House of Representatives

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SARBANES).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 23, 2021,

I hereby appoint the Honorable John P. SARBANES to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, in You we trust and pray Your blessing on this House and its Members. In these first days of spring, may we see the example of new life emerging from the bleakest of seasons, confident in Your care and sure of Your purpose. As trees planted by streams of water, may we extend our roots: ourselves, our energy, and our desires to the refreshment of Your life-giving spirit.

And when the heat of our days increases, and the schedule becomes withering, restore us with a reinvigorated desire to serve You.

When the storms of debate and disagreements intensify, may we not throw ourselves into the path of the tempest, but live into the grace we receive from Your promises.

And when the drought of certainty and the famine of significance seem to deplete us of any vestige of hope, revive our faithfulness that we, in this season, may bear fruit for Your Kingdom.

We offer this prayer in the strength of Your Name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC,
March 23, 2021,

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 23, 2021, at 9:37 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 128.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,
ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

EC–671. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Oxalic Acid: Exemption

H.R. 1276, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID–19 vaccines to certain individuals, and for other purposes;


SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker on Friday, March 19, 2021:

H.R. 1276. An act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID–19 vaccines to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Friday, March 26, 2021. Thereupon (at 11 o’clock and 3 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, March 26, 2021, at 2 p.m.

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0066; FRL-10017-66] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 668); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-672. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’S final rule — Orthosulfamuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0808; FRL-10018-15] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 668); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-673. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’S final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Approval and Implementation Plans; Utah; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Correction [EPA-OAR-2019-0963; FRL-10019-17-Region 8] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 668); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-680. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’S final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; San Diego Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0315; FRL-10018-29-Region 9] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 668); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-689. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’S final rule — Streptomycin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0067; FRL-10017-52] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 668); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


EC-692. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’S final rule — Benzovindiflupyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0066 and EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0963; FRL-10017-55] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 668); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-693. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’S final rule — Air Plan Approval; Washington; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2018 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0062; FRL-10018-22-Region 10] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 668); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-684. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the AGENCY’S final rule — Air Plan Approval; Washington; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 12-Month Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2019-0573; FRL-10016-79-Region 10] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 668); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
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EC–701. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notice of a vacancy, and a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–702. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notice of a vacancy, and a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–703. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–704. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–705. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–706. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–707. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–708. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–709. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–710. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–711. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105–277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681–614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BERA (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2118. A bill to authorize United States participation in the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. MCBATH (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 2121. A bill to amend the Family Vi- olence Prevention and Services Act to make improvements; to the Committee on Trans- portation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. CRIST, Ms. TITTUS, and Mr. PASCARELLI):

H.R. 2120. A bill to amend the Economic Aid to Hard-Hit Small Businesses, Non- profits, and Venues Act to include hospita- lity businesses in grant program for shuttered venue operators, and for other pur- poses; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. HINSON, Ms. JA- CONS of California, Ms. WILD, Mr. SHIELDS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HARBER of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 2121. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the limitation of the exclusion for dependent care assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BARRAGAN (for herself, Ms. BROWNLY, Ms. CHU, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 2122. A bill to designate the Battleship IOWA Museum, located in Los Angeles, Cali- fornia, as the National Museum of the Surface Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. HEATTY (for herself and Mr. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 2123. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protec- tion Act to require regulated entities to pro- vide information necessary for the Offices of Women and Minority Inclusion to carry out their duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2124. A bill to amend the Internal Rev- enue Code of 1986 to ensure that kombucha is exempt from any excise taxes and regula- tions imposed on alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHERSTER (for her- self, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms.
such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself and Ms. Kuster):

H.R. 2148. A bill to significantly lower prescription drug prices for patients in the United States by ending government-granted monopolies for manufacturers who charge drug prices that are higher than the median prices at which the drugs are available in other countries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NEUGE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. Omar, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2148. A bill to significantly lower prescription drug prices for patients in the United States by ending government-granted monopolies for manufacturers who charge drug prices that are higher than the median prices at which the drugs are available in other countries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2149. A bill to provide that certain rules and guidance related to waivers for State innovation under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act shall have no force or effect; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MALABAR (for himself and Miss Rice of New York):

H.R. 2150. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 2151. A bill to identify and refer members of the Armed Forces with a health care entitlement of the Armed Forces to notify affected communities before releasing water contaminated with cyanobacteria from flood risk management projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 2151. A bill to amend section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 to prevent immunity for interactive computer services for certain claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 2151. A bill to require the Corps of Engineers to notify affected communities before releasing water contaminated with cyanobacteria from flood risk management projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2152. A bill to provide emergency relief assistance under a modified Community Development Block Grant program for communities facing economic damage from civil and social crises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 2152. A bill to provide emergency relief assistance under a modified Community Development Block Grant program for communities facing economic damage from civil and social crises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 2153. A bill to provide grants to States, localities, and Indian Tribes to reform their criminal justice system to encourage the replacement of the use of pretrial detention with a condition of pretrial release in criminal cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARIN, Mr. WALTZ, Mrs. RICK of Oklahoma, Mr. OBERKOTZE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. KUSTERS, Mr. Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Mr. FRENSTRA, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Mr. MEJURE):

H.R. 2153. A bill to provide grants to States, localities, and Indian Tribes to reform their criminal justice system to encourage the replacement of the use of pretrial detention with a condition of pretrial release in criminal cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARIN, Mr. WALTZ, Mrs. RICK of Oklahoma, Mr. OBERKOTZE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. KUSTERS, Mr. Chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Mr. FRENSTRA, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Mr. MEJURE):

H.R. 2153. A bill to provide grants to States, localities, and Indian Tribes to reform their criminal justice system to encourage the replacement of the use of pretrial detention with a condition of pretrial release in criminal cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. WENSTIEF, Mrs. MC BATH, and Mrs. GARCIA-

H.R. 2153. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health insurance policy offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. DEGETTER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MANSOLO, Mr. MATHY, Mr. NARVAEZ, Mr. NEUGE, Mr. NORTON, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MASHburn, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BARRAGAN, Mr. LEMFLET, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. HAYES, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. SINES, Mr. NEUGE, Mr. VAJGA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. JONES, Ms. MENG, and Mr. HOFFMAN):

H.R. 2154. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require testing of underground sources of drinking water in connection with hydraulic fracturing operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWICKERT (for himself, Mr. PEERY, Mr. MANN, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mr. HICE of Georgia):

H.R. 2154. A bill to limit the authority of a State or other related taxing jurisdiction to impose a tax on a resident who has relocated permanent residence to another State or its related taxing jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SEWELL (for herself, Mr. BILIRIS, Mr. CARVALHO, Mr. KIND, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. HOULEHAN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2155. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the inclusion of certain audio-only diagnoses in the determination of risk adjustment for Medicare Advantage plans and PACE programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. S PELKIS, Mr. DENTON of New York, Mr. MACK, Mr. MAST, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MANN, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ROSENDALE (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WALTZ, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. ROSENDALE (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BARRAGAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MAST, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WALTZ, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. JAYAPAL, Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 2156. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the inclusion of certain audio-only diagnoses in the determination of risk adjustment for Medicare Advantage plans and PACE programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS):

