care; they are going to take a chance—and a lot of those people are Latino—wouldn’t it be nice to have a Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services who could reach out to that community, literally reach out to them and touch them and convince them that, yes, they need to take something they should do; they should take this chance and be glad they did.

Four years ago, this body confirmed President Trump’s nominee for Health and Human Services within just 20 days—20 days from the start of his administration. We knew then that this role was important to fill. It took us 20 days.

Now, in the midst of a deadly pandemic, one that has taken the lives of over 530,000 Americans—a toll that exceeds the number of American deaths on the battlefields of World War I, World War II, and the Vietnam war, in which I served—we cannot afford to let another day go by without confirming Xavier Becerra.

With all of that, I just want to say, colleagues, it is time. It is over time, and we need to confirm Xavier. I think—in fact, I am convinced he will do a good job. He was the California attorney general, he will be an invaluable part of President Biden’s administration. We need him. The President needs him.

And with him on board as the leader of HHS, he can go on work on behalf of the American people and put this pandemic behind us for good, and we need that day to come soon.

I don’t see anybody else waiting to speak. I think maybe I should suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, we are working today in the shadow of a truly hideous, horrific series of murders that occurred yesterday in Atlanta, GA, and I want to start by expressing my sympathies to the families that are affected, families of innocent women who were gunned down heinously by a murderer there. Eight lives were taken by that gunman, six of them Asian women.

There is an active, ongoing investigation, and I have no intention of prejudging the outcome. Justice must be done. And I have the confidence in the law enforcement authorities of Atlanta that they will assure that justice is done.

So we don’t know for sure what the gunman’s motivation was, but we know eight of the women were Asian, and we know for sure that this horrific shooting rampage is only the latest egregious incident in a sickening, despicable trend of anti-Asian-American, or AAPI, violence that has terrorized the Asian-American community over recent months.

And we know many of these incidents were, in fact, hate crimes motivated by...
bias, bigotry, and prejudice. Now, hate-motivated violence, as Attorney Gar-
land said at his confirmation hearing, “tear[s] at the fabric of our society . . .
make[s] our citizens worried about walking [on] the streets and exercising even the most normal rights.”
And he absolutely correct. It tears at our society. It degrades our trust in each other and in the fairness of Amer-
ica and the survivability of values and rights that are central to our democ-

cracy.

The increase in violence against Asian Americans must end, and we all
know it. We all say it, but we must do it. In Congress, we must do everything in our power to provide law enforce-
ment and prosecutors with the re-
sources and the tools they need to overcome it, to successfully fight it, which they can do. And they need the will and determination to wield the tools and resources that we give them because they have to not only inves-
tigate and try this growing threat to Asian Americans, but also to effectively prosecute and assure just punishment.

We don’t know for sure the motiva-
tion. We have evidence. And we can’t say for sure how many hate crimes there are, because we can’t control this growing scourge. We can’t count it. And we know that it is rampant, in part, because of the White supremacists and domestic terrorism and vio-
en extremism that showed its ugly face in this Chamber earlier this year. It showed its brutal, cruel force in this building.

It is the same virus and cancer that is metastasizing in this country today. And its visible forms are the assaults, harassment, and discrimination that may not be so often reflected in those murders yesterday.

I hope the NO HATE Act passes, but it won’t be for a while. I hope we can take other action, but it will take time. And in the meantime, we can all do our part to reduce hate crimes. We can all do our part to take our duty to denounce—not condoned by our silence—these groups and their extrem-
ist ideologies in White supremacists that perpetuate and expand the virus and cancer of hate crimes and hatred. Hate speech—fighting words—incite-
ment in our society.

Now, a bright spot for America today is the confirmation, which we hope will happen in the next 24 hours, of the first
Latino Secretary of Health and Human Services in America, the first. He was the first in his working-class family to go to college. He broke barriers throughout his career.

Xavier Becerra, presently the attor-
ney general of California, will be a leader of toughness, bravery, and vi-
sion at the Department of Health and Human Services.

I stand here as a former attorney general, actually, for 20 years. I know well how much of that job is spent on health care policy, and I know also the management skills it takes to achieve real concrete results.

Attorney General Becerra is deeply qualified because of his work as State attorney general, but he also enjoys a taketh of a moral imperative as per-
sonal and professional, that make him exactly the right person at this mo-
toment for that job. He knows the impor-
tance of healthcare—equitable healthcare, reducing the disparities in healthcare in our country that afflic-
tion in addressing this deep crisis.

leadership from the Biden administra-
tion and every day we are seeing strong leadership from the Biden administra-
tion.

As California’s attorney general, he was a warrior in fighting to preserve the ACA, and he will continue to fight against them and push them and work on the ACA. And more and more of them, fortunately, are taking advantage of it because of the American Rescue Plan.

He is also a leader in taking on Big Tobacco. I sued the tobacco companies, helped to lead a multi-State attorney general group, and I know it takes courage to stand up and speak out and act against Big Tobacco. And he has done more. He has taken that fight to a new frontier. He is committed to pro-
tecting our children from the scourge—of tobacco and all its filthful products—often they are flavored too—
that are sold by vaping giants, which now include some tobacco companies.
March 17, 2021

Congressional Record — Senate

Let me also say this. As some of the first Latinos in our respective positions, both Xavier and I are not unfamiliar with being held to a different standard. It is a different standard today that is so stark that our colleagues are willing to delay his confirmation through the night. Yes, in the middle of a global health pandemic, Republicans are holding up the nominee for Secretary of Health and Human Services. They are holding up the first Latino nominee to head this critical agency because that has disproportionately devastated the Latino community.

It is time to let Xavier Becerra get to work. I urge my colleagues to end the delay on Xavier Becerra’s confirmation for Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Thank you, Mr. President.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PADILLA. 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.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for votes on March 17, 2021, so I could return to Hawaii to tend to a family matter.

On March 17, had I been present, I would have voted yea on confirmation: Katherine C. Tai, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Trade Representative, Rollcall vote 123.

Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for votes on March 17, 2021, so I could return to Hawaii to tend to a family matter.

On March 17, had I been present, I would have voted yea on cloture motion: Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, Rollcall vote 124.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CONFIRMATION OF KATHERINE C. TAI

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Katherine Tai to serve as the next United States Trade Representative. When confirmed, Ms. Tai will be the first woman of color and first Asian American to lead the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

Katherine Tai’s story is America’s story. Her parents came to the United States of America.

Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the nomination of my friend California Attorney General Xavier Becerra to serve as Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.

As we all know, as we all feel, our Nation is going through one of the toughest health crises in our history. The COVID–19 pandemic has taken an incredible toll on our country. Every State has been affected. Every community has suffered, especially working-class communities and communities of color, like the very neighborhoods that Attorney General Becerra and I grew up in. These communities are hurting and people are dying at alarming rates, and they desperately need someone who knows these communities to their core.

Throughout his career, Xavier Becerra has always fought to improve the lives of his constituents. As the first Latino general of California, he made it his mission to tackle the structural inequalities in our healthcare system. As has been referenced already, Attorney General Becerra was the leading force behind the lawsuit to protect the Affordable Care Act. Yes, he had the audacity to maintain protections for people with preexisting conditions and for those suffering from a mental illness. Over the course of this past year, he has also fought to protect frontline healthcare workers from further exposure to COVID–19.

Xavier Becerra’s parents emigrated from Mexico, just like my parents did, with a dream of building a better life for themselves and their family. Just a few days ago, I spoke in this Chamber about my family’s history and journey in this country. A hard-working short-order cook and housekeeper raised the son who now serves in the U.S. Senate. The same is true for Xavier Becerra’s family. He, the son of a construction worker, is on the verge of becoming the first Latino attorney general of California.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote for him tomorrow when we have the chance to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSOFSKY). The Senator from California.

GEORGIA SHOOTINGS

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I want to begin by joining with so many of our colleagues and leaders around the country expressing our condolences to the victims of the senseless shootings in Atlanta yesterday, in sharing our thoughts and prayers to their families and friends. Our heart goes out to the greater community, and, of course, we stand here not only to try to understand better what happened, how it happened, but do the work necessary to try to ensure that it doesn’t happen again—not in Atlanta, not anywhere in the United States of America.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the nomination of my friend California Attorney General Xavier Becerra to serve as Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.

As we all know, as we all feel, our Nation is going through one of the toughest health crises in our history. The COVID–19 pandemic has taken an incredible toll on our country. Every State has been affected. Every community has suffered, especially working-class communities and communities of color, like the very neighborhoods that Attorney General Becerra and I grew up in. These communities are hurting and people are dying at alarming rates, and they desperately need someone who knows these communities to their core.

Throughout his career, Xavier Becerra has always fought to improve the lives of his constituents. As the first Latino general of California, he made it his mission to tackle the structural inequalities in our healthcare system. As has been referenced already, Attorney General Becerra was the leading force behind the lawsuit to protect the Affordable Care Act. Yes, he had the audacity to maintain protections for people with preexisting conditions and for those suffering from a mental illness. Over the course of this past year, he has also fought to protect frontline healthcare workers from further exposure to COVID–19.

Xavier Becerra’s parents emigrated from Mexico, just like my parents did, with a dream of building a better life for themselves and their family. Just a few days ago, I spoke in this Chamber about my family’s history and journey in this country. A hard-working short-order cook and housekeeper raised the son who now serves in the U.S. Senate. The same is true for Xavier Becerra’s family. He, the son of a construction worker, is on the verge of becoming the first Latino attorney general of California.
States as graduate students and remained here to make a better life for themselves and their family, her father as a researcher at the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center and her mother as a scientist for the National Institutes of Health.

Given her parents’ background, Katherine Tai is no stranger to public service, and through her parents’ hard work and dedication to make a better life for their children, she was able to attend Yale University and Harvard Law, became a talented trade lawyer, and was nominated by President Biden to lead the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. I have a deep appreciation for the Tai family. Their values and commitment to family. Representation matters, and Ms. Tai will be a representative for the United States in more ways than one.

Ms. Tai is a highly-qualified nominee with the experience to lead the U.S. trade policy at a critical time for our country, specifically as we continue to recover from the damage wrought by the coronavirus pandemic and rebuild our economy at all levels. They have described her willingness to build coalitions, working with the House Ways and Means Committee, where she built partnerships, addressing the considerable harm it has caused families.

Supporters have described her as a knowledgeable, tenacious trade expert who has worked with a cross-section of advocates and stakeholders with the goal of bettering the lives of the American people and strengthening our economy at all levels. They have described her willingness to build coalitions, working with the House Ways and Means Committee, where she built partnerships and crafted agreements that received broad bipartisan approval. These included the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement, which passed the Senate by an 89-10 vote and the House by a 385-41 vote. Ms. Tai played a key role in crafting the agreement, which speaks to her skills and experience. Perhaps no more importantly, however, Ms. Tai will prioritize trade policies that promote workers, families, the environment, and local communities.

I met with Ms. Tai just after President Biden nominated her, and during our conversation, it was clear she understands that trade policies have real-world implications for everyday people. She knows that if trade deals are not working for people, then they need to change. People need to come first as we develop trade deals. At a time when people are working to recover from the coronavirus, Ms. Tai is the Trade Representative we need for the United States.

In short, Xavier Becerra is the right candidate to lead the Department of Health and Human Services at this time, and I strongly urge the Senate to confirm his nomination. Thank you.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I rise to support Xavier Becerra’s nomination to serve as Secretary of Health and Human Services, HHS.

Attorney General Becerra will bring a fresh perspective to HHS at a critical time during this pandemic. While there is light at the end of the tunnel with the distribution of the coronavirus vaccines, there is still work to do to end this pandemic and put our country on a road to recovery, and that is where Attorney General Becerra’s leadership will be crucial.

Mr. Becerra was first in his family to graduate from college, and later, his juris doctorate from Stanford Law School. As a member of the House of Representatives, he was a strong advocate for health care for his constituents and fought to make the Affordable Care Act law. And as California attorney general he has been a staunch defender of the Affordable Care Act, leading 20 States and the District of Columbia in defense of the Affordable Care Act before the Supreme Court.

As part of his focus on protecting the health of Americans, Mr. Becerra has worked on a bipartisan basis with multiple stakeholders on issues still affecting our country today. These include the need to reduce youth exposure to tobacco products like e-cigarettes, increasing access to COVID-19 vaccines, as well as addressing the opioid epidemic and the considerable harm it has caused families.

As our State’s attorney general, Mr. Becerra has led the Nation’s second largest State in standing up against not just the U.S. Department of Justice. His experience leading large and diverse organizations will position him to successfully lead the Department of Health and Human Services, which is the Nation’s largest Federal agency by budget.