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for extensions of the time limitations for use of entitlement under Department of Veterans Affairs educational assistance programs by reason of school closures due to emergency and other situations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Mr. MCKINSEY, Ms. KELLY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SINES, Ms. THAYER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BLINT, Mr. ROCHESTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extensions of the time limitations for use of entitlement under Department of Veterans Affairs educational assistance programs by reason of school closures due to emergency and other situations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Mr. MCKINSEY, Ms. KELLY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SINES, Ms. THAYER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BLINT, Mr. ROCHESTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extensions of the time limitations for use of entitlement under Department of Veterans Affairs educational assistance programs by reason of school closures due to emergency and other situations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.
By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:
H. R. 2169. A bill to prohibit certain business expenses concerns from receiving assistance from the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SOTO:
H. R. 2170. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve access to adult vaccines under Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. WITTENMAN):
H. R. 2171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide certain tax credits associated with obtaining or maintaining recognized postsecondary credentials to be treated as qualified higher education expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. McGovern, Ms. CHU, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BERMEJO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. ESCH, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. MEEKS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. KATKO):
H. R. 2172. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit law enforcement officers from sexual activity with persons in custody, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLATLEY:
H. R. 2173. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to wastewater infrastructure workforce development purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. GUTERIE, Mrs. BUSSTOS, Mr. LONG, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. GOTTTHERRMER, Mrs. HARTZLIER, and Mrs. ANNE):
H. R. 2174. A bill to establish a rural postsecondary and economic development grant program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. STEWART:
H. R. 2175. A bill to prohibit certain heads of Federal agencies and Administrations from imposing a mask requirement on certain Federal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMPSON:
H. R. 2176. A bill to provide for the continued and uninterrupted production of domestic minerals in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES OF California (for herself, Mr. HABER of California, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. BUSSTOS, Mr. LONG, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. GOTTTHERRMER, Mrs. HARTZLIER, and Mrs. ANNE):
H. R. 2177. A bill to establish a rural postsecondary and economic development grant program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCOTT OF Virginia:
H. R. 2178. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to provide treatment for diabetes in minority communities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CHU, Mr. BARRAGAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. KHAHNA, Ms. PARKS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TLABIA, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SOUZZI, Mr. SHELBERG, Ms. LAWRENCE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mr. JONES):
H. R. 2179. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate cost-sharing with respect to coverage of insulin as a covered part D drug and associated medical supplies and to provide mail order access to insulin and such supplies under the Medicare program during the COVID-19 emergency period; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEBER OF Texas (for himself, Mr. BAHN of Georgia, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BURDINE, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CATHWORTH, Mr. FALLON, Mr. ABBINGTON, Mrs. HERRELL, and Mr. TIDWELL):
H. R. 2180. A bill to relocate fencing around the Capitol Buildings and the United States Capitol Grounds, and the Secret Service of the Treasury Department to reassign members of the National Guard deployed to the National Capital Region to the southern border of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. WELCH (for himself, Mr. BUSCH, Mr. DOUGEN, Mr. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. NEUZE, Mr. OMAR, and Mrs. SCHAKOWSKY):
H. R. 2181. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the importation of affordable and safe drugs by wholesale distributors, pharmacies, and individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WEXTON (for herself, Mr. BRYER, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. R. JONES, and Mrs. TRAHAN):
H. R. 2182. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide funding to States for extending broadband service to unserved areas in partnership with broadband service providers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT OF Florida (for herself, Ms. DELAURAO, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. ADENIWA, Mrs. SCHUTZ, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BRETTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, MR. ELUMENAUR, Ms. BLUNT ROCHER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. BROWNL, Mr. BUSH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFLY, Mr. CARRAJAL, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE OF New York, Mr. CLEever, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. COOPER, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DRAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DEGETTE, Mr. DEBENNE, Mr. DENHVER, Mr. DREUTCH, Mrs. DEMING, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. FLICKER, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. GARCIA OF Texas, Mr. GARCIA OF Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HAYNES, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JACKSON OF California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON OF Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAHLE, Ms. KAPIT, Mr. KATINO, Ms. KELLY OF Illinois, Ms. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRK-PATRICK, Mr. KRISHNAOMOTH, Mr. KUSTER, Mr. LANGSTON, Mr. LAWSON OF Florida, Mrs. LEE OF Nevada, Ms. LEE OF California, Mr. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN OF California, Mr. LIEU, Ms. LOFUREN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MABRY, Mr. SEWELL, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SMITH OF Washington, Ms. SPEeER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLABIA, Mr. TORRES OF New York, Mr. TRAHAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VEQUEZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WEXTON, Mrs. WILLIAMS OF Georgia, Ms. WILSON OF Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. JOHNSON OF Georgia, and Miss RICE OF New York):
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. BERA:
H.R. 2119.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:
H.R. 2130.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARL:
H.R. 2131.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 2132.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 2133.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 2134.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CRIST:
H.R. 2135.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUETZ:
H.R. 2137.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:
H.R. 2123.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:
H.R. 2123.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOST:
H.R. 2127.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:
H.R. 2130.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:
H.R. 2130.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:
H.R. 2142.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:
H.R. 2142.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. JAYAPAL:
H.R. 2145.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:
H.R. 2145.
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. JOYCE of Ohio:
H.R. 2146.
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 3

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.R. 2363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 33.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 137: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 151: Ms. LOFUREN.
H.R. 169: Mr. WALTZ and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 161: Mr. EVANS and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 199: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 256: Mr. BERA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PASSICHELL, Mr. WILD, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RUPPERFSGER, Mr. MCMENY, and Mr. NUGO.

H.R. 259: Mr. COOPER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. MALDOWSKI, Mr. NEGUICE, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 263: Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. LOFUREN, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. JACOBS of California, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 279: Ms. LOFUREN.
H.R. 301: Ms. LOFUREN.
H.R. 310: Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Ms. CHENYE.

H.R. 391: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 392: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 400: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 401: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 406: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 425: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 463: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 467: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 477: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 526: Ms. FLETCHER.

H.R. 534: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 550: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 556: Mr. NUGO and Mr. SCHRIER.
H.R. 586: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 623: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOWLING of Pennsylvania and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 707: Mr. STEIL, Mr. MCREYNOLDS, Mrs. MCBATH, and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 708: Ms. WILD and Ms. HOUHAN.
H.R. 717: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 741: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. KILDER.

H.R. 801: Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. EASSON, Mr. HOPSON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PRYCE, and Mr. BROWN.

H.R. 851: Mr. SOTO and Ms. BARRAGAN.
H.R. 864: Ms. GREENE of Georgia.
H.R. 883: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 892: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 899: Mr. POSHY.

H.R. 911: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 926: Ms. DEFAZIO and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 958: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 962: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. HOUHAN.

H.R. 1017: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1035: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 1054: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1065: Ms. MANNING and Mrs. KIM of California.

H.R. 1111: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. HASTINGS.
The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable Raphael G. Warnock, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who commands the morning to appear, we honor Your Holy Name.

Lord, guide our lawmakers to find delight in Your guidance. May Your wisdom provide them with food for reflection, morning, noon, and night. Renew their strength, as they seek for ways to reduce the violence in our land.

Lord, provide them with uncommon wisdom to bring greater respect for the preciousness of each person made in Your image. Give us all a greater reverence for the sanctity of every life.

Lord, provide us all with the power to be productive for You in every season of life, as You cause our plans to flourish. We pray in Your merciful 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 to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. Leahy).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

Senate


To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable Raphael G. Warnock, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

Patrick J. Leahy, President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK 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.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.J. RES. 17

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, I understand that there is a joint resolution at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 17) removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. In order to place the joint resolution on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

COLORADO SHOOTINGS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, this morning the Nation grieves with the people of Boulder, CO, the site of another horrific mass shooting last night. A depraved gunman opened fire inside a local supermarket, killing 10 people, including a police officer. Many more are injured.

Our hearts go out to the people of Boulder and the families of those Americans who have lost their lives so unexpectedly.

Our thanks again go out to the brave first responders.

People kiss someone goodbye for the morning and send somebody off to school and they are never seen again—never seen again. It is just awful. And it has been less than 8 weeks since eight people were killed in another series of shootings in Georgia. We cannot seem to finish grieving one tragedy before another takes place.

It is a reminder that we must confront a devastating truth in the United States: An unrelenting epidemic of gun violence steals innocent lives with alarming regularity. Even amidst the pandemic, gun violence has not receded. In fact, confoundedly, it has grown even worse, and 2020 was one of the deadliest years for gun violence in two decades—a reminder that most gun violence doesn’t even make headlines but nonetheless causes immeasurable devastation to communities from one end of our country to the other.

So we have a lot of work to do. I have already committed to bringing universal background checks legislation to the floor of the Senate. There is a hearing today in the Senate Judiciary Committee under Chairman DURBIN’s leadership to examine several commonsense proposals to reduce gun violence.

Two summers ago, the Republican leader—then the majority leader—promised there would be a debate in the Senate on gun violence, but it never happened. It never happened.

This Senate will be different. The Senate is going to debate and address
the epidemic of gun violence in this country.

Today, our hearts are with the people of Colorado and with everyone whose lives have been touched by gun violence.

VIOLENCE AGAINST ASIAN AMERICANS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, as I mentioned, the shooting in Colorado comes only a week after another tragedy in the communities outside Atlanta, GA, where eight people were killed in a string of shootings, six of whom were women of Asian descent.

It is important to place the Atlanta area shootings in context. Over the past year, there has been a rising tide of violence against Asian Americans driven by fear, misinformation, and age-old prejudices against the Asian-American community, from shouted insults and racial slurs to outright assault.

A 61-year-old Filipino American was slashed in the face by a box cutter on the New York subway. An 84-year-old Thai American in San Francisco was shoved so violently it led to his death. And now this attack in Georgia.

Every day, Asian Americans walk down the streets looking over their shoulders, wondering if they will be assaulted or even worse—even worse.

The poison of racism has always existed in America, but over the past 4 years it seems to have found new life. There is no question that the former President Donald Trump, through word and deed, fanned the flames of racial bias in our country. It is not a coincidence that it is worse now than it has been before. Donald Trump fanned those flames—fanned those flames, often with glee.

With respect to the Asian-American community, specifically, the former President engaged in rhetorical that blamed the Chinese people for the coronavirus—an absolutely despicable notion that has led to all sorts of verbal and physical assaults on Asian Americans. You could see him with his chin strutted out when he called it the virus that he named it—you know what—the China virus. So despicable. And he did it with almost a joy.

Here in America, we all know that an attack against any one group is an attack against all of us. So it is up to all of us now to stand up and speak out in support of the Asian-American community in America.

Over the weekend, I joined several vigils to stand with Americans of all ages, races, and faiths to support the Asian-American community. There was a large turnout, and our Asian brothers and sisters were so relieved that so many of us from the elected community were there. We should all be doing that in every part of the country.

Upon the rise of the Senate this morning, I started the process to make two pieces of legislation available for action by the full Senate.

First is a bill led by my friend Senator HIRONO of Hawaii, very similar to the same bill introduced by our New York Congress Member, GRACE MENG, of Queens. This legislation by Senator HIRONO will address COVID-related hate crimes against Asian Americans head-on. It would appoint a point person at the Department of Justice to expedite the review of COVID-19-related hate crimes, provide support for State and local law enforcement agencies to respond to hate crimes, and work on solutions to the problem of racially discriminatory language that has been used to describe the pandemic.

Second is a bill led by my friend Senator DURBIN to counter the threat of domestic terrorism and violent White supremacy. This is a bill that passed the House of Representatives last year on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. As far as legislation goes, it is as much of a no-brainer as it comes.

Every one of us—every one of us—has an obligation to speak out against these hate crimes. One of the best antidotes—there are many—but one of the best antidotes when hate occurs is to answer it forcefully, strongly, and repeatedly so that no one thinks it is acceptable, and those who perpetrate it are shamed and then, if they have broken the law, punished.

Every one of us must do this. We must speak out. Here in the Senate, we have more than a responsibility to just speak out; we must take action. I hope we will have universal support for these pieces of legislation that I mentioned.

I yield the floor.

The SENATOR from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHUMER said:

I am the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. President.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, while House Democrats try to overturn a certified election result from last November, some Senate Democrats are attempting to ram through a partisan rewrite of all 50 States’ election laws—all 50 States’ election laws.

The 60-vote threshold is the reason huge pillars of domestic policy don’t oscillate back and forth every time a different party wins the majority. So let’s think of something like the Mexico City policy, the executive branch policy about funding overseas abortions. It has flipped back and forth every single time the White House has changed parties since the 1980s. Republican Presidents issue the memo; the Democratic Presidents retract it.

The legislative filibuster is what keeps the entire country from moving forward. For a long time, Senators on both sides have recognized the Senate and the country are better off with some actual stability. Both sides have understood there are no permanent majorities in American politics, so a system that gives both sides a voice benefits, actually, everyone in the long term.

That is what 33 of our Democratic colleagues said just a few years ago, when they all signed a joint letter insisting that rules protecting debate on legislation be preserved.

That is what President Biden believed consistently throughout his long Senate tenure. About 15 years ago, then-Senate Biden said killing the filibuster would be, “an example of the arrogance of power.” That was President Biden. He restated his long-held position during the campaign just last year.

Here is what my colleague the Democratic leader said in 2017.

SCHUMER said:

The legislative filibuster is the most important distinction between the Senate and the House. . . . [L]et’s find a way to further protect the 60-vote rule for legislation.

That was the Democratic leader in 2017.

And Democrats didn’t just spend the last 4 years supporting the filibuster; they spent 4 years using it. Senate Democrats used the filibuster to kill Senator Tim Scott’s police reform bill in the wake of the deaths of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor.

We could have had Federal legislation on the books since last summer, putting more body cameras on police officers, requiring fuller incident reporting to the FBI, and finally making lynching a Federal crime, among other things. Democrats stopped it. They stopped it using the filibuster.

A few months before, they used the filibuster to briefly turn the bipartisan sprint toward the CARES Act into a partisan standoff. The press marveled that Senate Democrats had the gall to block relief—a tactic that helped tank the markets—in order to demand further changes.

But in early 2018, Senate Democrats used the filibuster to block government funding and force a brief government shutdown over, of all things, immigration. One of the Democratic leader’s first major acts as the leader of his conference was to wield the filibuster to push back the entirety of Federal law enforcement.

So, look, the Democratic side just spent 4 years defending and, of course, happily using the same Senate rule that many of our colleagues now attack. This reversal is not about principle. It has nothing whatsoever to do with principle. It is just raw power—raw power.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.
Three years ago, the assistant Democratic leader was asked about the Senate majority going “nuclear” and killing the legislative filibuster. Here’s what Senator DURBIN had to say:

“I can tell you that would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to our Founding Fathers.”

That was Senator DURBIN in 2018, just a few years ago. Now he argues the opposite.

Now I understand our colleague has rotated through several different explanations for his reversal in just the last few days.

First, our colleague from Illinois indicated he changed his mind—changed his mind—because the Republicans, and I specifically, had used the filibuster so much in the intervening years. But, Mr. President, Republicans were in the majority the whole time. We were in the majority the whole time. It was the Democrats and the filibuster in the minority in 2018, 2019, and 2020—not Republicans. That argument makes no sense whatsoever.

A few days later, there was a new made-up rationale: It is just that the Senate is getting anything done, so the institution needs an overhaul. Except we have just had a uniquely terrible year to make that argument.

Last year was not a good year to make that argument. We passed five—five—bipartisan COVID bills with big bipartisan majorities that spent the most money in American history and helped save the country. Don’t see any obstruction in that. We passed a historic bipartisan bill for national parks and public lands. Didn’t see any outrageous use of the filibuster on that.

So there is fake history swirling all around the discussion—fake history.

About a year ago, former President Obama launched a new, coordinated, and very obvious campaign to get liberals repeating the claim that the Senate rules are somehow a relic of racism and that the law came just a month after Democrats had used the filibuster to kill Senator Tim Scott’s police reform and anti-lynching bill.

So these talking points are an effort to use the terrible history of racism to justify a partisan power grab in the present. It is not unlike what we saw last summer, when some protest mobs ended up defacing statues of people who actually crusaded for justice—for example, Abraham Lincoln, Ulysses S. Grant, and the abolitionist Matthias Baldwin—mistakenly damaging good institutions because of our troubled past.

Multiple fact checkers have torn into this simplistic notion that the rules of the Senate are rooted in racism: “Historians told PolitiFact that the filibuster did not emerge from debates over slavery or segregation.” One scholar’s account was that “the very first Senate filibuster was over a bridge across the Potomac River.”

The senior assistant legislative clerk read nomination of Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The Acting President pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read nomination of Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, talk continues to swirl about eliminating the legislative filibuster here in the U.S. Senate. The Democratic leader has threatened that if Republicans don’t vote the way he wants them to vote on legislation, eliminating the filibuster will be on the table.

An interview where he issued his threat, the Democratic leader made it very clear that he is not inviting Republicans to work with Democrats on legislation. This isn’t an invitation for both parties to sit down at the table and arrive at an agreement that both parties can support. No. This is an invitation for Republicans to support exactly what Democrats want or face the consequences.

It is ironic that the Democratic leader would be taking that position today because this is what he was saying back in 2017 about the legislative filibuster. This is the Democratic leader saying the “legislative filibuster” is “the most important distinction between the Senate and the House. Let’s find a way to further protect the 60-vote rule for legislation.”

So the Democratic leader was very supportive of this back in 2017, when they were using it extensively to try and stop or slow Republican legislation.

The assistant Democratic leader, the Democratic whip, Senator DURBIN from Illinois, said this in January 2018:

“[G]oing back to our Founding Fathers,” referencing the legislative filibuster and how important it was historically here in the U.S. Senate.

Well, about that same time, 2017, 61 Senators out of 100 were in the U.S. Senate, 61 out of 100 Senators signed a letter in which they supported retention of the legislative filibuster. In fact, it goes on to say:

We are writing to urge you—

And this is to the Senate leaders at the time, Senators McCONNELL and Schumer—

To support our efforts to preserve existing rules, practices, and traditions as they pertain to the right of Members to engage in extended debate on legislation before the United States Senate. We express a variety of opinions about the appropriateness of limiting debate when we are
Sixty-one Senators, including over 30 Democrats, on record as recently as 2017 in support of the legislative filibuster—over 30 Democratic Senators, including the Democratic leader and the Democratic whip.

Well, what has changed? Because now they have done an abrupt reversal, a complete 180. I mean, they are spinning around so fast, it makes your eyes glaze over. What an incredible versatility of conviction they have demonstrated on this issue.

And you think about the reason for it. What are they arguing? Well, they are saying the Republicans have been misusing the filibuster. That is a little bit ironic, given the fact that Republic- cans have been in the majority for the past 6 years. Republicans took the majority in January of 2015 and held it until January of 2021.

So the past 6 years it has been the Democrats who were in the minority. They would use their filibuster to block legislation, and they used it extensively. They used it extensively last year to block legislation, repeat- edly, over and over and over again.

And Republicans, at the time, were under a lot of pressure to get rid of the legislative filibuster, and they used it extensively. They used it extensively last year to block legislation, re- peatedly, over and over and over again.

And Republicans, at the time, were under a lot of pressure to get rid of the legislative filibuster, including by the President of the United States, over and over and over, saying Republicans need to get rid of the legislative fili- buster.