As Secretary, he will lead the Nation’s top health agency charged with enhancing the health and well-being of all Americans. In this global pandemic, he will oversee the implementation of President Biden’s national strategy for COVID-19 response, which is vital to defeating the virus that has plagued our country for far too long. His history-making nomination as the first Latino to manage this Department comes at a time when this pandemic is affecting communities of color at much higher rates than white Americans. And those of us who know him personally know the highest level of his dedication to protect the health and safety of all hard-working Americans and their families.

Perhaps no more importantly, however, Mr. Becerra will bring his dedication to protecting the health and well-being of all Americans. In this global pandemic, he will oversee the implementation of President Biden’s national strategy for COVID-19 response, which is vital to defeating the virus that has plagued our country for far too long. His history-making nomination as the first Latino to manage this Department comes at a time when this pandemic is affecting communities of color at much higher rates than white Americans. And those of us who know him personally know the highest level of his dedication to protect the health and safety of all hard-working Americans and their families.
CONFIRMATION OF ISABELLA CASILLAS GUZMAN

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to support the confirmation of Isabel Guzman, a dedicated public servant and successful small businesswoman, to lead the Small Business Administration.

Small businesses are a cornerstone of Maryland’s economy, creating jobs, driving innovation, and anchoring communities. Isabel Guzman’s extensive leadership experience serving at SBA under the Obama administration and running her own small businesses positions her well to engage small business communities as we finish the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic and address the unique challenges faced by women- and minority-owned small businesses across Maryland.

In her new role as SBA Administrator, she will inherit an economic crisis compounded by a mismanaged pandemic that has devastated the small business community from retail to restaurants and bars to sole-proprietorships. She will be charged not only with administering critical small business relief programs, including the Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program and the Paycheck Protection Program, but also with building back better to shape the environment for a thriving small business community. I look forward to working closely with her to ensure that we build an inclusive economy that encourages and supports local entrepreneurs.

REMEMBERING LARRY “CLIZ” CLISBY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, today I wish to honor and recognize the distinguished legacy of Larry “Cliz” Clisby, who passed away on February 27, 2021, at the age of 74 after a valiant fight against cancer. Famously known across the State of Indiana as the legendary Voice of the Boilermakers, he will forever be remembered for his unmatched play-by-play commentary of Purdue basketball and his trademark “Bullseye!” calls during crunch time.

Born and raised in Ohio, Larry graduated from Warren Howland High School and Kent State University. Shortly after college and service in the U.S. Army, Larry started his broadcasting career in Paducah, KY. However, his time in Paducah was brief, as he moved to West Lafayette, IN, to work for WLFI-TV in the sports department in 1977. During his early career in the Lafayette area, Larry called high school basketball and assisted during Purdue sports broadcasts. It wasn’t until 1982 that Larry became the full-time radio announcer for the Boilermakers.

Over the course of nearly 40 years, Larry called hundreds of games and Purdue men’s basketball games, including dozens of high-profile Indiana vs. Purdue rivalry games. Since the 1980s, Larry was involved in many of Purdue’s historic moments, including one Big Ten Tournament title, nine Big Ten Championship Seasons, 28 NCAA Tournaments, and three Elite Eight appearances. In 2018, he was inducted into the Indiana Sportswriters and Sportscasters Hall of Fame, and he received one of Indiana’s highest honors, the Sagamore of the Wabash, from Governor Eric Holcomb in 2020.

From the Purdue sports staff to the team players, everyone saw Larry as a true, dedicated Boilermaker and not just a typical play-by-play announcer. Throughout his career, Larry devoted his charisma, talents, and life to the Lafayette community, and I believe his work will serve as a benchmark for those who aspire to join the field of sports radio.

I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our sympathies to Larry’s wife, Michelle; his children, Chad and Carly; his sister, Carol; his step-children and grandchildren; and all of his family and friends as they mourn his loss. And to Larry’s Purdue University family, I wish his beloved Boilermakers many, many “Bullseye!” moments in the years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET HUETTL

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, as we observe National Women’s History Month throughout March, it gives me great pleasure to recognize one of North Dakota’s own history makers. Margaret Huettl from Minot has become my State’s first female Eagle Scout and is a member of the inaugural class of young women to receive this high honor across the United States.

Margaret is a member of Scout Troop 5401 of the Northern Lights Council. A recent graduate of Minot High School, Margaret is currently studying biology education at Minot State University. Despite the coronavirus pandemic, which limited many Scouting group activities over the past year, she continued pressing on toward her goal of completing the merit badges necessary to earn the award. For her Eagle Scout project, she spent 238 hours building a pit for gaga ball, which is a variation of dodgeball, for outdoor activities at her home church, Zion Lutheran.

She said earning the 21 merit badges, along with completing her project and the other requirements for the Eagle Scout Award, helped her further develop leadership, time management, and communication skills. She intends to continue her involvement with Troop 5401, transitioning to an adult leader this year.

I congratulate Margaret on achieving this award through hard work and persis-tence and a being a trailblazer for other young women who have earned the Eagle Scout rank. With only 6 percent of all scouts attaining the rank of Eagle Scout, she now will be recognized alongside the 2.5 million
others who have earned this prestigious award since it was created in 1911. She will learn, as have other Eagle Scouts, that throughout her life, this accomplishment will bring her recognition as being a person of the highest caliber and character. I fully expect to hear from Margaret from Management in the future as she excels in academic, professional, and personal endeavors.

RECOGNIZING BISSON’S SUGAR HOUSE

- Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize Bisson’s Sugar House, a New Hampshire institution that is celebrating its 100th anniversary. March is Maple Month in New Hampshire, where maple producers across our State produce more than 90,000 gallons of maple syrup, and the Bisson family represents three generations of this great and tasty tradition.

Lazzare Bisson and his nephew Armand found Bisson’s Sugar House in Berlin in 1921, and ran the business together successfully for 15 years. Lazzare then passed the business on to Armand and his wife, Juliette. In 1953, they constructed a new sugar house to support their growing business, and since then, they have welcomed families from New Hampshire and beyond to see their work each spring.

The Bisson family has prioritized preserving the traditional sugaring experience, while also modernizing their operations in order to provide high-quality, delicious maple products to their customers. Each year, the Bisson family taps more than 3,000 trees, and they still boil their sap on a wood-fired evaporator built by Armand and Juliette more than 50 years ago. During the height of the sugaring season in March and April, they make candy with the same evaporator they have used since the 1940s.
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I hope you will join me in celebrating the 100th anniversary of Bisson’s Sugar House and extend our best wishes for a successful harvest and many more years of sharing their traditions with the people of New Hampshire.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER FRANK YORK

- Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, on Monday, March 15, the community of Ashland, KS, celebrated the career of someone who dedicated nearly 45 years to the Stockgrowers State Bank. Walter Frank York has called Ashland home since the day he was born. His parents, Russell and Marjorie, brought him up in a modest home on a farmer’s income during the 1950s and 1960s. Frank, as he came to be called by his family and friends, went on to study finance at Kansas State University, but the Vietnam war draft-up ended his plans before he could graduate.

Frank ultimately did not serve due to a back injury incurred while playing football for Ashland High, but the draft experience took him to Eagle County, CO, where he used his education to assist his sister with a new business that she was operating in Vail Village near the well-known ski resort. While talking on this challenge in Colorado, he finished his degree at CU Boulder, despite his long-lasting love for the K-State Wildcats. After earning his degree, his route led him to Ashland when he applied for a vacant position at a bank. His first day at Stockgrowers State Bank was March 15, 1976.

Working as a loans officer, Frank added a sense of small-town care for each of his customers over the years. After all, he would frequently see his customers at church, at the grocery store, and at Friday night sporting events in Ashland and surrounding communities in Kansas. In 2007, he earned the title of executive vice president after years of loyally helping customers. One recent highlight from his career was being awarded as a recipient of the Pioneer Award in early 2021, which is given annually by the Kansas Ag Bankers division of the Kansas Bankers Association. When he achieved the award, one customer of his remarked to the Kansas Ag Bankers: “Frank just makes it simple to do business and helps keep me connected to the Ashland community.” In return, Frank likes to share that his clients and colleagues became “family” to him. Being surrounded by good people in an enjoyable community helped keep Frank at Stockgrowers for the entirety of his banking career.

I would be remiss if I did not speak of community involvement while sharing about Frank York. Whether it was being involved in his children’s Boy Scouts troop, coaching local youth baseball programs in the summer, announcing football games for Ashland High, broadcasting SPIAA League high school basketball tournaments, or serving on the board of organizations in early and which is giving me some space for the entirety of his banking career.
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MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Cole, one of the clerks, was announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

- H.R. 1799. An act to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to extend the...
MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 344. A bill to amend title 16, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans’ disability compensation and non-veterans’ disability retirement, with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–637. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Effluent Guidelines and Standards for the Pulp, Paper and Paperboard Manufacturing Industry” (FRL No. 10021–73–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.


EC–639. A communication from the Director of the Bureau of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Effluent Guidelines and Standards for the Pulp, Paper and Paperboard Manufacturing Industry” (FRL No. 10021–73–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–641. A communication from the Endangered Species Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Bradshaw’s Lomatium (Lomatium bradshawii) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife” (RIN1018–BS59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–642. A communication from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “March 2021 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP”; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mrs. MURRAY for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Nomination was reported with рекомендation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MURKLEY for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. HASSAN)).

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. ROSENTHAL): S. 786. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to review laws relating to the illegal passing of school buses and to establish a public safety campaign relating to illegal passing of school buses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY): S. 787. A bill to amend the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the local coordinating entity for the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area under that Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. HAWLEY): S. 788. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a nonrefundable tax credit for the purchase of gun safes and gun safety courses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. HASSAN): S. 790. A bill to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER: S. 791. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate practices and strategies to reduce bird fatalities resulting from collisions with certain public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. SMITH): S. 792. A bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to modify certain agricultural exemptions for hours of service requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HAYNIE, Mr. HAWKEYE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):
S. 793. A bill to require the Congressional Budget Office to make publicly available the fiscal and mathematical models, data, and other details of computations used in cost analysis and scoring; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MARKEY).

S. 794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a corporate tax rate increase on companies whose ratio of compensation of the CEO or other highest paid employee to median worker compensation is more than 50 to 1, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BURKHART (for herself, Mr. DUKIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH).

S. 795. A bill to establish the Emmett Till and Mamie Till-Mobley and Roberts Temple National Historic Site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Ms. COLLINS).

S. 796. A bill to codify maternity care coordination programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUTZ (for himself and Mr. THUNE).

S. 797. A bill to require transparency, accountability, and protections for consumers online; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 798. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that the 2021 Re-covery Rebates are not provided to prisoners; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CAS-SIDY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BRAIN, Mr. TESTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN).

S. 799. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish programs for carbon dioxide capture, transport, utilization, and storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS).

S. 800. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit nurse practitioners and physician assistants to satisfy the requirement under the Medicare program for coverage of certain shoes for individuals with diabetes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMACHER (for himself, Ms. HYSAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. YOUNG, and Ms. ROSEN).

S. 801. A bill to identify and address barriers to coverage of remote physiologic devices under State Medicaid programs to improve maternal and child health outcomes for pregnant and postpartum women; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Ms. CORTES CASTRO, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. CAPITO, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. MURKOWSKI).

S. 802. A bill to modify the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. HAYES).

S. 803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove short-barreled rifles from the definition of firearms for purposes of the Importing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS;

S. 804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the amount individuals filing jointly can deduct for certain local taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. BLACKHUNT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CRUZ).

S. 805. A bill to repeal the wage requirement of the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BURKHART, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

S. 806. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to provide grants to carry out activities to benefit pollinators on roadsides and highway rights-of-way, including the planting and seeding of native, locally-appropriate grasses and wildflowers, including milkweed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOUCHAR).

S. 807. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. Cramer, Mr. COTESTE CASTRO, and Mr. WYDEN).

S. 808. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide transparency in the oversight of cybersecurity risks at publicly traded companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. PADILLA).

S. 809. A bill to encourage and facilitate efforts by States and other stakeholders to conserve and sustain the western population of monarch butterflies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CORTES CASTRO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMACHER, Ms. CAPITO, Mr. LEHAY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COONS, Ms. MURRAY, Ms. KLOUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. Barrasso).

S. 810. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the list of diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans who served in the Republic of Vietnam to include hyperension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKKEY (for himself, Mr. RUINO, Mr. COONS, Ms. HAGERTY, and Mrs. SHAHERN).

S. 811. A bill to establish the Taiwan Fellowship Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. DONIGER).

S. 812. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKNEY (for himself, Mr. RUINO, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MARKEY).

S. 813. A bill to promote and ensure deliverability of high-quality special education and related services to students with visual disabilities to develop tools for hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs, to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mrs. SHAHERN).