Republicans, being consistent in their position—the 61 Senators, Republic- cans who signed this letter, including me, have been consistent in our posi- tion, even when we were in the major- ity, even when the Democrats were using the filibuster to block legislation. So we were trying to advance, that we needed to maintain the filibuster because it was important to the institu- tion of the Senate, and it required bi- partisan cooperation. It required a level of comity to get legislation passed, and it made sure that the mi- nority was represented in legislative proceed- ings that were produced by the U.S. Senate. We have been consistent in that position, even when it meant taking on our administration, our President, and over and over again the past 6 years, now their argument now is that we have to get rid of the legisla- tive filibuster because Republicans have been misusing it. How was that even possible? We were in the majority.

The legislative filibuster is a tool used by the minority. It was used by the Democrats over and over and over again the past 6 years, but their argu- ment now is that the Senate is not functioning, the Senate is not pro- ducing legislation? Really?

Laura Ingraham was in the majority. We passed out of the Senate five coronavirus relief bills with huge bipartisan majorities—huge bipartisan majorities—responding to the greatest crisis facing this country, both health crisis and economic crisis.

We responded to it in a bipartisan way, honoring the rules and the tradi- tions of the Senate, which were created by the Founders by majority rule. Here is where the rights of the minority are honored, which required cooperation and working together to get results.

And we produced results, in spite of the fact that we consistently filibustered legislation. Now, there were certain pieces of legislation we didn't get passed. We didn't pass polic- ing reform. Senator TIM SCOTT offered a piece of legislation that included all kinds of provisions that would have ad- dressed that important issue for our country, and the Democrats filibustered it, over and over and over again. So we didn't get the 60 votes to get po- licing reform across the finish line.

But it is incredibly ironic. I mean, hypocrisy is unknown in politics, but hypocrisy on this level is unprecedented. The Demo- cratic leader, the Democratic whip, and over 30 Democratic Senators have said as recently as 2 years ago, 3 years ago, 5 years ago, that we were using the filibuster because it is true to the tra- dition of the Senate and what the Founders intended in terms of the role that the Senate was supposed to play in our democracy.

And here we are, 2 or 3 years later, not because the Republicans had been misusing the filibuster, because the Re- publicans have been in the majority. We have been fending off the use of the filibuster by Democrats. They had no problems with the filibuster when they were using it as a tool at their disposal to block Republican initiatives.

The first CARES bill they filibustered multiple times, and it forced us to sit down with them and forge a com- promise that got 60 out of 100 votes in the U.S. Senate. But now the shoe is on the other foot. They are in the majority, and they have got all these things they want to get done, all this pent-up agenda.

I would argue that what is happening here is all the outside groups, all the leftwing groups that have all these things they want to get done, all of a sudden have concluded that notwith- standing their use of the filibuster to block legislation from accomplishing their agenda for the past 6 years, now that the shoe is on the other foot, they are in the majority and we have got power, we are going to do away with over 200 years of history—200 years of history that we put in place by the Founders to require the U.S. Senate to be different than the House of Rep- resentatives.

The House of Representatives does everything by simple majority. They have a Rules Committee. I served for a while on a Rules Committee that prescribes, basically, what legislation can come to the floor, what amendments are made in order, how much time is allowed for debate on each amendment. Everything is very structured. It is very organized. It is all done by democratic rule—majority rule, simple majority rule.

The Senate was created to operate differently by the Founders. And here we are having a debate about whether we are going to honor that tradition, that heritage, that legacy, that vision the Founders had when it came to how the U.S. Senate should operate.

The author of Federalist No. 62 notes: ‘A senate, as a second branch of the legisla- tive assembly, distinct from, and dividing the power with, a first, must be in all cases an interposition between the power and the people—by requiring the concurrence of two distinct bodies in schemes of usurpation or perfidy. . . . Sec- ondly, the necessity of a senate is not less indicated by the propensity of all single and numerous assemblies to yield to the impulse of sudden and violent passions, and to be seduced by factious leaders into intemperate and pernicious resolutions.

That is from Federalist No. 62. So the Founders created the Senate as a check on the House of Representa- tives. They made the Senate smaller than the House, for a reason, with the intention of creating a more stable, more thoughtful, and more de- liberative legislative body to check ill- considered or intemperate legislation and attempts to curtail minority rights.

As time has gone on, the legislative filibuster has become perhaps the key way the Senate protects minority rights. The filibuster ensures that the minority party has a voice in the Sen- ate. It forces compromise. It forces bi- partisan cooperation.

Even in the now rare case when a major- ity party has a filibuster-proof major- ity in the Senate, the filibuster still
forces the majority party to take into account the views of its more moderate or middle-of-the-road Members, thus ensuring that more Americans are represented in legislation.
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Demagoguery for minority rights would be troubling even if they had a substantial majority in the Senate. The voice of the minority deserves to be heard even when the minority is substantially outnumbered. But it is particularly outrageous that Democrats are so determined to sweep away protections from minority rights when they barely—barely—have a majority in the Senate and certainly don’t have a mandate. In fact, Democrats don’t have a real majority at all: only a technical one. The Senate is divided 50 to 50. The only reason Democrats have a real majority at all is because the Vice President is a Democrat. In the House, Democrats’ majority narrowed substantially in the November election.

Now, as for the Presidency, while certainly a Democrat won the election, it is worth noting that the only candidate who could win the Democratic primary was a man historically regarded as a moderate. Even among Democrats, Democrats’ far-left liberal candidates did not fare so well.
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work laws give workers a choice. Choice creates competition, and competition breeds success. Forced unionization creates a monopoly, which only leads to stagnation.

President Biden says he believes that "every worker should have a free and fair choice to join a union," but the PRO Act would tip the scales towards unionization even further. Among other things, the bill requires that workers' personal contact information be sent to unions; removes vote by secret ballot, subjecting them to union harassment; and limits the information workers may receive during a union-organizing campaign. That doesn't sound free and fair to me; it sounds like they want to ensure a favorable outcome for the union bosses and give them the ability to punish workers who don't go along with them.

On a related note, I want to briefly mention the upcoming unionization vote for nearly 6,000 workers at Amazon’s Bessemer, AL, facility. Amazon is the company that has been at the center of the unionization campaigns outside of Birmingham. There has been a lot of attention paid to this lately. We have had Hollywood actors, celebrities, Members of Congress, and even President Biden trying to help tip the scales in favor of the union's favorable outcome. Let me be clear. These hardworking Alabamians don't need Hollywood elites or Federal Government officials telling them what to do. We should all trust they will make the decision they think is right for them and their families. That is what right-to-work is all about—the right to choose. This is still a free country, after all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the crisis that is affecting our country right now, and it is the crisis at our southern border. Later this week, I will travel to Texas to inspect the situation firsthand.

My Republican colleagues and I will first say thank you to our law enforcement officers who are there on the frontlines. Their work is always important, and it is especially important at this time.

The President said on Sunday that he hopes to visit the border. He said he hopes to visit the border "at some point." Well, with all due respect, just the American people don't have time to wait. I invite the President to join us this Friday. Come with us. See the situation. Witness it firsthand.

Here are the facts. In the month of February, Federal agents apprehended more than 100,000 illegal immigrants crossing our southern border. That is more than double the number from last February. So in just 28 days—28 days of February—over 100,000 illegal immigrants crossed our border.

You know, illegal immigration numbers usually go down in the winter. It rises in the spring and peaks in the summer. We have every reason to expect that this is only going to get much worse in the months ahead. Even the Biden administration admits it. They admit that we are on pace this year to have more illegal immigrants than any year over the last 2 decades. Why is this happening? Well, if you ask the migrants, they will tell you the answer. His name is Joe Biden. There are photographs of migrants near Tijuana wearing shirts that say: "Biden PLEASE LEAVE US ALONE". They even use the Biden logo—his campaign logo—on their shirts.

So when did the surge of illegal immigrants start? Well, just after President Biden took office on January 20. Before the month was over, President Biden had already issued over seven Executive actions on immigration alone.

As I detailed on the floor a couple of weeks ago, President Biden has unveiled the most leftwing immigration agenda in the history of our Nation. During the campaign last year, President Biden promised lavish taxpayer benefits for illegal immigrants. So did Vice President Harris.

When the moderators at the Democratic debates asked who supported free healthcare for illegal immigrants, President Biden raised his hand. Vice President Harris also endorsed free healthcare for illegal immigrants. President Biden promised not just amnesty but American citizenship for illegal immigrants, and 26 Democrat Senators have already signed onto the bill that he has just introduced.

President Biden said in February that he will even give the coronavirus vaccine to illegal immigrants. You come here illegally; you get a free vaccine against coronavirus and free healthcare. No wonder illegal immigrants are rushing to our borders.

But we all remember what happened 4 years ago after President Trump was elected. Before he even issued most of his initial Executive actions, illegal immigration plummeted. It went down by 40 percent the first 4 months of his Presidency. It was called "The Trump Effect." It happened even before his policies went into effect. It was because he sent a clear message to the world. He said: Don't come here illegally; you get a free pass. He went on television last week and said: "We will not expel your child. . . . We will care for the child and reunite that child with a responsible parent.

In that same interview, he said: "I hope [children] will not undertake that perilous journey" to our border.

But as long as liberal policies are in place, it is a guarantee. They will undertake the perilous journey. They will risk traveling at the hands of smugglers, cartels, and human traffickers to get here.

Now we have a system that is overwhelmed. Our border agents can't keep up. Immigration and Customs Enforcement just spent $86 million to rent hotel rooms—hotel rooms for families who illegally crossed the border; $86 million for hotel rooms for over 1,000 families last week.

It has been reported that more than 100 illegal immigrants who tested positive for the coronavirus have been released into Texas. They were told to quarantine after they traveled through the country to their destination in the United States. We don't know where they are now or how many people they infected along the way. It could be in Texas. It could be anywhere. It is very concerning to people all across the country, and yet the White House is still in denial.

In fact, last week, the White House Press Secretary had to correct herself. She accidentally used the word "crisis" when talking about the border. A reporter asked her if that meant the White House was finally acknowledging that it was a crisis. She said no. She said it was just a "challenge."

Joe Biden promised us he would always tell us the truth. Yet the Biden White House is trying to mislead the American people about one of the most important issues that is facing our country today. It is not working. The American public knows this is a crisis. Democrats may think that this is some political game. In reality, this is a humanitarian crisis. Thousands of children are being harmed because of this.

Liberals talk a lot about how much compassion and empathy they feel. The truth is, the policies that they have don't lead to compassionate outcomes. They lead to some very cruel outcomes. As Secretary Mayorkas admits, the journey north from Central America is a "perilous" one. It is not safe for children. Large numbers of children who make the journey are trafficked, sold, and violated by gangs. If this year is like previous years, thousands and thousands of children are going to be harmed because...
they make the journey north. There is nothing passionate about the open border policy of this administration. It didn’t have to happen. It should not have happened, and the blame rests squarely with President Biden and the open borders. In less than 2 months, President Biden has already shown himself the most open-borders President in our history as a Nation. It is no surprise that the whole world has noticed.

The crisis will not fix itself. We need to take action. Republicans have a series of commonsense solutions to improve this situation immediately. They include enforcing the law, securing the border, and restoring the policy called “Remain in Mexico.” Without these, the Biden border crisis is going to continue to undermine our Nation’s safety and its security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and then, after me, Senators LEAHY and PETERS be allowed to complete our remarks in their entirety before the scheduled vote.

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

FILIBUSTER

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, the debate about the legislative filibuster is not a debate about S. 1 or S. 101 or S. 50. No, this is a debate about nothing less than the nature and durability of American self-government. Quite apart from the wrestling over which particular bill was filibustered 8 years ago or 4 years ago or 2 years ago or tomorrow, the decision about whether or not to eliminate the filibuster is the Senate’s most important policy debate in decades.

Eliminating the filibuster would obviously have all kinds of policy consequence, from tax rates and labor law to energy and infrastructure. But that is not why the debate is so important. This isn’t fundamentally a debate about this or that policy.

The debate about the filibuster is deeper than that because it is a debate about how and whether we debate at all. This matters a whole lot in a country this big, in a continental nation, because it is right at the heart of how peaceable self-government works at all. In that up, if we don’t have this as if it is just a matter of time before the filibuster goes away and all we really have is red-versus-blue jerseys anyway, if we just end the Senate’s rules as they have existed for 240 years, we will dramatically alter not just this institution but our entire form of self-government, and in the process we will dramatically escalate the fevered pitch of America’s recent arguing.

We shouldn’t ignore the deep and long-term significance of what adding the Senate’s rules on fire would mean simply because terms like “super-majority requirement” don’t fit really neatly into our modern, made-for-cable-TV, soap-opera variety of politics as entertainment, politics as sport, even politics as religion. “Super-majority requirements” are a whole bunch of syllables, and it just doesn’t make for great sound bites.

But let’s assume that we set the Senate’s rules on fire, we are going to cause dramatic, horrible consequences in American civic life.

Almost every single Member of the newly minted Democratic majority in the Senate has resolved in recent weeks that the legislative filibuster needs to be abolished, or, in their most recent focus group term, to be “reformed” out of existence.

This move would be directly contrary to over two centuries of tradition in this country and in this body. It would be directly contrary to the Founders’ explicit purposes for why this institution was created at all, and it would be directly contrary to the words of dozens and dozens of the majority Senators—their words just in the last 48 months.

This is no mere procedural change. If they go through with this, an already sick Senate would be committing institutional suicide. There really is no reason to believe that if the Senate doesn’t exist to foster real debate that is bigger than simple majority power.

This nuclear trigger would all but destroy the principle of consensus-building that the Senate demands and, thereby, but more than mere minority rights in this country would become subject to more and more fickle, more more and more power hungry, and, inevitably, more and more abusive simple majorities.

America is built on a number of seemingly small, but actually quite grand, ideas. One of the very best of those ideas, one that is just elegantly simple—so simple that we regularly don’t pause to reflect on it together and alone—was the simple idea that whenever possible, groups of different people should be allowed to make different rules for themselves. This is what our system of federalism is about. This is why we divide power both vertically and horizontally between legislative, executive, and judicial branches, and then also across the 50 States and versus the Federal Government.

It is not actually an extravagant thought. Consider, on a playground, kind of instinctively understand that if you can’t get one giant game of kickball together, it is OK to let the playground divide up into a few different games of kickball and dodgeball. It is a grand American tradition that when we don’t have to agree, we don’t have to agree about everything. It is OK to allow some diversity. It is OK for not all workplace regulations to be exactly the same everywhere in the country.

As it happens, America is a really big country, a continental nation, and we regularly don’t agree. Californians don’t always agree with Nebraskans. Virginians don’t always agree with New Yorkers. People in regularly sunny Miami don’t always see the world exactly the same as folks in regularly wintry Boston do. Ohio State fans don’t have to wear the blue and gold of Michigan.

It is a big country full of disagreements, and so our principle is, regularly, that wherever we can protect and respect differences, we should. We don’t force folks to wear the jerseys of the teams they don’t support. There is no reason to.

I feel like there is some joke I should make about Oral Roberts versus Harbaugh—I know relative competitions against Ohio State—but prudence recommends skipping that.

There are also circumstances, obviously, where we need to make big wide-ranging monopolistic government decisions. There are times when we have to have one-size-fits-all rules, but those laws do fit. Because laws rare fit for everything. Even in those moments when they are required, we still want to work hard to protect the rights of minorities and dissenters.

One way how do we respect their rights and abilities to make rules for varying communities across a nation of 330 million people from shore to shore? How do we allow as many people as possible to make divergent rules as they see fit? One way the ways we have traditionally in the Senate is we have always made sure, here, where we come from all across the country—east to west, north to south—that we would be required to pass legislation not by 50 plus 1 but by 50 plus 10. You have to bring some people from across the aisle over to your side. If you are in the majority, it means that you have to learn the habit of sitting down with Members of the minority. You have to talk to them. As importantly, you have to listen to them.

When this process of compromise works and a bill is passed, you are then guaranteed that the new law has the stamp of approval of at least some representatives of the minority on that issue, and it means that they will become your allies against quickly undoing that law next year. They will become your allies, because the process of compromise has led you to listen to each other and say: Instead of doing the 51-percent thing, what harder work might be required to get to the 60-percent thing?

When the process of compromise breaks down, that is a pretty important signal as well. When you are forced to make rules that are binding on diverse groups of people, it is in everyone’s interest that you get as much buy-in as possible. That is why we have done that.

One of the ways we have done that traditionally in the Senate is we have always made sure, here, where we come from all across the country—east to west, north to south—that we would be required to pass legislation not by 50 plus 1 but by 50 plus 10. You have to bring some people from across the aisle over to your side. If you are in the majority, it means that you have to learn the habit of sitting down with Members of the minority. You have to talk to them. As importantly, you have to listen to them.

When this process of compromise works and a bill is passed, you are then guaranteed that the new law has the stamp of approval of at least some representatives of the minority on that issue, and it means that they will become your allies against quickly undoing that law next year. They will become your allies, because the process of compromise has led you to listen to each other and say: Instead of doing the 51-percent thing, what harder work might be required to get to the 60-percent thing?

When the process of compromise breaks down, that is a pretty important signal as well. When you are forced to make rules that are binding on diverse groups of people, it is in everyone’s interest that you get as much buy-in as possible. That is why we have done that. It is the reason that the new rule will be respected and followed beyond just this 2-year Congress. Yet, if you shelve a rule change
through with a bare-knuckle majority, you ensure that 49 percent of the country is going to resent not just the rule but you. Pass laws today with a 50-plus-1 majority, and watch them be repealed tomorrow with a 50-plus-1 majority. Our Nation would last just as long from one policy agenda to another. It makes politics too central in the lives of the American people to allow a flexible 51-and-49-percent majority to change the whole direction of the Nation. Each election would become more do or die, more make or break. Each campaign would descend further and further into tribal ugliness.