S. 814. A bill to promote security partnership with Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. COL-INS, Mr. Cramer, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. ARCTIC COWLEY).

S. 815. A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to extend the covered period for the paycheck protection program.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 816. A bill to amend the Diplomatic Security Act of 1986 to provide for improved serious security incident investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. Res. 119. A resolution establishing the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program for the placement in offices of Sen-ators, of children, spouses, and siblings of members of the Armed Forces who are hostile casualties or who have died from a train-ing-related injury; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, MR. RUBIO, MR. KANE, and MR. CASSIDY).

S. Res. 120. A resolution recognizing the Ninth Summit of the Americas and reaffirming the commitment of the United States to a more prosperous, secure, and democratic Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MARKEY).

S. Res. 121. A resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of the birth of George Daniel Crowe; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 17.

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 17, a bill to support library infrastructure.

S. 231.

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 231, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop guidance for firefighters and other emergency response personnel on best practices to protect them from exposure to PFAS and to
limit and prevent the release of PFAS into the environment, and for other purposes.

S. 601

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 455, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to prohibit governmental discrimination against health care providers that do not participate in abortion.

S. 455

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to require States to establish complete streets programs, and for other purposes.

S. 425

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to provide for congressional review of actions to terminate or waive sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as co-sponsors of S. 545, a bill to permanently exempt payments made from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account from sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

S. 545

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 611, a bill to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 611

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 628

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 634, a bill to support and expand civic engagement and political leadership of adolescent girls around the world, and other purposes.

S. 634

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 661, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the qualifying advanced coal project credit, and for other purposes.

S. 661

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to establish an interactive online dashboard to allow the public to review information for Federal grant funding related to mental health programs.

S. 662

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the Bicentennial of Harriet Tubman’s birth.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as co-sponsors of S. 723, a bill to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to extend the covered period for the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes.

S. 723

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEES) were added as cosponsors of S. 730, a bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to remove the prohibition on States and territories against lowering their taxes.

S. 730

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 748, a bill to provide for an extension of the temporary suspension of Medicare sequestration for COVID-19 public health emergency.

S. 748

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 758, a bill to support financing of affordable and reliable energy projects by international financial institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 758

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 117, a resolution to provide support for the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement, or the Belfast Agreement, and subsequent agreements and arrangements for implementation to support peace on the island of Ireland.

S. RES. 117

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 797. A bill to require transparency, accountability, and protections for consumers online; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, social media platforms have become a pretty significant part of Americans’ lives. We use them to stay up to date on news from friends and family—something that has become especially essential during the pandemic—to communicate with relatives and friends, for entertainment, and as a shopping resource. Social media sites provide ways to network, to connect with like-minded individuals from fellow theater lovers to animal advocates for causes that we believe in, to conduct business, even to date, and more and more we rely on social media sites as a primary source of news and information, from Presidential election news to updates on COVID vaccinations.

Social media offers a lot of benefits and opportunities, but the increasing dominance of social media, particularly in the news and information space, has also raised concerns. Consumers have become increasingly troubled about whether their information is used by social media platforms and how these sites decide what news and information we see. And there are increasing numbers of anecdotes to suggest that some social media platforms are moderating content in a biased or political way.

Currently, content moderation on social media platforms is governed by section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, which was enacted into law 25 years ago. Section 230 provides that sites which contain content—are like YouTube or Twitter or Facebook—with immunity for the content that users post on their sites. So, for example, if somebody posts a video on YouTube that contains illegal content, YouTube isn’t held legally responsible for that content.

Section 230 has been critical to the development of the internet as we know it today. Without section 230 protections, many of the sites we rely on for social connection or news or entertainment would never have come into being.
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But as the internet and social media have grown and developed, it has also become clear that some changes need to be made. In particular, it has become increasingly clear that sites need to provide greater transparency when it comes to their content moderation practices. Social media sites are no longer just providing a platform for user-generated content as they did in their infancy. They are now making a lot of decisions about that content and carefully shaping our social media landscape. What we see, what posts we see, what news stories we see.

Currently, federal law does not require that social media sites be at all accountable to consumers for those content moderation decisions. That is why, today, I am introducing the Platform Accountability and Consumer Transparency Act, or the PACT Act, along with my colleague, Senator SCHATZ. Our bill would preserve the benefits of Section 230, like the internet’s growth and widespread dissemination of free speech it has enabled, while increasing accountability and consumer transparency around content moderation.

Now, content moderation is certainly not all bad. For example, most of us are happy to have YouTube or Instagram suggest additional content that matches the music that we like to listen to or the hobbies that we are interested in. The problem is that content moderation has been and largely continues to be a black box, with consumers having little or no idea how the information they see has been shaped by the sites that are visiting.

The PACT Act would address this problem by increasing transparency around the content moderation process. Sites would be required to provide an easily digestible disclosure of their content moderation practices for users, and, importantly, they would require to explain their decisions to remove material to consumers.

Until relatively recently, sites like Facebook and Twitter would remove a user’s post without explanation and without an appeals process. And even as platforms start to shape up their act with regard to transparency and due process, it is still hard for users to get good information about how content is moderated.

Under the PACT Act, if a site chooses to remove your post, it has to tell you why it decided to remove your post and explain how your post violated the site’s terms of use. The PACT Act would also require sites to have an appeals process. So if Facebook, for example, removed one of your posts, it would not only have to tell you why, but it would have to provide a way for you to appeal that decision.

We have seen increased concern lately about news articles being removed from social media sites. Under the PACT Act, a newspaper whose article was posted on Facebook or Twitter and then removed by one of those platforms could challenge Facebook or Twitter, which would have to provide a reason for removing the article and allow the newspaper to appeal the decision.

The PACT Act would also help us develop the data necessary to demonstrate whether social media platforms are biased in a political or policy fashion. As I said earlier, there has been increasing concern about biased content moderation on social media sites. The PACT Act requires detailed transparency reports every six months from large social media platforms, like Twitter and Facebook, which will provide the data it needed to determine whether and where biased moderation exists.

The PACT Act would also bolster efforts by State governments to hold social media platforms accountable. The bill would allow State attorneys general to bring civil lawsuits against social media platforms when these platforms have violated Federal civil laws.

The PACT Act would also require companies to remove material that has been adjudicated as illegal by a court. Internet platforms would be required to remove illegal content within 4 days. Failure to remove illegal material would result in the platform’s losing its 230 protections for that content or activity, a provision that matches a recommendation made by the Trump Department of Justice for section 230 reform.

I am grateful to Senator SCHATZ for partnering with me on this legislation. Our bill is a serious, bipartisan approach to the issue of section 230 reform, and it would go a long way toward making social media platforms more accountable to consumers and increasing transparency around the content moderation process.

I invite our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in advancing this legislation.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the amount individuals filing jointly can deduct for certain State and local taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this is the time of year when people are calculating their taxes and filing their returns. There are inequities in our Tax Code, and the bill I am introducing today, the SALT Deduction Fairness Act, would help remedy one of these inequities. This bill would ensure that limits on State and local tax deductions, also known as SALT deductions, do not disproportionately and unfairly penalize married couples.

Currently, the amount in State and local taxes that both single and married filers may deduct from their annual income taxes is capped at $10,000. Single filers and married filers are taxed the same, but married people who file their taxes separately are limited to $5,000 each. In other words, people would be better off not getting married when it comes to the SALT deduction. My bill removes this penalty by simply doubling the deduction to $20,000 for married filers.

This is the situation we have now: Two single people can both claim $10,000 worth of State and local income taxes. If they get married, they can claim only $10,000 together. This is a classic example of a marriage tax penalty.

When the Senate considered the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act in 2017, I worked to keep the SALT deduction in the Federal Tax Code because of the increased tax burden its elimination would have imposed on many Mainers who pay property taxes on their seasonal cottages as well as their homes, who remit annual excise taxes on their vehicles, and who are subject to State income taxes.

The SALT deduction has been in the Tax Code since 1913, when the Federal income tax was first established. It is intended to protect families from double taxation, from essentially paying a tax on a tax.

The Senate adopted my amendment, which paralleled that of the House, to retain the deduction for State and local taxes up to $10,000. This deduction is especially important to families living in high-tax States, like Maine, which has one of our Nation’s highest State taxes and where many residents own second homes, like camps on Maine’s beautiful lakes. Last year, an analysis by WalletHub found that Maine had the fourth highest overall tax burden behind only New York, Hawaii, and Vermont. Yet Maine’s median household income ranked only 35th in the Nation and was approximately $6,800 below the U.S. median household income. So maintaining this deduction provides important tax relief for those Mainers who continue to itemize their deductions. Yet we can do better. We can make the SALT deduction fairer by eliminating the marriage penalty that limits a married couple to just $10,000; whereas, if they were not married, they could each claim $10,000.

According to the U.S. Census, there are more than 60 million married couples living in our Nation. Our Tax Code should be fair to them. We should not create a situation in which married couples would have been better off financially, in terms of taxes, had they not married. One way to accomplish this goal is to double their access to deductions for the State and local taxes they pay, including from properties they share, such as their homes. This legislation would remedy this double taxation problem and eliminate the marriage tax penalty when it comes to the SALT tax deduction.

It boils down to this: We simply should not be taxing American taxpayers for being married.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill to fix this marriage tax penalty.
S. 807. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REED, 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. 807

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 “Cameras in the Courthouse Act.”

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.

(a) In General.—Chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“§ 678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings

"The Supreme Court shall permit television coverage of all open sessions of the Court unless the Court decides, by a vote of the majority, that allowing such coverage in a particular case would constitute a violation of the due process rights of 1 or more of the parties before the Court.""

(b) Clerical Amendment.—The chapter analysis for chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“§ 678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings.”

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 808. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to promote transparency in the oversight of cybersecurity risks at publicly traded companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED, Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Cybersecurity Disclosure Act along with three members of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Chairman WARNER and Senators COLLINS and WYDEN, in addition to Senators CORTEZ MASTO and CRAMER, who serve with me on the Senate Banking Committee. In response to serious data breaches of various companies, our legislation asks each publicly traded company to include—in Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) disclosures to investors—information on whether any member of the Board of Directors is a cybersecurity expert, and if not, why having this expertise on the Board of Directors is not necessary because of other cybersecurity steps taken by the publicly traded company. To be clear, the legislation does not require companies to take any actions other than to provide this disclosure to its investors.

As EY, also known as Ernst & Young, noted in an August 2020 publication, “Public disclosures can help build trust by providing transparency and assurance around how boards are fulfilling their cybersecurity risk oversight responsibilities.” Investors and customers deserve a clear understanding of whether publicly traded companies are prioritizing cybersecurity and have the capacity to protect investors and customers from cyber related attacks. Our legislation aims to provide a better understanding of these issues through improved SEC disclosures.

While this legislation is a matter for consideration by the Banking Committee, of which I am a member, this bill is also informed by my service on the Armed Services Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence. Through this Banking-Armed Services-Intelligence perspective, I see that our economic security is indeed a matter of our national security, and this is particularly the case as the pandemic has forced many of us to be ever more dependent on technology and the Internet.

Indeed, General Darren W. McDew, the former Commander of U.S. Transportation Command, which is charged with moving our military assets to meet our national security objectives in partnership with the private sector, offered several sobering assessments during an April 10, 2018 hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee. He stated that “cyber is the number one threat to U.S. Transportation Command, but I believe it is the number one threat to the Nation . . . in our headquarters, cyber is the commander’s business, but not everywhere across our Country is cyber a CEO’s business . . . in our cyber roundtables, which is one of the things we are doing to raise our level of awareness, some of the CEO’s chief security officers cannot even get to see the board, they cannot even . . . see the CEO. So that is a problem.”

With growing cyber threats that have resulted in serious breaches, we all need to be more proactive in ensuring our Nation’s cybersecurity. This legislation seeks to take one step towards that goal by encouraging publicly traded companies to be more transparent to their investors and customers on whether and how their Boards of Directors and senior management are prioritizing cybersecurity.

I thank the bill’s supporters, including the North American Securities Administrators Association, the Council of Institutional Investors, the National Association of State Treasurers, the California Public Employees’ Retirement System, the Bipartisan Policy Center, MIT Professor Simon Johnson, Columbia Law Professor Jack Coffee, the Consumer Federation of America, and Rhode Island General Treasurer Seth Magaziner, and I urge our colleagues to join in supporting this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 119—ESTABLISHING THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD STAR FAMILY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM FOR THE PLACE- MENT IN OFFICES OF SENATORS OF CHILDREN, SPOUSES, AND SIBLINGS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE HOSTILE CASUALTIES OR WHO HAVE DIED FROM A TRAINING-RELATED INJURY

MRS. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 119

Resolved.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the “SFC Herbert and Liz Cooper and SCP Cooper Gold Star Family Fellowship Program Resolution”.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD STAR FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) Definitions.—In this section—

(1) the term “eligible individual” means an individual who is the child (including a step-child), spouse, or sibling of a member of the Armed Forces who is a hostile casualty or died from a training-related injury;

(2) the term “hostile casualty” and “training-related injury” have the meanings given those terms in section 2002(b) of title 38, United States Code; and

(3) the term “Program” means the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program established under subsection (b).