In a big and diverse country, the Senate exists to force lawmakers to build a healthy consensus before we try to make sweeping national, legal changes. The Senate exists precisely to force this kind of consensus-building. That is really why this institution exists. It is how we guarantee that we do not have laws on the books that are respected by half of the country and resented and hated or ignored by the other half of the country. The Senate’s super-majority requirement has helped to ensure that big changes are not impulsive and narrow and instant but, rather, deliberative and broadly accepted.

But there is an alarming trend in our time. Let’s be clear: It is in both parties. It is not just the Democrats, who are now in the majority, who are interested in this kind of new, more instant, more divisive, more ideological kind of politics. There is a new trend toward a bare-knuckles belief that this is the only kind of politics that works, that it is the only kind of way you can go forward.

So my colleagues—again, in both parties—have decided that if you have the power, you should wield it, and you should wield all of it with no constraint. They might use this or that particular bill as a stalking horse for partisan cooperation anymore. There won’t be bipartisan cooperation anymore. There won’t be a healthy consensus before we try to make sweeping national, legal changes.

Some of the Republicans who have already spoken on the floor last week have warned the Democrats that they might rip his face off. I actually like the language that was used. That was the language that was used. I could give an hours- and-hours-long speech and go through all the flip-floppers in this Chamber who had one position 48 months ago and now have a completely different position. I don’t need to name all of them. We should just ask, what changed? We know what changed. The only thing that has changed in the last 2 years is who is in power.

When the Democrats were in the minority, you were fierce defenders of this indispensable Senate prerogative. That was the language that was used. The filibuster was standing between America and fascism, we heard. But now, when you have the slimmest majority—actually, it is just 50-50, and you need the VP’s motorcade to break a tie—the filibuster is standing between you and some of your legislative goals; therefore, it needs to be tossed out. When you were using the filibuster to halt Senator SCOTT’s police reform legislation, you were doubling down on principles and practices, and traditions—precisely because it advanced the deliberative purposes of the Senate. I don’t remember Senator SCHUETZ calling it the “Jim Crow filibuster” when he wrote that letter or when he was blocking Tim SCOTT’s police reform legislation last year by pointing to the Senate’s supermajority requirement rules. I don’t remember Senator SCHUETZ calling it “stupid” when he filibustered COVID relief in September and again in October under the Senate’s current rules.

Look, I want to be clear. I am not picking on BRIAN; I am naming him precisely because I like him, and afterward, we can argue about this. With Senator SCOTT, I have a relationship with, it would be less useful to cite them than the people with whom I actually have a lot of comity and good will. I do want to keep working with BRIAN, but in a simple majoritarian body, there won’t be bipartisan cooperation anymore. There isn’t much right now, but there is still a chance for the reform of this institution. Ending the filibuster is to end the Jim Crow filibuster. To be clear, this isn’t about Senator SCHUETZ. I could give an hours- and-hours-long speech and go through all the flip-floppers in this Chamber who had one position 48 months ago and now have a completely different position. I don’t need to name all of them. We should just ask, what changed? We know what changed. The only thing that has changed in the last 2 years is who is in power.
majoritarian exercise of power, it is supposedly exclusively a relic of slavery and a tool of Jim Crow. It is nonsense, and the people saying it know that it is nonsense. You used the same rule last year, and you were not racist when you used it.

This is B.S. that has been focused on, and particular bills are being used as the excuses to grab power that won’t just be for this bill; it will be forever. It will be the end of the Senate. Was there really a tool of Jim Crow when it was used against Tim Scott last year? I don’t think so, and I don’t think any of you think so. If somebody wants to come to the floor and repent of their racism for having used the filibuster last year, please do, but that isn’t what was happening, so stop with the nonsense rhetoric that is just for an MSNBC sound bite tonight.

It is sad to watch so many of my colleagues who know better be bullied into this position of shortsightedness, and that I know better because a U.S. Senator is to say: I know that people are angry. I know that people are yelling. I know that there are hot-heads. But one of the jobs of a Senator and surely the job of this body is to try to find a way to allow cooler heads to prevail.

We already have an institution that is instantly responsive to majorities—you only have to walk 200 yards to see it—and there is nobody who serves in this body who wishes they served in that body. We know what it looks like to have a simple majoritarian body, and the House was designed to do that. It is a good thing. The House was designed to do that. We already have an institution that is instantly responsive to majorities—and there are many on that side of the aisle who want to resist this change—are worried that going against the tide means watching dollars and votes flow away. It means getting screamed at in restaurants. It means that your self-interest is to avoid the short-term pain and ride the short-term tide.

Let me tell you, this feels pretty familiar. When I ran for this seat in 2014—it was the first time I had ever run for anything in my life—one of the fundamental reasons I ran, in my heart, never sought any office of any kind, was that I thought the Senate had a chance to still be restored to its deliberative place in American life.

We are living through a digital revolution that is disrupting the future of work, the future of war, the nature of local community, the neuron, synapse, and frontal lobe formations of our teens. The digital revolution is transforming American life everywhere, and this institution has a chance to help shape, instead of just allow the tide to flow at full speed and consume this institution as well.

So I said, I pledged—and when I said it to a largely red State in 2014, most people apparently didn’t think I meant it—that I wasn’t running just because I disagreed with a lot of President Obama’s policies but because I would defend the constitutional system of limited government and a Senate that exists to preserve processes even if someone in my own party came to power and urgent instant, radical changes that disrespected large portions of America.

I literally made the centerpiece of why I was running that I would resist someone in my own party who tried to do majoritarian, instant stuff. And I can tell you, I can introduce you to a whole bunch of Republicans on the ground in Nebraska who are really mad that I didn’t just do it. I didn’t precisely say it 17 different ways, where I named every person that they might later want to have all of that instant power.

After the 2016 election, people started looking back at what I said the whole 2014 campaign and got more uncomfortable with what they voted for. So nobody has to tell me how unpleasant it is to stand up and say things that are unpopular in your own party.

Over the course of the last 5 years, I have been cussed out by lots of people who once supported me and called me a friend. None of that was particularly fun, but so what?

The oath I took and the duty I swore to him as well, despite lots of ridicule from House Republicans. A lot of people in the House Republican caucus wanted much faster politics, but their passions were a poor guide to long-term wisdom for a nation this big and diverse. It is better for America’s hard est debates to be decided in a deliberative Senate rather than in the thunderdome.

Republicans in the majority held firm against blowing up this central structural pillar of this institution, even when it would have benefitted us politically. In other words, we faced the same choice then that you face now, and we decided that it was better to choose long-term stability over short-term legislative victories. It was the right choice for a nation this big and this diverse.

A lot of Republicans think that decision was naive. Their argument was that the other side hated us. They will definitely use all power against us whenever they can. And I know that many Democratic strategists on the outside, many people raising money, small-dollar fundraising online, they are making the exact same argument, but this isn’t war, and we are not supposed to be permanent enemies.

We want a politics of debate and of verbal jousting rather than of physical violence. And one of the most urgent political tasks we face today is to demonstrate that it is possible for people who deeply disagree and who are polarized in our division—we can still work together for the common good.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LITT). On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 38.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak for not more than 5 minutes regarding Shalanda Young.

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

NOMINATION OF SHALANDA D. YOUNG

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am proud to be here on the Senate floor to offer my strong support for Shalanda Young to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, as I have spoken about her earlier before the committee.

She has worked on the House Appropriations Committee for nearly 14 years. She has been the House Appropriations staff director since 2017.

It is with my position on the Appropriations Committee that I got to know her very well. I can tell you, without any reservation, there is no one better suited for this position. Her deep understanding of, really, the often arcane Federal budget process, her years of experience on the Appropriations Committee, her tenacity, and her dedication to public service will serve the Agency and the American people.

I think after we had the last shutdown of the government—I believe the longest in history—we ended up, finally, with four of us meeting for several weeks in my office here in the Capitol. When we forged the agreement to reopen, Senator SHELBY and myself, Congresswomen LOWEY and GRANGER from the House—we were chair and vice chair of our respective committees—but, most importantly, Shalanda Young was there for the House, as was Chuck KIEFFER, and she had an opportunity to work for the Senate. Her knowledge of the intricacies of that and her ability to help us reach agreement were absolutely essential.

Ms. Young began her career in public service in 2001 at the National Institutes of Health. She first came to work on Capitol Hill as a detailer for the House Appropriations Committee in 2005. She came back as a professional staff member in 2007. She worked her way up in the Appropriations Committee over the years. She helped develop a budget for and conducted oversight of key Agencies. That has given her a critical insight into the operation of some of our Nation’s most important Agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the General Services Administration. She even served as a staff director for the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, which covers the budget for Congress.