(b) Establishment.—There is established in the Senate the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program, under which an eligible individual may serve a 12-month fellowship in the office of a Senator.

(c) Direction of Program.—The Program shall be carried out under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate.

(d) Placement in District of Columbia Office or State Office.—An individual may serve a fellowship under the Program at the office of a Senator in the District of Columbia or an office of the Senator in the State the Senator represents.

(e) Regulations.—The Program shall be carried out in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 120—RECOGNIZING THE NINTH SUMMIT OF THE AMERICAS AND REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO A MORE PROSPEROUS, SECURE, AND DEMOCRATIC WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. Kaine, and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 120

Whereas the United States has pursued multiple collaborative initiatives to advance the region’s enduring interest in a more secure, prosperous, and democratic Western Hemisphere;
Whereas the United States will host the Ninth Summit of the Americas for the first time since it hosted the inaugural Summit in Miami, Florida in 1994; and

Whereas the Summit of the Americas is a valuable forum for democratically elected heads of state and governments of the Western Hemisphere to discuss common concerns, affirm shared values, and commit to concerted actions at the national and regional level to address the novel and existing challenges facing the Americas; and

Whereas the First and Second Summits of the Americas advanced commitments to lower trade barriers, improve transparency and market access, and facilitate economic integration; and following those Summits, the United States has signed free trade agreements with 12 of the 35 countries in the region; and

Whereas, since 2018, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Panama, Suriname, and Uruguay have signed Memorandums of Understanding with the United States under the America Crece Program to leverage private investment in energy and infrastructure projects and achieve economic, prosperity, security, and good governance; and

Whereas, during the 2018 Summit of the Americas, the United States announced additional financial assistance for Venezuelans who have fled their country as a result of the political, economic, and security crises created by the regime of Nicolás Maduro, including support for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) response to assist Venezuelan refugees in Colombia and Brazil; and

Whereas Transnational Criminal Organizations (TCOs) and their involvement in money laundering and the trafficking of people, narco-tics, and weapons in the region pose complex threats to United States public health and national security, as well as the stability of the Americas, by under-mining citizen security, basic human rights, the rule of law, good governance, and economic development; and

Whereas the United States has sought to improve regional security through friendly and sustained relationships that build inter-operability, readiness, and capability with regional security partners, including through programs such as Plan Colombia, the Merida Initiative, the Central America Regional Security Initiative (CARSI), and the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI); and

Whereas the COVID-19 pandemic has acceler-ated the need to advance foreign policy objectives, including through its deepening political, economic, and security support for the Maduro regime in Venezuela; and

Whereas the United States Government is deeply concerned about efforts by the Government of Iran to expand its political, economic, and security presence in the region, including through its deepening ties with the Maduro regime in Venezuela; and

Whereas the regimes of Nicolás Maduro in Venezuela, Miguel Díaz-Canel in Cuba, and Daniel Ortega in Nicaragua, have systematically eroded democratic institutions, commit widespread human rights violations, and support the support of malign state and non-state actors, which pose a challenge to United States national security and national interests; and

Whereas collusion, linkages between transnational criminal organizations and political actors, and the harassment and murder of journalists, human rights defenders, and civil society leaders in Latin America and the Caribbean weaken citizens’ confidence in democracy and negatively affect United States national interests; and

Whereas weak rule of law, elevated levels of criminal violence, and systemic corruption in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras fuel irregular migration that affects regional stability: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemo rates the occasion of the United States hosting the Ninth Summit of the Americas; and

(2) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to promote economic prosperity, security, and democratic governance throughout the Americas; and

(3) calls on the President to lead a strong and coordinated diplomatic effort during the Summit process to ensure the Ninth Summit of the Americas—

(A) strengthens democratic governance by building on the 2018 Lima Commitment to—

(i) reduce impunity and increasing the rule of law; and

(ii) strengthen the independence of judiciaries;

(iii) increase transparency through the use of new techniques to combat criminality; and

(iv) encourage private sector participation in the formulation of public anti-corruption policies; and

(B) strengthens post-COVID-19 economic recovery efforts by outlining specific commitments to deepen trade and investment integration throughout the Americas and pursuing effective nearshoring and reshoring initiatives; and

(C) builds upon United States efforts to enhance the institutional capacity and technical capabilities of partner countries to strengthen democratic institutions, uphold human rights, and government transparency; and

(D) builds upon United States efforts to enhance the economic, diplomatic, and military capabilities of partner countries to collectively confront malign state actors, including China's growing influence throughout the region; and

(E) reinforces the capacity of member states to—

(i) implement actions and initiatives in support of peaceful and democratic efforts of the people of Cuba, Nicaragua, and Venezuela, who desire to hold free and fair elec tions and restore democratic order and the rule of law in their respective countries; and

(ii) support the people of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras as they strive to address weak democratic governance and control elevated levels of corruption, violence, and criminality that drive irregular migration; and

which, if adopted, explores a comprehensive approach to forced displacement and migration challenges in the Western Hemisphere, takes stock of humanitarian crises and flashpoints in the region, and mobilizes member state commitments to advocate for and support multilateral humanitarian and development responses.

SENATE RESOLUTION 121—HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEORGE DANIEL CROWE

Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 121

Whereas George Daniel Crowe (referred to in this preamble as “Mr. Crowe”)—

(1) was an extraordinary athlete; and

(2) excelled at both basketball and baseball; and

(3) holds the rare status of having played both basketball and baseball at the professional level;

Whereas Mr. Crowe was born in Whiteland, Indiana, on March 22, 1921;

Whereas Mr. Crowe was raised in nearby Franklin, Indiana, where he was a standout on the football, baseball, and basketball teams;

Whereas Mr. Crowe led his basketball team to a 1939 Indiana State championship game, where, although his team lost to Frankfort High School, Mr. Crowe displayed his talents to a State-wide audience and became the first player to ever earn the prestigious distinction of Indiana Mr. Basketball;

Whereas Mr. Crowe earned an athletic scholarship to attend Indiana State Central College, known today as the University of Indianapolis, where he played basketball, baseball, and ran track;

Whereas higher education was rare for an African American in the 1930s and 1940s, and Mr. Crowe took advantage of the opportunity to be a student athlete and graduated in 1943;

Whereas, after graduation, Mr. Crowe entered the Army during World War II and served the United States admirably until 1946;

Whereas, following his service to the United States in World War II, Mr. Crowe began playing professional basketball on a series of Negro League baseball teams between 1946 and 1953, including the Los Angeles Red Devils and the New York Renaissance (commonly known as the “Harlem Renaissance”);

Whereas, in 1947, Mr. Crowe joined the New York Black Yankees, which was a baseball team in the Negro Leagues;

Whereas in 1949, Mr. Crowe joined the New York Black Yankees, Mr. Crowe played 2 professional sports simultaneously;
Whereas, in 1949, 2 years after Jackie Robinson integrated Major League baseball, Mr. Crowe was picked up by the Minor League Hartford Chiefs, where he won the batting title with a .355 average.

Whereas, Mr. Crowe was called up by the Boston Braves in 1952 and played in the Major Leagues for 9 years on that team, the Cincinnati Reds, and the St. Louis Cardinals.

Whereas, during his Major League baseball career, Mr. Crowe played primarily as a first baseman and occasional outfielder.

Whereas, upon his retirement from Major League baseball, Mr. Crowe held the Major League career of 3 pinch hit home runs and had a .960 fielding percentage.

Whereas the most successful period of Mr. Crowe’s career in the Major Leagues was in 1957, when he hit 31 home runs, and 1958, when he was selected as a National League All-Star;

Whereas Mr. Crowe also played winter baseball for the Santurce Crabbers in the Puerto Rico baseball league;

Whereas Mr. Crowe and his teammates on the Santurce Crabbers, who included Willie Mays and Roberto Clemente, won the Caribbean World Series;

Whereas Mr. Crowe was a pioneer in civil rights and quietly but firmly paved the way for what is now a reality in society in the United States by proving his ability as an athlete and student in college and as a professional baseball player.

Whereas, in 1946, soon after his discharge from the Army, Mr. Crowe forced the integration of the movie theater in Franklin, Indiana, when he refused to leave his seat on the main floor and move to the designated Negro section in the back of the theater;

Whereas the prominence of Mr. Crowe in the Franklin, Indiana, community and his service in World War II, which was a war against fascism, led the movie theater to be permanently integrated 1 week after Mr. Crowe refused to leave his seat; and

Whereas, after his retirement from professional sports, Mr. Crowe began new careers as an insurance salesman and then a school teacher in New York; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) George Daniel Crowe—
(A) a man whose example can help guide (B) a man of respect and achievement; and (C) a man whose example can help guide (D) a story of trying to leave the world a (E) a story of developing talent and achieve (i) with his dogged determination and hard (ii) by taking advantage of opportunities as they arose; and (iii) by making the careers of countless people of the United States who followed him possible;

(2) the story of George Daniel Crowe is— (A) the story of the United States in the 20th century; (B) a story of overcoming oppression; (C) a story of demanding what President Lincoln called the “Right to Rise”; (D) a story of developing talent and achieving great things through hard work; and (E) a story of trying to leave the world a better place than he found it; and

(3) on March 22, 2021, which is the 100th anniversary of his birth, the Senate recognizes George Daniel Crowe as— (A) a great Hoosier; (B) a man of respect and achievement; and (C) an example that can help guide the people of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED
SA 1400. Mr. Padilla (for Mr. Tester (for himself and Mr. Moran)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1276, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID-19 vaccines to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS
SEC. 2. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO FURNISH COVID-19 VACCINES TO COVERED INDIVIDUALS NOT ENROLLED IN PATIENT ENROLLMENT SYSTEM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) In General.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may furnish a vaccine for COVID-19 to a covered individual during the COVID-19 public health emergency.

(b) Prioritization.—In furnishing vaccines for COVID-19 under the laws administered by the Secretary, the Secretary shall:

(1) prioritize the vaccination of veterans who are enrolled in the patient enrollment system, veterans who receive hospital care and medical services pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of section 1765 of title 38, United States Code, and accompanying caregivers of such veterans before the vaccination of covered individuals otherwise described in this paragraph; and

(2) only furnish vaccines for COVID-19 to covered individuals under this section to the extent that such vaccines are available.

(c) Timing of Vaccines Provided to Spouses of Veterans.—The Secretary may determine the timing for offering a vaccine for COVID-19 to the spouse of a veteran from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(d) Vaccine Allocation.—It is the sense of Congress that, to the extent practicable based on the current national supply chain, the Secretary of Health and Human Services should adjust the allocation for the Department of Veterans Affairs for COVID-19 based on the additional eligibility of covered individuals under this section.

(e) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) ACCOMPANYING CAREGIVER.—The term “accompanying caregiver” means a caregiver described in subparagraph (D), (E), or (F) of paragraph (2) who is accompanying a veteran who is receiving a vaccine for COVID-19 furnished by the Department.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term “covered individual” means any of the following individuals:

(A) a veteran who is not eligible to enroll in the patient enrollment system.

(B) a veteran who is eligible for care under section 1724 of title 38, United States Code.

(C) a beneficiary under section 1781 of such title.

(D) a family caregiver of a veteran participating in the program of comprehensive care assistance for family caregivers under section 1720G(a) of such title.

(E) a caregiver of a veteran participating in the program of comprehensive caregiver support services under section 1720G(b) of such title.

(F) a caregiver of a veteran participating in the Medical Foster Home Program, Bowes and Blinder Foster Home Program, Caregiver Support Program, or Veteran Directed Care Program, or Veteran Directed Care Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(G) A spouse of a veteran.

(3) Covered Public Health Emergency.—The term “covered public health emergency” means an emergency with respect to COVID-19 declared by a Federal, State, or local authority.


(5) Patient Enrollment System.—The term “patient enrollment system” means the system of annual patient enrollment of the Department of Veterans Affairs established and operated under section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code.

(6) Veteran.—The term “veteran” has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code.
on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S. 344

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 344 and it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEORGE DANIEL CROWE

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 121, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 121) honoring the 100th anniversary of the birth of George Daniel Crowe.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 121) was agreed to.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 121, submitted earlier today.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 121) was ordered to be reported from the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs by unanimous consent.

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

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VETERANS’ AND CAREGIVERS’ COVID–19 IMMUNIZATIONS NOW EXPANDED ACT OF 2021

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1276, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1276) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID–19 vaccines to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PADILLA. I ask unanimous consent that the Tester-Moran substitute amendment be considered and agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 1400), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute) Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Strengthening and Amplifying Vaccination Efforts to Locally Immunize All Veterans and Every Spouse Act” or the “SAVE LIVES Act”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO FURNISH COVID–19 VACCINE TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS NOT ENROLLED IN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS’ PATIENT ENROLLMENT SYSTEM.

(a) In General. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may furnish a vaccine for COVID–19 to a covered individual during the COVID–19 public health emergency.

(b) Prioritization. In furnishing vaccines for COVID–19 under the laws administered by the Secretary, the Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize the vaccination of veterans who are enrolled in the patient enrollment system, veterans who receive hospital care and medical services pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of section 1765 of title 38, United States Code, and accompanying caregivers of such veterans before the vaccination of covered individuals not otherwise described in this paragraph; and

(2) only furnish vaccines for COVID–19 to covered individuals under this section to the extent that such vaccines are available.

(c) TIMING OF VACCINES PROVIDED TO VETERANS OR CAREGIVERS. The Secretary may determine the timing for offering a vaccine for COVID–19 to the spouse of a veteran from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(d) VACCINE ALLOCATION. It is the sense of Congress that, to the extent practicable based on the current national supply chain, the Secretary of Health and Human Services should adjust the allocation for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the vaccine for COVID–19 based on the additional eligibility of covered individuals under this section.

(e) DEFINITIONS. In this section:

(1) ACCOMPANYING CAREGIVER. The term “accompanying caregiver” means a caregiver described in paragraph (D), (E), or (F) of paragraph (2) who is accompanying a veteran who is receiving a vaccine for COVID–19 furnished by the Department.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL. The term “covered individual” means any of the following individuals:

(A) A veteran who is not eligible to enroll in the patient enrollment system.

(B) A veteran who is eligible for care under section 1724 of title 38, United States Code.

(C) A beneficiary under section 1781 of such title.

(D) A family caregiver of a veteran participating in the Department of Veterans Affairs in the Medical Foster Home Program, or Veteran Directed Care Program, or Veteran Directed Care Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(E) A caregiver of a veteran participating in the program of general caregiver support services under section 1726G(b) of such title.

(F) A spouse 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.

(G) A spouse of a veteran.

(3) COVERED PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY. The term “covered public health emergency” means an emergency with respect to COVID–19 declared by a Federal, State, or local authority.


(5) PATIENT ENROLLMENT SYSTEM. The term “patient enrollment system” means the system of annual patient enrollment of the Department of Veterans Affairs established and operated under section 1765(a) of title 38, United States Code.

(6) VETERAN. The term “veteran” has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code.

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

Mr. PADILLA. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 2021

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. Thursday, March 18, 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 work in the day and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the nomination of Xavier Becerra to be Secretary for Health and Human Services, further, that the post cloture debate time on the Becerra nomination expire at 12 noon; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; finally, that upon disposition of the Becerra nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Martin Walsh to be Secretary of Labor and that the cloture motion with respect to the Walsh nomination ripen at 1:30 p.m.

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

Mr. PADILLA. Finally, for the information of Senators, we expect two roll call votes during Thursday’s session of the Senate in relation to the Becerra and Walsh nominations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PADILLA. 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 6:22 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 18, 2021, at 10 a.m.
NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

JOSE W. FERNANDEZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE KEITH KRACH.

EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

JOSE W. FERNANDEZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, VICE KEITH KRACH.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOSE W. FERNANDEZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENERGY, AND THE ENVIRONMENT), VICE KEITH KRACH.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 17, 2021:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

KATHERINE C. TAI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLeni-POTENTIARY.
Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Angelina Hemphill, a newly minted Eagle Scout with Ankeny Troop 186, as our Iowan of the Week. Angelina is a member of the inaugural class of female Eagle Scouts nationwide and one of the first-ever from Iowa. She hopes to inspire others to work hard and never settle for less than what they deserve. Her goal is to help people believe in themselves even when they’re faced with challenges and to help them look for the good in the world.

To rise to the rank of Eagle Scout, Angelina has invested a lot of time and energy in educating herself and in giving back to her community. She completed 21 merit badges for tasks such as climbing, tying knots and fishing. In all, Angelina completed nine more electives than she needed to earn the rank of Eagle Scout. Angelina also organized and led a conservation service project with a crew of volunteers who removed invasive species at Chichaqua Bottoms Greenbelt. Through her accomplishments, she has learned numerous first aid and outdoor skills and how to be a positive, contributing citizen. She has also learned valuable leadership skills that she will carry with her for the rest of her life.

As one of the first women elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the state of Iowa, I can attest that being the first at something is never easy. Angelina’s bravery and determination, and her belief that young women should have an equal chance to learn about leadership and valuable life skills makes me so excited to see what the next generation can achieve. I am proud to represent constituents like Angelina who aren’t afraid to stand up for themselves and take a chance at doing something new. During this first week of Women’s History Month, I couldn’t be happier to name trailblazing Angelina as Iowan of the Week.

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 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.


Over the past year they have faced chal- lenges most of us cannot even imagine. They have shown incredible resolve in the face of the storms that come our way. Unfortunately, we have lost many loved ones to COVID-19. I couldn't be more thankful to represent the incredible people across South Dakota and all over the United States.
The United States Capitol Police expanded its force after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, and again following the historic merger with the Library of Congress Police in 2009.

In addition to the more than 2,000 sworn members of the United States Capitol Police, the United States Capitol Police Department has over 350 civilian personnel who provide operational and administrative support and its diverse workforce is comprised of employees from nearly all 50 states and the U.S. territories.

The United States Capitol Police embodies the best in American policing and serves as a model in security, urban crime prevention, dignitary protection, specialty response capabilities, and homeland security.

As ambassadors of the Congress, officers of the United States Capitol Police Department are often the first face that visitors and employees encounter, leaving a lasting impression that is reflective of the Legislative Branch and its role in America’s democracy.

Officers of the United States Capitol Police Department ensure the protection of the legislative process, the symbol of the nation’s democracy, the people who carry out the process, and the millions of visitors who travel here to see democracy in action.

No finer example of the selfless devotion to duty of love of country, and fidelity to their oath to preserve the Constitution of the officers of the United States Capitol Police Department than their valiant, heroic, and courageous response to the January 6, 2021 assault on the Capitol Building by thousands of domestic terrorists, insurrectionists, and rioters sent there by the President of the United States to “fight like hell” to disrupt and derail the constitutionally required Joint Meeting of Congress to open, count, and publicly confirm the vote tally of the presidential electors and announce the persons who had been elected President and Vice-President of the United States.

District of Columbia Mayor Muriel Bowser and the Metropolitan Police Department have a distinguished record of protecting all groups, regardless of their beliefs, who come to the nation’s capital to exercise their First Amendment rights peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

At the direction of Mayor Bowser, and in advance of the scheduled demonstrations, mutual aid was requested by the Metropolitan Police Department from several area police departments to be on standby in the District, including neighboring law enforcement departments, the Metropolitan Transit Police and non-law enforcement agencies such as the District of Columbia’s Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency and the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department.

The sustained assault on the Capitol precipitated an equally unprecedented response, necessitating the urgent request of the United States Capitol Police for the Metropolitan Police Department to come defend the Capitol to which the Metropolitan Police Department responded immediately with several Civil Disturbance Unit Platoon and proceeded to deploy to the west front of the Capitol and arrived within minutes.

The violent mob overran protective measures at the Capitol and by 1:50 p.m., Metropolitan Police Department had declared the assembly to be a riot and immediately began working to achieve the objectives of stopping domestic terrorists from entering the Capitol building and removing those that were already inside, secure a perimeter so that the Capitol could be cleared for lawmakers to resume the Joint Meeting of Congress to demonstrate to the nation and the world the robustness and viability of America’s democracy and making arrests of anyone violating the law.

During the height of the siege of the Capitol, approximately 850 Metropolitan Police Department members were at the Capitol, with another 250 in the area to directly support the response and aftermath.

Madam Speaker, people around the country and the world were shocked and moved by the video of a Metropolitan Police Department Officer being beaten by a crowd of insurgents, including one wielding an American flag, and of another in agony as he was crushed between a door and a riot shield but also awed by their bravery in the face of this unprovoked and vicious attack, bravery that was matched that day by countless other unheralded Metropolitan Police Department officers.

The January 6, 2021 siege of the Capitol assault resulted in one of the worst days of injuries for law enforcement in the United States since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.

Madam Speaker, officers of the United States Capitol Police Department, the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, D.C., and other uniformed law enforcement officers stood their ground in defense of American democracy while being attacked by the angry mob of domestic terrorists with metal pipes, sharpened chemical irritants, and other weapons.

At least 138 officers, 73 from the United States Capitol Police Department and 65 from the Metropolitan Police Department in Washington, sustained injuries during the attack on the Capitol Building, several of which required hospitalization.

The injuries sustained ranged from bruises and lacerations to more serious damage such as concussions, rib fractures, burns and even a mild heart attack.

The United States Capitol Police Department officer died from injuries sustained while physically engaging with protesters and two officers involved in the response have died by suicide.

Dozens, if not hundreds, of officers whom law enforcement officials estimate will suffer in years to come with post-traumatic stress disorder and the dozens who contracted the coronavirus from the unmasked domestic terrorists and rioters who stormed the Capitol.

At least 38 Capitol Police officers have tested positive, or were exposed to the coronavirus as well as nearly 200 National Guard personnel who were deployed to protect the Capitol.

Madam Speaker, the seven hours between the urgent call for help from the Capitol Police to Metropolitan Police Department and the re-supply of work by both houses of Congress will be indelibly etched in the memories of every law enforcement officer who was on the scene, as it is in the minds of the Senators, Representatives, congressional and support staff, media, and members of the media corps who were forced to seek safety behind locked doors.

Despite being overwhelmed and outnumbered, the indomitable forces of American
democracy, symbolized by the resolve of the officers of the United States Capitol Police Department, prevailed and the seditious attack was quelled, the Capitol Building preserved, and the lives of United States Senators and Representatives protected, as well as those of congressmen and support staff, and order was restored so that a Joint Meeting of Congress was resumed and completed its constitutionally required duty of counting and announcing the votes of the presidential electors, an essential step in the peaceful transfer of power that has been a hallmark of American democracy and the example to the world for more than two centuries.

Madam Speaker, the gold coin authorized to be minted by this legislation and displayed at the United States Capitol Police headquarters, to the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, D.C., and exhibited on display by the Smithsonian Institution conveys the thanks and appreciation of a grateful nation for the selfless and heroic service exhibited by these sentinels of the republic in defense of American democracy in responding to the January 6, 2021 assault on the U.S. Capitol by domestic terrorists.

This tribute is, as President Lincoln noted at Gettysburg, “altogether fitting and proper” for heroes of the republic.

The action we are taking today should encourage all educational and media institutions throughout the United States to teach and celebrate the story of the heroism of the officers of the United States Capitol Police Department, the Metropolitan Police Department, and all other law enforcement officers who, out of true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, selflessly risked their lives to protect the Capitol Building and its personnel, the Congress, and the spirit and fact of democracy in America.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Americans to read, celebrate, and revere the Constitution of the United States, fidelity to which is the surest best means of forming a more perfect union, establishing justice, ensuring domestic tranquility, providing for the common defense, promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessing of liberty to them and their posterity.

COMMEMORATING THE SUCCESSFUL FEDERAL CAREER OF BRENDA B. SMITH

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, as the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I rise today along with Ranking Member KEVIN BRADY, to commemorate the successful federal career of Brenda Smith, Executive Assistant Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s (CBP) Office of Trade. Ms. Smith is retiring after 33 years of government service, including 27 years with CBP and the legacy U.S. Customs Service.

Ms. Smith’s leadership at CBP is marked by significant advancements in the agency’s trade mission. She spearheaded unprecedented automation and modernization of the U.S. government’s import/export system, a renewed focus on preventing duty evasion, intellectual property rights infringement, and importation of goods derived from forced labor, as well as efforts to adapt the agency’s trade and revenue workforce for the new pace and challenges of the 21st century trade environment. Ms. Smith also led the development of global e-commerce standards and focus on new technologies like blockchain and advanced analytics.

Under Ms. Smith’s leadership, CBP modernized the international trade process, completing development and deployment of the U.S. Single Window and the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE)—the electronic portal for exporters and importers to clear shipments across the U.S. border. Ms. Smith took command of the Single Window project, organizing the efforts of 49 federal agencies and partnering with thousands of importers, exporters, brokers, and technology developers to successfully deploy the modem, automated system. The Single Window is now a global model, and it has revolutionized the international trade process for U.S. businesses and consumers. In recognition of her leadership on this project, Ms. Smith was a 2017 finalist in the Samuel J. Heyman Service to America award for management excellence.