Ms. Young became staff director of the House Appropriations Committee in 2017, coincidentally the same year I became vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee. But she has helped the House navigate some of the most difficult issues before the Chamber. As I said, she was a critical player in helping to end the longest Federal shutdown in history in 2019, and she was instrumental in crafting 2020 bipartisan COVID relief bills.

She has a reputation as a tough but fair negotiator. That is high praise on Capitol Hill because she gets it from both Republicans and Democrats. I can attest to the truth of these statements. I have seen these skills firsthand.

I have already said that the Office of Management and Budget is one of the most powerful government Agencies that most Americans have never heard of. That is true. It wields incredible influence on not just the Federal budget but over policies that affect people’s lives.

We need people like Shalanda Young to help steer the Agency in these important decisions. That is why I voted yes on the recent motion, and that is why I want to see her in that position as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

NOMINATION OF SHALANDA D. YOUNG

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, during committee review of Ms. Young’s nomination to be the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, important questions were raised about whether she would uphold and enforce the restrictions of the Hyde amendment if confirmed. I found her initial response to a question put to her on the subject troubling as it suggested she may seek to use her position to undermine Hyde. However, after speaking with Ms. Young and pressing her on the issue, I am satisfied that she will follow the law as written by Congress without regard to her own personal views. She has assured me that she has no intention to revise rules or regulations concerning Hyde and understands it is not her place to change law. I therefore have decided to vote in favor of her nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

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

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise in support of confirming Shalanda Young as the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. The OMB urgently needs Senate-confirmed leaders, and Ms. Young is exceptionally qualified for this role. Her budget experience and extensive record of bipartisan accomplishments will help the OMB needs to guide our Nation through the current pandemic and through the current economic crisis.

During her 14 years as a senior staff member for the House Appropriations Committee, Ms. Young developed a deep understanding of the budget process and government operations, and she has been instrumental in negotiating bipartisan agreements on many critical issues.

She is a proven leader who is ready to get to work at the OMB, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her confirmation.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON YOUNG NOMINATION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

All postcloture time is expired.

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

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Baldwin  Grasseys  Onsoff
Bennet  Hassan  Padilla
Bingamon  Heurich  Peters
BHO  Hickenlooper  Reed
Booher  Hirono  Rosen
Brown  Hoeven  Sanders
Burr  Hyde-Smith  Schatz
Cantwell  Kaine  Schumer
Carson  Kelly  Shaheen
Carper  Kennedy  Shelby
Casey  King  Sinema
Caucas  Kihuen  Simon
Collins  Leahy  Stabenow
Collins  Cortez Masto  Sullivan
Cramer  Marked  Tester
Duckworth  Menendez  Warner
Durbin  Merkley  Whitehouse
Feinstein  Murkowski  Wyden
Gillibrand  Murphy  Wyden
Graham  Murray  Wyden

NAYS—37

Barrasso  Hawley  Rounds
Blackburn  Hufeld  Rubio
Boozman  Johnson  Sasse
Carmody  Lankford  Scott (FL)
Capito  Lee  Scott (SC)
Cory  Lummus  Thune
Cornyn  Marshall  Tillis
Crapo  McConnell  Toomey
Cruz  Moran  Tuohy
Daines  Paul  Tuberville
Ernst  Portman  Wicker
Risch  Romney  Young

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.
The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOSURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Vivek Hallegere Murthy, of Florida, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of four years.


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 Vivek Hallegere Murthy, of Florida, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of four years, 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.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Baldwin
Benner
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carter
Casey
 Cassidy
Collins
Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Feinstein
Gillibrand
Hassan
Heinrich
Kaine
YEAS—43

Barrasso
Blackburn
Blumenthal
Boozer
Braun
Burk
Capito
Correa
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Ernst
Fischer

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Vivek Hallegere Murthy, of Florida, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of four years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Young nomination, 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.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, today I am proud to join a number of my colleagues to highlight the importance of S. 1, the For the People Act.

The ballot box is the pulsating heart of our government of, by, and for the people.

President Lyndon B. Johnson said: "The vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice."

Think about that—"the most powerful instrument ever devised for breaking down injustice." It is Robert Kennedy who observed that "each citizen's right to vote is fundamental to all the other rights of citizenship."

You know, the opportunity to cast a ballot is not just an opportunity. It is not simply a responsibility. But it is a right—the right—that embodies all it means to be a republic in which power flows from the people. Our Nation, however imperfect in the beginning, has worked toward this vision of citizens through the ballot box, driving the vision of our Nation, for over 200 years, overcoming barrier after barrier. We overcame some of the barriers of race with the 14th and 15th Amendments. We overcame the barriers of gender with the 19th Amendment. We overcame barriers that had denied Native Americans the right to vote with the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924. We overcame barriers with sturdy, clear ideals and excellent ideas and grit and determination. So this bill says we will have an independent commission in each State to draw the boundaries of the districts so that you have an end to partisanship gerrymandering.

This bill says that government of, by, and for the people means you can't have a stadium sound system turned up to full volume, drowning out the voice of people. And if you have money, sound system? It is the dark money, hundreds of millions of dollars of unidentified funds racing and coursing through our elections across this country, doing attack ads, with citizens having no idea where that funding is coming from. That is simply wrong.

This bill says that public servants should work in the public interest, not to line their own pockets, not to serve simply the wealthy or the powerful or the privileged.

These points are straightforward. We have been fighting to improve and guarantee the vision of government of, by, and for the people over our entire history. Now, to protect our system of voting, the foundation of our Republic, we have to get this bill over the finish line. We have an extraordinary team working to make that happen, Senators with sturdy, clear ideals and excellent ideas and grit and determination coming together to save our Republic. Senator Kyrsten Sinema, who will be speaking next—author of several of the key provisions of this bill, including bipartisan provisions—who tomorrow will be chairing the first-ever Senate hearing on this landmark legislation, Senator Padilla, who knows exactly what it is like to be a secretary of state and has been an amazing champion for voter empowerment in his home State; Senator Van Hollen, who authored the DISCLOSE Act portion of the bill and is a tremendous leader on campaign finance reform.
Today, our Nation is at a crossroads. Are we going to be a nation for “we the people,” or are we going to be a nation for “we the powerful”?

We must pass the For the People Act to save our democracy. As our leader said last week, “Failure is not an option.” So let’s get it done, and let’s do it right, as noted by Senator MERKLEY, and so many others have proposed over the years. But it will make it easier to vote, end the dominance of big money in elections, and ensure that public officials work for the public interest.

This bill will, in short, make it easier to vote, not harder to vote, as, sadly, some of our colleagues have proposed over the years. It will make it easier to vote, end the dominance of big money in elections, and ensure that public officials work for the public interest.

And it includes provisions, as Senator MERKLEY noted, from 15 bills that I lead to strengthen our democracy.

I appreciate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—who have championed and supported these commonsense policies that so many of us worked on, including Senator LANKFORD and Senator BURR. Those are in this bill.

These are reforms that have broad support among the American people. According to a Pew Research Center poll, 65 percent of respondents said the option to vote early, in this bill, or absentee, in this bill, should be available to any voter. And a poll from the Campaign Legal Center found that 83 percent of likely voters support public disclosure of contributions to organizations involved in elections. Of course, they do. People want to know who is paying for these ads they see on TV.

They want to know where the money is from and then they can follow the money. Many of the provisions in the bill have already been adopted across the country in red, blue, and purple States. And Republican and Democratic election officials and Governors have supported them.

As the chair of the Senate Rules Committee, the committee with jurisdiction over elections and campaign finance law and the committee to which this bill has been referred, I believe we must get this done. Tomorrow, as noted by Senator MERKLEY, we will be holding a hearing on the bill. I plan to press the single Democrat Member of this committee to be a cosponsor of the bill. I intend to move quickly to a markup to send the bill to the Senate floor for a vote.

The For the People Act is critically important. It is important because it would improve our democracy by protecting voting rights, getting dark money out of our elections, and putting in place anti-corruption reforms. It is important because every one of the things that we want to get done, from reforming our economy to fixing our immigration system, to investing in infrastructure, to tackling the climate crisis, to reforming our criminal justice system, they all depend on a democracy that works for the people.

According to a Pew Research Center poll, 65 percent of likely voters support public disclosure of contributions to organizations involved in elections. Twenty-one States have same-day voting, requiring all States to allow early in-person voting. Forty-three States have early voting. Just last month, Kentucky’s Republican secretary of state praised a State bill that would make early in-person voting permanent.

Certainly, we need to ban purges of voting rolls. As my friend Stacey Abrams said: If you don’t go to a meeting every year, you don’t lose your right to assemble under the Constitution. If you don’t go to church or synagogue or mosque or temple, you don’t lose your right to worship. So if you haven’t voted for a few elections and you decide you want to vote because you care about a candidate or an issue, you should not lose your right to vote.

This is the day our democracy picks itself up, brushes off the dust, and does what America always does: goes forward as a nation, under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

For decades, there have been those who have been trying to chip away at the fundamental right to vote. We can’t just keep taking it. We have to ensure that right to vote.