She also implemented key components of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act (TFTEA) of 2015, the first comprehensive reauthorization of CBP since the agency’s creation in 2003. Ms. Smith led CBP’s implementation of the Enforce and Protect Act of 2015, increasing the transparency and effectiveness of CBP’s enforcement of antidumping/countervailing duties laws, and, following the repeal of a critical loophole, CBP’s increased focus on enforcement of the import prohibition on goods produced using forced, prison, and forced child labor.

Ms. Smith also led U.S. delegations to several partner nations to strengthen relationships with customs and human rights officials, industry leaders, and non-governmental organizations and bolster international safeguards against forced labor. For this work and for her focus on strengthening CBP’s trade enforcement mission, Ms. Smith was honored with a 2017 Distinguished Executive Presidential Rank Award, the highest award in civil service. In addition to leading a number of U.S. delegations, Ms. Smith represented the United States on the World Customs Organization Council in 2007 and 2017.

Ms. Smith also led CBP’s implementation of the landmark U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), working with the United States Trade Representative (USTR) and other federal agencies, as well as the U.S. international trade community, to ensure effective and timely delivery of key customs provisions of the USMCA.

Throughout her tenure at CBP and its predecessor, Ms. Smith always took the time to be responsive to Member questions and concerns, making herself available for regular briefings.

Prior to joining Customs, Ms. Smith worked at the Department of the Treasury. She also served on the staff of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment and subsequently in the personal office of Congressman Bernard J. Dwyer of New Jersey. Over the course of her career, Ms. Smith received numerous accolades, including a National Performance Review “Hammer Award” and countless agency awards.

We wish to congratulate Ms. Smith on her retirement and express our sincere appreciation for the many years of service, leadership, and accomplishment she has devoted to the U.S. government and the American people.

We wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

REMEMBERING JOAN F. ARP

HON. TIM RYAN
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Joan F. Arp, of Liberty Township, Ohio, who passed away on Saturday, March 13, 2021 at the age of 78.

Joan was born on February 28, 1943 in Youngstown, Ohio, the daughter of Louis and Katherine (Popovich) Kunovich. Joan was a member of the First United Methodist Church in Grindstone and a member of the church’s care team, bereavement committee, and taught Sunday School when her children were younger.

Mrs. Arp was a homemaker and stayed home to raise her children. She enjoyed playing bingo, needlepoint and was so proud of her collection of Santa Clauses. Joan loved to participate in the many fun activities and outings that were offered at Liberty Arms Assisted Living.

Joan will miss all of her cherished friendships, especially those she resided with. She leaves in her cherished memory her children, Mark (Mary) Arp, of Hermitage, PA., and her daughter Kelly Hontula, of Liberty Township; sister Maureen Perrico, of Las Vegas, Nevada and grandson, Nicholas Arp. Besides her parents, Joan is preceded in death by her husband, Kenneth J. Arp, whom she married October 9, 1965 and died May 5, 2014, and her brother, James Kunovich.

I am proud to be friends with Joan’s daughters, Kelly, and thank her for her long-standing support. My deepest condolences go out to Kelly, the entire family, and to all whose lives were touched by Joan.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF ROBERT HOYER

HON. MARK DeSaulnier
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. DeSAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of long-time community member Robert Hoyer as he celebrates his 100th birthday.

Bob grew up in Oakland and attended the University of Nevada, Reno. During World War II, Bob took a leave from his studies and served in the United States Army in the Philippines. When he returned home, Bob graduated from the University of Nevada with a degree in mining engineering. It was also in Reno that Bob met his wife, Eldora, who had served in the United States Navy WAVES during WWII in her aircraft navigation training.

Following college, Bob worked for the Natomas Mining Company in Nevada. When the mining industry declined after the end of
the war, Bob and Eldora moved back to the Bay Area where Bob worked for Dow Chemi-
cal in Pittsburg. He then went on to work for the East Bay Regional Parks District as a con-
struction inspector.

In 1956, Bob and Eldora settled in Clayton where they advocated, along with other resi-
dents, for its incorporation. When the City of Clayton was incorporated in 1964, Bob be-
came the first mayor and served on the City Council until 1980. One of the City Council’s
early accomplishments was the establishment of walking trails and preserved open space, which remain a highlight for the city today.

Bob and Eldora also contributed to the cre-
ation of the Clayton Historical Society, which was chartered in 1976. Bob served as the
President, helped raise money for city monu-
ments, and participated in the establishment of the Clayton Historical Society Museum. In
1976, two historic homes were moved to Main Street and joined together to create the Mu-
seum, which stands today as a testament to Clayton’s dedicated citizens. Throughout his
many years in Clayton, Bob continued to be an active member of the community. He served on
The Grove Park Blue Ribbon Task Force and the Keller Ranch Master Plan com-
mitee and donated the flagpoles at City Hall, the Grove Park, and the Museum.

Bob is a regular in downtown Clayton and is
known for his laughter and insightfulness. Please join me in congratulating Bob on his
100th birthday and his lifetime of service and leadership.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANN WAGNER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I was un-
avoidably detained. Had I been present, I
would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 81.

RECOGNIZING MS. NANCY DOLAN

HON. KAY GRANGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise
today to recognize Ms. Nancy Dolan, a key
member of the Senior Executive Service of the
Department of the Air Force, upon her pro-
motion and departure as the Deputy Director,
Strategic Concepts and Assessments, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Plans and
Requirements. Ms. Dolan was responsible for
developing and executing the Air Force strat-
egy and strategic planning efforts and assess-
ing alignment of planning products with stra-
tegic guidance. She supported the Chief of
Staff of the Air Force with U.S. and Allied
Strategic Studies Group, led Air Force trans-
formation by developing, exploring, and advo-
cating joint and combined force employment
concepts, and executed the CSAF’s Title 10 Futures Capabilities and unified engagement
wargames.

Nancy also previously served as the Staff
Director for the U.S. Congress for the House Veterans’ Affairs Committee, where she was
responsible for the operations of four sub-
committees. She coordinated the work of the
Full Committee minority to provide and update the legislative and fiscal authorizations for the
Department of Veterans Affairs.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Na-
tion, we wish Ms. Dolan the best of luck in her
new role as the Deputy Director of Staff, Sec-
retary of the Air Force. I extend our deepest
appreciation to Ms. Nancy Dolan for her dedi-
cated service to the Department of the Air
Force, the U.S. Congress, and to our Nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF BEDFORD
COUNTY

HON. JOHN JOYCE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speak-
er, I rise to celebrate the 250th anniversary of
Bedford County, Pennsylvania on March 9,
2021. In 1771, the Pennsylvania General As-
sembly passed a law forming Bedford County.
Since then, it has been an integral part of
Pennsylvania.

The first settlement in the colony was estab-
lished in 1758 around Fort Bedford, which was
constructed during the French and Indian War.
At the time of the County’s formation, 221
families lived in the region. Over the course of
250 years, the County grew in both popula-

tion and economic success. In addition to
being a wonderful place to work and live, Bed-
ford County is an important center of railroads
and interstate highways, among other national
priorities.

Bedford County is home to hardworking
Pennsylvanians who build, sustain, and serve
our commonwealth and our nation. It is an
honor to recognize the Bedford County
Sestercentennial and celebrate the County’s
remarkable history. I look forward to continued
participation with the people of Bedford County
to continue this incredible legacy for the next
250 years and beyond.

IN MEMORY OF C.T. WRIGHT

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I rise
today to honor the memory of Dr. C.T. Wright,
"a passionate, faithful, and devoted public serv-
ant and valued neighbor. C.T. will be remem-
bered as a mentor and true leader throughout
the education, criminal justice, and faith com-
munities in Arizona. He devoted much of his
life to civil rights and education, working for
three and a half years at historically black col-
leges and universities, where he then moved
on to his passion to help with human rights.
He founded the Light of Hope Institute, which
promotes human rights around the world. He
also served as a delegate for the Electoral
College and met six Presidents. C.T. fre-
quently led prayers at campaign rallies and
promoted faith. He proudly served as the
Chairman of the Board of Executive Clem-
tions.

C.T. Wright had great passion for his family,
education, faith, and freedom. Many will al-
ways remember and consider him as their
brother. He leaves behind a great legacy
that has reached out to communities across
Arizona. He was a thoughtful, compassionate,
and kind man who always cared for others
while ensuring a good future for all.

C.T. Wright served countless communities
selflessly and served as a great leader. May
we continue to honor his memory through our
passion and service to our communities.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF
MALCOLM HARDY DUDLEY

HON. ANNA G. ESCHOO
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Ms. ESCHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise to
honor the very well-lived life of Malcolm Hardy
Dudley who died on February 10, 2021 at
home in Atherton, California, with his wife of
67 years, Cosette. He was born in Santa
Cruz, California, to Allen Mason Dudley and
Glady's Alta Hardy Dudley.

Malcolm Dudley was a graduate of the Uni-
versity of California, Davis, and studied at the
London School of Economics. He served his
duty for three years on active duty and for another three years as a
communications officer for the U.S. Naval
Command Europe. He retired from the Naval
Reserves as a captain in 1967.

Malcolm Dudley’s life was full and varied
and he has been described as affable, cheer-
ful, and relaxed, traits he combined with tre-
mendous energy and efficiency. He began his
career as a financial advisor in 1962 and re-
mained in that capacity until 2017, two weeks before his 85th birth-
day. He had a great interest in the environ-
ment and traffic congestion which led to his in-
terest in local government. He served on the
Atherton City Council for 24 years, six of them
as Mayor. He was a champion of public trans-
portation and he was known as the resident
guru on regional transportation issues.

Malcolm had a passion for boating and
water-skied on Lake Tahoe, often sailing his
70-foot motor cruiser up the Pacific coast to
Washington and Colorado. He played jazz and
did a popular dance band in the 50’s and played with the
Unicorns swing band until this year.

Malcolm leaves his wife Cosette and his
daughters, Lynette Stebin and Virginia Rock,
two grandchildren and countless friends, all of
whom benefitted from his generosity and kind-
ness. I consider myself privileged to have
been among his wide group of friends.
Madam Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life of Malcolm Dudley, a great and good man who was a true patriot, and in extending our condolences to his wife and his entire family. His was a life well-lived, one filled with generosity, public service and care for others. He bettered our community and strengthened our country.

HONORING OUR PRISONER OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION HEROES

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I arise today to recognize the sacrifices made by American men and women in uniform today and throughout our nation's history. We should each take a moment to recognize the enormous loss of Americans who leave their homes and families to serve their nation, and whose fates are unknown—some captured and listed as prisoners of war, while many others are listed as missing in action. Their families endure tremendous grief and pain, knowing that their loved one’s story may never be revealed and that they may never be laid to rest.

Current estimates of American servicemembers who are unaccounted for number over 80,000. The vast majority of these are from conflicts decades ago, and answers continue to elude us. We must continue our efforts to make sure that all American servicemembers listed as POW or MIA are returned and that we continue to remember and venerate those who gave the ultimate sacrifice in war.

I want to commend the efforts of Gene Spanos, a constituent of the 9th Congressional District, who has spent a great deal of time and energy contributing to these efforts. His ongoing missions include, but are not limited to, pushing for recognition of American POWs who died in captivity during the Korean War, advocating for greater United Nations support of POW-MIA recognition efforts, ensuring that MIA servicemember gravesites are included in the Master Exhumation list by country. The efforts of Mr. Spanos and so many dedicated individuals around the country are ensuring that we continue to move forward on this critical issue.

Madam Speaker, I commend the work of my constituent Gene Spanos and his counterparts who are dedicating their time and passion to these efforts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes on March 16, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 78, NAY on Roll Call No. 79, YEA on Roll Call No. 80, and YEA on Roll Call No. 81.

VOCA FIX TO SUSTAIN THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1652, or the “VOCA Fix Act of 2021,” a critical piece of legislation designed to curtail and prevent future cuts to an already diminished federal victim service grants program.

This legislation must pass, because VOCA grants provide compensation to victims of crime at critical moments of desperation. VOCA funds could help compensate the only surviving victim of Robert Lee Haskell who, driven by vengeance, fatally shot six members of his exwife’s family in Texas, including four children.

The survivor of Haskell’s rampage, a girl of only fifteen, was shot in the head and only survived by playing dead.

VOCA funds could help compensate the wife and two children of a man killed in a home intrusion in Hidalgo County, Texas, after an intruder entered the family’s home, ordered the wife and children to lock themselves into a room, and then proceeded to shoot their husband and father.

VOCA funds could help compensate a woman who was abducted in Houston and forced to drive to an ATM at gunpoint, where she withdrew cash to give to her abductors.

VOCA funds could help compensate innumerable victims and survivors of federal crimes, but only if we pass this legislation.

VOCA grants have been vital in their support of traditional victim service providers across the nation, particularly for those organizations serving victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, trafficking, and drunk driving.

VOCA grants also fund victim compensation, which helps survivors pay medical bills, missed wages, and in the most severe cases, funeral costs.

However, the “federal grants used to support victim services through VOCA have decreased significantly over the past several years.

Further drastic cuts to VOCA funding are expected, as the non-taxpayer funded pool from which these grants originate, the Crime Victims Fund, is running dry.

The Crime Victims Fund serves as an example of true justice, because the money used to support victims comes not from tax dollars but rather from the criminal fines and penalties paid by federally convicted offenders.

The Crime Victims Fund has shrunk rapidly in recent years and continues to decline, because rather than prosecuting cases, the Department of Justice increasingly settles cases through deferred prosecution and non-prosecution agreements, and the monetary penalties associated with these agreements are deposited into the Treasury rather than the Crime Victims Fund.

These agreements deny funding to victim services, which is contrary to the spirit of VOCA: monetary penalties from crimes should go to serve victims of crimes.

The crimes from which these penalties are derived are the same, whether they are prosecuted or settled, and the funding should be going to serve victims.

The VOCA Fix Act of 2021 fixes this by ensuring that monetary penalties associated with deferred and non-prosecution agreements go into the Crime Victims Fund instead of into the Treasury.

This simple fix will prevent future funding cuts that jeopardize programs’ abilities to serve their communities and will help address the many growing and unmet needs of victims and survivors, including survivors of domestic violence.

This legislation not only recognizes that it is the victims of crime that bear the brunt of the drastic cuts being made, but also that we must protect those victims that have the courage to come forward and work together with the authorities to bring justice to their offenders.

Victims who cooperate with authorities often fear for their own safety and face pain at revisited trauma, and this legislation recognizes that rather than putting victims in further danger, we create for them a safe environment—both physically and emotionally.

Victims may be intimidated by law enforcement or other government agencies, but if we want victims to fully and freely cooperate with the authorities, we must ensure that victims feel protected and that there is no risk of becoming retraumatized.

We must also make sure that if victims cooperate with authorities, then measures to ensure the safety of victims will be provided in our government agencies working in tandem with victim service providers.

Tomorrow, the House will vote on H.R. 1629, which will reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994.

We are doing so because we recognize the urgency and dire need faced by the victims and survivors throughout this country during a significant moment of ongoing domestic violence caused by this pandemic and experienced by both women and men.

Although local victim services agencies are there to help, they are facing record numbers of clients as well as the economic consequences of the pandemic.

Without the VOCA Fix Act of 2021, survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault will inevitably lose access to victim support services, leaving victims and survivors without options for safety and vulnerable to further victimization.

Madam Speaker, the time is now to deliver access to the services victims and survivors so desperately need during a critical moment when the need for victim assistance has skyrocketed and programs are being forced to cut lifesaving services for victims.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee of the time and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.
As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 18, 2021 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 22
6 p.m. Committee on Foreign Relations To receive a closed briefing on the policy and legal rationale of U.S. airstrikes in Syria. SVC–217

MARCH 23
9:30 a.m. Committee on Armed Services To receive a closed briefing on Department of Defense cyber operations. SVC–217

10 a.m. Committee on Finance To hold hearings to examine how U.S. international tax policy impacts American workers, jobs, and investment. WEBEX

Committee on Foreign Relations To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development. SD–106/VTC

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security To hold hearings to examine why the U.S. pays the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. SD–430

Committee on the Judiciary To hold hearings to examine constitutional and common sense steps to reduce gun violence. SH–216

2:30 p.m. Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation To hold hearings to examine bolstering democracy in Georgia. SD–106/VTC

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs To hold hearings to examine the 2020 census and current activities of the Census Bureau. SD–342

MARCH 24
9 a.m. Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Cybersecurity To receive a closed briefing on Department of Defense cyber operations. SVC–217

10 a.m. Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs To hold hearings to examine the quarterly CARES Act report to Congress. WEBEX

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation Business meeting to consider the nomination of Polly Ellen Trottenberg, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation, and a routine list in the Coast Guard; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine rebuilding America’s transportation infrastructure. SH–216

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Cynthia Minette Marten, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Education. SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight To hold hearings to examine the National Response Enterprise, focusing on preparing for future crises. SD–342/VTC

Committee on Rules and Administration To hold hearings to examine S. 1, to expand Americans’ access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy. SR–301

2:30 p.m. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on Water and Power To hold hearings to examine the viability of incorporating natural infrastructure in western water management and policy to support economic development, protect watershed health, and build more resilient communities. SD–366

Committee on Indian Affairs To hold an oversight hearing to examine water infrastructure needs for Native communities. SD–628

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship To hold an oversight hearing to examine Small Business Administration’s COVID-19 relief programs. SD–215

3 p.m. Committee on Veterans’ Affairs To hold hearings to examine veterans’ mental health and implementation of the Hannon Act, focusing on coping during COVID. SD–G50

MARCH 25
10:15 a.m. Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Deanne Bennett Criswell, of New York, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security. SD–342/VTC
Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

**Routine Proceedings, pages S1577–S1621**

**Measures Introduced:** Thirty-four bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1, 784–816, and S. Res. 119–121.

**Measures Passed:**

- **George Daniel Crowe:** Senate agreed to S. Res. 121, honoring the 100th anniversary of the birth of George Daniel Crowe.

- **SAVE LIVES Act:** Senate passed H.R. 1276, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID–19 vaccines to certain individuals, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:
  - Padilla (for Tester/Moran) Amendment No. 1400, in the nature of a substitute.

- **Major Richard Star Act—Referral:** A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 344, to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans’ disability compensation and retirement pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

- **Becerra Nomination—Agreement:** Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.
  - During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:
    - By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. EX. 124), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.
    - A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, March 18, 2021; and that the post-cloture debate time on the nomination expire at 12 noon; provided further that following the disposition of the nomination of Xavier Becerra, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Martin Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor; and that the motion to invoke cloture with respect to the nomination of Martin Joseph Walsh ripen at 1:30 p.m., on Thursday, March 18, 2021.
  - Senate confirmed the following nomination:
    - By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. EX. 123), Katherine C. Tai, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.
  - Senate received the following nominations:
    - Jose W. Fernandez, of New York, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years.
    - Jose W. Fernandez, of New York, to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
    - Jose W. Fernandez, of New York, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment).

- **Messages from the House:**
  - Pages S1612–13

- **Measures Referred:**
  - Pages S1577

- **Measures Read the First Time:**
  - Pages S1577

- **Executive Communications:**
  - Pages S1613

- **Executive Reports of Committees:**
  - Pages S1613

- **Additional Cosponsors:**
  - Pages S1614–15

- **Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:**
  - Pages S1615–19

- **Additional Statements:**
  - Pages S1611–12

- **Amendments Submitted:**
  - Pages S1619

- **Authorities for Committees to Meet:**
  - Pages S1619–20

- **Record Votes:** Two record votes were taken today. (Total—124)
  - Pages S1582–83

- **Adjournment:** Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:22 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday,
March 18, 2021. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1620.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

INCOME AND WEALTH INEQUALITY
Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the income and wealth inequality crisis in America, after receiving testimony from Robert B. Reich, University of California Goldman School of Public Policy, Berkeley; Sarah Anderson, Institute for Policy Studies, John W. Lettieri, Economic Innovation Group, and Scott Winship, American Enterprise Institute, all of Washington, D.C.; and Jennifer Bates, Amazon BHM1, Bessemer, Alabama.

EXPANDING BROADBAND
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine recent Federal actions to expand broadband, after receiving testimony from Christopher Ali, University of Virginia Department of Media Studies, Charlottesville; Michael P. O’Rielly, former Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, Arlington, Virginia; Jon Wilkins, Quadra Partners, Washington, D.C.; and Justin Forde, Midcontinent Communications, West Fargo, North Dakota.

DRINKING WATER AND WASTE WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS
Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water to examine the challenges facing drinking water and waste water infrastructure projects, after receiving testimony from Shellie R. Chard, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, Oklahoma City, on behalf of the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators; Kishia L. Powell, DC Water, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the National Association of Clean Water Agencies; Michael McNulty, Morgantown Utility Board, Morgantown, West Virginia; and Nathan Ohle, Rural Community Assistance Partnership, Falls Church, Virginia.

COVID–19 IN NURSING HOMES
Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine COVID–19 in the Nation’s nursing homes, including steps taken by the Department of Health and Human Services in response to pandemic, after receiving testimony from John E. Dicken, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; Adelina Ramos, SEIU District 1199 New England, Greenville, Rhode Island; Denise Bottcher, AARP Louisiana, Baton Rouge; R. Tamara Konetzka, University of Chicago Department of Public Health Sciences, Chicago, Illinois; Quiteka Moten, State of Tennessee Long Term Care Ombudsman, Nashville; and David R. Gifford, American Health Care Association/National Center for Assisted Living, Washington, D.C.

STRATEGIC COMPETITION WITH CHINA
Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine advancing effective U.S. policy for strategic competition with China in the twenty-first century, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth Economy, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, New York; and Thomas H. Shugart III, Center for New American Security, and Saif M. Khan, Georgetown University Center for Security and Emerging Technology, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:
S. 231, to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop guidance for firefighters and other emergency response personnel on best practices to protect them from exposure to PFAS and to limit and prevent the release of PFAS into the environment, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
S. 272, to amend the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, to require the budget justifications and appropriation requests of agencies be made publicly available, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
S. 583, to promote innovative acquisition techniques and procurement strategies;
S. 517, to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism;
S. 671, to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies;
S. 693, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the halt in pension payments for Members of Congress sentenced for certain offenses;
S. 658, to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to work with cybersecurity consortia for training;
S. 636, 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, with an amendment;
S. 688, to prohibit contracting with persons that have business operations with the Maduro regime;
S. 522, 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. 111, to establish the Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Best Practices;
S. 664, to require the Comptroller General of the United States to review certain legislation in order to identify potential risks of duplication of and overlap with existing Federal programs, offices, and initiatives;
S. 566, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 42 Main Street in Slatersville, Rhode Island, as the “Specialist Matthew R. Turcotte Post Office”;
H.R. 208, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 West Main Street, Suite 102 in Tupelo, Mississippi, as the “Colonel Carlyle ‘Smitty’ Harris Post Office”; and
H.R. 264, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1101 Charlotte Street in Georgetown, South Carolina, as the “Joseph Hayne Rainey Memorial Post Office Building”.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Vivek Hallegere Murthy, of Florida, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and Rachel Leland Levine, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary, both of the Department of Health and Human Services.

EQUALITY ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Equality Act, focusing on LGBTQ rights, after receiving testimony from Senators Merkley, Baldwin, Blackburn, Hyde-Smith, and Lankford; Representatives Cicilline, Newman, and Hartzler; Alphonso David, Human Rights Campaign, New York, New York; Edith Guffey, PFLAG National, Lawrence, Kansas; Mary Hasson, Ethics and Public Policy Center, Washington, D.C.; Stella Keating, Tacoma, Washington; and Abigail Shrier, Los Angeles, California.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Paycheck Protection Program, focusing on performance, impact, and next steps, including S. 723, to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to extend the covered period for the paycheck protection program, after receiving testimony from Lisa Mensah, Opportunity Finance Network, and Joel Griffith, The Heritage Foundation, both of Washington, D.C.; John K. Hoey, The Y in Central Maryland, Baltimore; and Brad Polumbo, Foundation for Economic Education, Arlington, Virginia.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 43 public bills, H.R. 1953–1995; and 8 resolutions, H. Res. 243–250, were introduced. Pages H1497–H1500

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H1501–02

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment: The House passed H.J. Res. 17, removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 204 nays, Roll No. 82. Pages H1419–32, H1475–76

H. Res. 233, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1620), (H.R. 6), (H.R. 1603), (H.R. 1868), and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 17) was agreed to, yesterday, March 16th.


Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–3, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 117–12, shall be considered as adopted.

Agreed to:
Nadler en bloc amendment No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–12: Burgess (No. 1) that requires the DOJ and HHS to issue guidance and best practices on strategies to improve coordination of sexual assault forensic examination training and program sustainability; Bush (No. 2) that ensures that survivors can access transitional housing and be protected from unfair evictions and denial of service; Bush (No. 3)
that requires the Attorney General shall make publicly available on the Department of Justice website reports involving police sexual misconduct; Case (No. 4) that ensures the inclusion of Native Indian, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian groups; requires a review and subsequent Department of Justice report of Native Hawaiian interactions with the criminal justice system and related crime prevention programs to add to pre-existing data on Native Indians and Alaska Natives; Connolly (No. 5) that adds the right to be informed of the status and location of a sexual assault evidence collection kit to the rights of sexual assault survivors; Crist (No. 6) that clarifies that STOP grants can be used to cover the fees associated with replacing driver’s licenses and birth certificates for survivors and their children; will provide survivors and their families with life-saving assistance as they take steps to build a safe and independent life; Rodney Davis (IL) (No. 7) that requires the Department of Health and Human Services to include in their Study and Report on Barriers to Survivors’ Economic Security Access (Sec. 704), the impact of the COVID–19 pandemic on such survivors as it relates to their ability to maintain economic security; Delgado (No. 8) that adds to the findings on Economic Security for Victims that individuals living in rural areas facing intimate partner violence often face barriers to accessing resources, ranging from health care to the criminal justice system; Delgado (No. 9) that requires an analysis of the unique barriers faced by survivors in rural communities in the study on barriers to survivors’ economic security; Dingell (No. 10) that establishes pilot program grants (up to 10) through the Department of Justice to state and tribal courts, offering them the opportunity to explore the feasibility and effectiveness of serving protection orders electronically; Kaelhe (No. 11) that ensures appropriate consultation and inclusion with indigenous groups to support the tailored needs of indigenous women; Lamb (No. 12) that adds training for sexual assault nurse examiners (SANE nurses) to VAWA’s Rural Programs, to expand access to and retention of quality SANE nurses in rural areas; Lawrence (No. 13) that amends Section 102 (Grants Encouraging Improvements and Alternatives to the Criminal Justice Response), to authorize grants to also be used for the purpose of better identifying and responding to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking against individuals who have been arrested or have contact with the juvenile or adult criminal justice system, and for developing or strengthening diversion programs and to ensure they receive comprehensive victim services; Lawrence (No. 14) that incentivizes states to adopt laws prohibiting the prosecution of minors for prostitution; Leger Fernandez (No. 15) that directs the Office on Violence Against Women to report on actions taken to prevent suicide amongst survivors and to consult with SAMHSA to establish best practices to prevent suicide amongst survivors; Leger Fernandez (No. 16) that requires that services provided pursuant to grants to support families in the justice system are provided in a culturally relevant manner and requires DOL’s public outreach and education campaign to be conducted in a culturally relevant manner; Levin (MI) (No. 17) that amends Sec. 101 (STOP Grants) to add “implementing a vertical prosecution system” to the list of permissible uses for STOP grants; Meng (No. 18) that ensures family-focused programming for prisoners—from intake through reentry—to support the prisoners’ familial needs, as well as provide appropriate training for correctional staff to engage with prisoners’ families; Meng (No. 19) that ensures clear distribution and accessibility of sanitary products to prisoners and provides that no visitor is prohibited from visiting due to the visitor’s use of sanitary products; Moore (No. 20) that authorizes a study on the intersection between domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking, and maternal mortality or morbidity; Moore (No. 21) that authorizes and expands programs offering sexual assault medical forensic exams and sexual assault victim services in tribal communities; Newman (No. 22) that requires grant applicants of the National Resource Center on Workplace Responses to include microbusiness in their outreach to qualify; Omar (No. 23) that includes credit history in the GAO economic barrier study; Omar (No. 24) that includes barriers of legal costs and jurisdictional challenges in the GAO economic study; Phillips (No. 25) that establishes a pilot program to identify and make immigration relief available to immigrants who are dependent upon their abusers for immigration status and have been subject to battering or extreme cruelty and have already been authorized for employment; Plaskett (No. 26) that establishes a civil cause of action against a person that discloses an intimate image of an individual without the depicted individual’s consent, if the person disclosed the image with knowledge of or reckless disregard for such lack of consent; Pressley (No. 27) that establishes LGBTQ+ specific grants and services to LGBTQ+ victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; Ross (No. 28) that revises the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to allow grants to be used to for the development of statewide databases with information on where sexual assault nurse examiners (SANE nurses) are located; Ross (No. 29) that creates a statutory mandate that a victim’s safety should be central to the housing and housing-related decisions that covered housing
providers make when implementing VAWA to not evict survivors, keep their information confidential, and do not deny assistance; Scanlon (No. 30) that provides legal representation to individuals for post conviction relief proceedings; Scanlon (No. 31) that creates a pathway for providing legal services through the Department of Veterans Affairs to address unmet needs such as elder law, child custody, and housing disputes; Speier (No. 32) that adds the Stopping Harmful Image Exploitation and Limiting Distribution Act (the "SHIELD Act") to the bill, which addresses the malicious sharing of private, intimate images, known as "nonconsensual pornography" or "revenge porn"; Speier (No. 33) that directs the Secretary of Education to make available a climate survey for institutions of higher education to administer to students on their experiences with sexual assault, sexual harassment, domestic violence, stalking, and dating violence; Speier (No. 34) that establishes an Interagency Task Force on Sexual Violence in Education to provide pertinent information to the government, public, and educational institutions on campus sexual violence prevention and response, as well as how to better assist survivors; Speier (No. 35) that builds on the unanimous passage of the Survivors’ Bill of Rights Act establishing rights for survivors of federal sexual assault offenses by incentivizing states to ensure that survivors have, at a minimum, the rights guaranteed by the federal law; includes the right to be informed if the government intends to destroy or dispose of a sexual assault evidence collection kit, the right to be informed of any result of a kit, and the right to have a sexual assault evidence collection kit or its probative contents preserved without charge for the maximum applicable statute of limitations or 20 years, whichever is shorter; Torres (CA) (No. 37) that requires the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of HHS, to conduct a study investigating whether abused victims who raise evidence of domestic violence are more likely to lose primary custody of their children to an abusive partner or to the State, including reviewing and providing recommendations on restructuring relevant state laws, regulations, and practices; Torres (CA) (No. 38) that requires the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of HHS, to conduct a study on the direct and collateral economic costs and risks of divorce from an abusive partner to a victim of domestic violence, including payment of alimony, legal fees, spousal support, or the division of property; Torres (NY) (No. 39) that mandates state and local governments submit to the Attorney General a report on the number of sexual assault response teams at hospitals and their average victim response times to be eligible for certain federal funds; and Williams (No. 41) that ensures any study conducted under this bill includes an assessment, to the extent practicable, of any disparate impacts of the matter studied, by race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity (by a yeo-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 197 nays, Roll No. 83); and

Wagner amendment (No. 40 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–12) that enhances VAWA’s transparency and accountability measures by making entities found by the Attorney General to have intentionally misused VAWA grant funds ineligible to apply for future grants for up to 5 years, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing (by a yea-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 174 nays, Roll No. 84).

Rejected:

Stefanik amendment (No. 36 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–12) that sought to strike all and replace the text with the Violence Against Women Extension Act of 2021 (by a yea-and-nay vote of 177 yeas to 249 nays, Roll No. 85). Pages H1474–75, H1477–78

H. Res. 233, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1620), (H.R. 6), (H.R.1603), (H.R.1868), and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 17) was agreed to yesterday, March 16th.

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Awarding three congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021: H.R. 1085, amended, to award three congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 413 yeas to 12 nays, Roll No. 87; Page H1480

COVID–19 Bankruptcy Relief Extension Act of 2021: H.R. 1651, amended, to amend the CARES Act to extend the sunset for the definition of a small business debtor, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 399 yeas to 14 nays, Roll No. 88; and Pages H1480–81

VOCA Fix to Sustain the Crime Victims Fund Act of 2021: H.R. 1652, amended, to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 384 yeas to 38 nays, Roll No. 89. Pages H1481–82

Clerk to Correct Engrossment: Agreed by unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 1620, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House. Page H1482
Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 244, electing a certain Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives.


Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Committee Meetings
CLIMATE CHANGE, NATIONAL SECURITY, AND THE ARCTIC
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing entitled “Climate Change, National Security, and the Arctic”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DHS MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing entitled “DHS Management Challenges”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING FOR A CLEAN ENERGY FUTURE
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Domestic Manufacturing for a Clean Energy Future”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RISING TO THE CHALLENGE: THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION POST COVID–19
Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment held a hearing entitled “Rising to the Challenge: The Future of Higher Education Post COVID–19”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEADING THE WAY FORWARD: BIDEN ADMINISTRATION ACTIONS TO INCREASE COVID–19 VACCINATIONS
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Leading the Way Forward: Biden Administration Actions to Increase COVID–19 Vaccinations”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Health and Human Services officials: Rochelle P. Walensky, M.D., Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Anthony S. Fauci, M.D., Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health; and Peter Marks, M.D., Director, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research, U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

AVERTING A CRISIS: PROTECTING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE IN THE U.S. TERRITORIES
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Averting a Crisis: Protecting Access to Health Care in the U.S. Territories”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Sablan, Radewagen, Plaskett, González-Colón, and San Nicolas; Anne Schwartz, Executive Director, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission; and Carolyn Yocom, Government Accountability Office.

GAME STOPPED? WHO WINS AND LOSES WHEN SHORT SELLERS, SOCIAL MEDIA, AND RETAIL INVESTORS COLLIDE, PART II
Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Game Stopped? Who Wins and Loses When Short Sellers, Social Media, and Retail Investors Collide, Part II”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WOMEN LEADING THE WAY: THE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT IN BELARUS
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Energy, the Environment, and Cyber held a hearing entitled “Women Leading the Way: The Democratic Movement in Belarus”. Testimony was heard from a public witness.

UPDATE ON COVID–19 IN AFRICA
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Global Human Rights held a hearing entitled “Update on COVID–19 in Africa”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE WAY FORWARD ON HOMELAND SECURITY
Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Way Forward on Homeland Security”. Testimony was heard from Alejandro Mayorkas, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

FROM RESCUE TO RECOVERY: BUILDING A THRIVING AND INCLUSIVE POST-PANDEMIC ECONOMY
Committee on Oversight and Reform: Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis held a hearing entitled “From Rescue to Recovery: Building a Thriving and Inclusive Post-Pandemic Economy”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.
BRAIN DRAIN: REBUILDING THE FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC WORKFORCE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight held a hearing entitled “Brain Drain: Rebuilding the Federal Scientific Workforce”. Testimony was heard from Candice Wright, Acting Director, Science, Technology Assessment, and Analytics, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

THE BUSINESS CASE FOR CLIMATE SOLUTIONS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Business Case for Climate Solutions”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its rules for the 117th Congress. This meeting was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to receive a closed briefing on the planning, programming, budget, and execution process of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the 21st century economy, focusing on protecting the financial system from risks associated with climate change, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine fighting forced labor, focusing on closing loopholes and improving customs enforcement to mandate clean supply chains and protect workers, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the COVID–19 response, focusing on an update from Federal officials, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the SolarWinds supply chain attack, focusing on the Federal perspective, 10:15 a.m., SD–342/WEBEX.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 632, to amend chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, to require the voluntary collection of demographic information for patent inventors, S. 169, to amend title 17, United States Code, to require the Register of Copyrights to waive fees for filing an application for registration of a copyright claim in certain circumstances, and 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, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: to resume joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, 10 a.m., W EBEX.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine COVID–19 one year later, focusing on addressing health care needs for at-risk Americans, 9:30 a.m., VTC.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, 10 a.m., Webex.


Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing entitled “Unmanned Systems of the Department of the Navy”, 11 a.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services; and Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, joint hearing entitled “Fighting for Fairness: Examining Legislation to Confront Workplace Discrimination”, 10:15 a.m., Zoom.


Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion, hearing entitled “By the Numbers, How Diversity Data Can Measure Commitment to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion”, 10 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism, hearing entitled “Assessing the Human Rights Situation in Saudi Arabia”, 10 a.m., Webex.


Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties, hearing entitled "Discrimination and Violence Against Asian Americans", 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn and Webex.

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law, hearing entitled “Reviving Competition, Part 3: Strengthening the Laws to Address Monopoly Power”, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn and Webex.


Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Lessons Learned from the Texas Blackouts: Research Needs for a Secure and Resilient Grid”, 10 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Underserved, Agricultural, and Rural Business Development, hearing entitled "The Role of Community Navigators in Reaching Underserved Businesses”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn and Webex.


Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Beyond Deborah Sampson: Improving Healthcare for America's Women Veterans in the 117th Congress”, 2:30 p.m., Zoom.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing entitled “Hearing with the IRS Commissioner on the 2021 Filing Season”, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth and Webex.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to resume joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, 10 a.m., WEBEX.
Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, March 18

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, and vote on confirmation thereon at 12 noon.

Following disposition of the nomination of Xavier Becerra, Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Martin Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 1:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 p.m., Thursday, March 18
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