What is this about? One, making it easier to vote. That is exactly what the For the People Act does. It includes provisions that I have championed and so many others have, like automatic voting registration, ending purges of voters, and ensuring that new voting laws are not a means to make it harder to vote.

These are commonsense policies that were already in place in many States in the 2020 general election. Forty-five States didn’t require an excuse to vote by mail. This will ensure that in every State, you don’t need to make an excuse. Twenty-one States have same-day registration, including States like Idaho, Wyoming, and Iowa. Forty-three States have early voting. Just last month, Kentucky’s Republican secretary of state praised a State bill that would make early in-person voting permanent.

We must pass the For the People Act. It also tightens regulations on super PACs and restructures the Federal Election Commission to make it more transparent to campaign spending so that voters are informed about who is funding candidates and who is paying for ads. It also tightens regulations on super PACs and restructures the Federal Election Commission to make it more transparent to campaign spending so that voters are informed about who is funding candidates and who is paying for ads.
The For the People Act is restoring trust in our government. Democracy isn’t just about what happens on election day; it is also about making sure elected officials are accountable once they take office. The For the People Act ensures that Members of Congress and other Federal officials are truly working for the people. It expands conflict of interest laws, prohibits Members of Congress from serving on the boards of for-profit entities, and codifies ethics rules for the executive branch.

More importantly, why does the highest Court in the land not have any ethical rules for the Supreme Court when every other Federal court in the Nation does? This bill answers that question.

Three simple ideas: Making voting easier, getting big money out of politics, and strengthening ethics rules.

The year 2020 marked the 100th anniversary of the ratification of the 19th Amendment, which granted women the right to vote. A century after that ratification, we elected our first African American, first Asian American, and first woman Vice President in Vice President Kamala Harris. As we celebrate these firsts, we are reminded that throughout our country’s history, the right to vote has been hard-fought and hard-won.

As Congressman John Lewis, whom we sadly lost, once said:

“Your vote is precious, almost sacred. It is the most powerful nonviolent tool we have to create a more perfect union.

When we reflect on the sacrifices and strides that have been made for the right to vote, one thing is very clear: the fight isn’t over. The best way we can honor the countless Americans who have risked and, in some cases, given their lives—given their lives to protect our freedoms overseas, given their lives to protect our democracy here at home—the best way is to make sure this continues unabated and that everyone has the right to vote because we know, as Senator Warnock reminded us, that there are some people who are trying to make it hard for some people to vote. That is not how America works.

The For the People Act is all about making sure America works for everyone.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I see we are joined by two Senators who are going to be speaking, Senator Padilla—three Senators—from California, as well as Senator Whitehouse from Rhode Island and Senator Van Hollen from Maryland.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to speak today on the For the People Act.

But before I do, I want to take a moment to honor the lives of those tragically lost in Colorado yesterday by yet another senseless mass shooting in our country. My heart breaks for their families, but the sobering and harsh reality is that in many parts of the United States, it is easier to buy a gun than to vote by mail. In 25 States, voter registration records have specific forms of identification in order to cast a ballot, but those same States allow people to buy rifles without permits and require no bond checks for some sales. Think about that. It seems that the mistakes of the past are not entirely backward when it comes to making it easier to buy a weapon than we do to cast a ballot.

As we work to rebuild our economy for all people, we must acknowledge that to build an inclusive economy, we need an inclusive democracy. Just as the pandemic has put a spotlight on the inequities in our economy and our healthcare systems, so, too, has the pandemic put a spotlight on the inequities in our elections. The 2020 election, held in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, demonstrated once again that we have made it easier for some citizens to vote than others. This is not an accident.

Depending on where a voter lives, they may or may not have the ability to register to vote online; they may or may not be able to participate in same-day registration; they may or may not be able to vote early or vote by mail.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleagues who have gathered here on the floor to help pass and urge the passage of this very important piece of legislation, the For the People Act.

Our Constitution begins with three words that ring in the minds of each and every American, “We the People.”

Seventy-six years after those words were written, President Lincoln resolved, in 1863, that those who had lost their lives on the battlefield at Gettysburg shall not have died in vain and that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the Earth.”

One hundred two years after Gettysburg, our beloved former colleague, Congressman John Lewis—their civil rights activist and leader—together with nonviolent marchers, was beaten bloody by Alabama State Troopers in 1965 as they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge while demanding voting rights.

Later that year in 1965, Congress acted to pass the Voting Rights Act, and it was reauthorized regularly thereafter, most recently in 2006 by a vote of 90 to 0 here in the U.S. Senate.

The For the People Act presents an opportunity for us to establish a baseline of voting rights and ballot access for all voters. I know that the For the People Act will improve voting rights in America because, as California’s Secretary of State, I helped adopt and implement the best practices. These include automatic and same-day voter registration; online voter registration; expanded access to vote-by-mail; extended early voting periods—in-person early voting periods; and widespread, convenient access practices. These include the denial of vote-by-mail or early voting options as well.

The election reforms within the For the People Act are not partisan. These reforms are not Democrat or Republican. They are common sense and are proven to work. All voters deserve equal voting rights and equal access to the ballot.

Colleagues, we are a stronger democracy and a better nation when we hear all voices from all corners of our Nation and when those voices are not just heard but counted. By passing the For the People Act, we can ensure that more voices are heard and more voices are, indeed, counted.

I yield the floor.
and 390 to 33 in the House, where I served at that time.

Then, in 2013, in the case of Shelby County v. Holder, the Supreme Court, in a notorious 5-to-4 decision, stripped away a key enforcement provision from the Voting Rights Act. The requirement that the Department of Justice approve changes to voting rights laws in States that had histories of discriminating against African-American voters was nullified by their past laws.

Almost immediately, like within 24 hours, you saw States that had been covered by that act begin to move to erect barriers to the ballot box, making it more difficult for people of color to vote. I led, with the assistance of the North Carolina State Conference of the NAACP v. McCrory, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit said that the voting provisions passed by the North Carolina legislature, in the aftermath of the Supreme Court’s decision, were in violation of the Voting Rights Act, were designed to “target African-Americans with almost surgical precision.”

Now we come to 2021. On January 6, we witnessed a violent mob, incited by the former President of the United States, attack this Capitol in order to overturn the results of a democratic election. The mob came because of the big lie—the big lie told by Donald Trump and fueled by some of his allies here on Capitol Hill—that he had been cheated out of an election victory. It is a pernicious and insidious lie that has caused Republican State legislatures across the country to try to build up barriers to voting—limiting vote-by-mail, reducing the number of days for early voting, even making it illegal in Georgia for anyone to provide water to someone who is waiting in line to vote—a real provision that has already passed the Georgia House and is on its way to the Senate. These are all measures designed to make it harder for American citizens to exercise their right to vote.

We needed the For the People Act before January 6, but we need it more than ever now to establish some minimum national standards to ensure that every American’s right to vote is secure.

In addition to the barriers being erected around the country to voting, our democracy faces another real and present danger: the flood of cash from Big Money and special interests—inflating the airwaves and invading the internet—that seeks to drown out the voice of the people of this country to stop the For the People Act. We have a duty to every patriotic American who has worked hard—and the many who have spilled blood—for the right to vote. We have a duty to pass the For the People Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I pick up where Senator VAN HOLLEN left off because, when he was fighting for the DISCLOSE Act in the House, I was the manager of that bill on the floor here in the Senate.

It would do something very simple. If you are spending more than $10,000 in a race, we ought to know who you are. That is pretty easy. It is not going to be a huge burden on lots of small donors. It will get the big interests who are out there trying to control our democracy and hide who they are while they are doing it.

As Senator VAN HOLLEN said, this started with Citizens United—a wretched decision that unleashed unlimited money into our politics, but it said that the unlimited interest money was going to be transparent. That was its predicate: It is going to be transparent. You won’t have corruption because everybody will be able to see. The ad will say: We are ExxonMobil, and we paid for this message. Well, of course, the dark money forces, in having achieved that victory at the Supreme Court, went right out and violated that predicate—right out. They have built an entire architecture of deception around their campaign finances since then. It is the shell companies that don’t have to report their donors. It is the donor-advised trusts that are money identity laundering devices for big donors. It is even as simple as phony-baloney shell corporations. Sometimes they are stacked up, and the money goes to the phoney-baloney shell corporation. The shell corporation launderers it through DonorsTrust, and DonorsTrust gives it to the next 501(c) or a super PAC. They all know it is going on. This is orchestrated stuff.

So we have a real battle on our hands. We passed the billion-dollar-in-dark-money threshold a long time ago. When people are spending $1 billion in dark money to influence what goes on in this country, you can bet they are winning. You can bet they are winning. They wouldn’t keep spending money by the billions if they were not winning. So we have to put a stop to this.

The American people are with us. The polling is unbelievable. It is in the nineties. Whether you are a Bernie Bro or a tea partier, you hate the idea that there is big dark money in politics calling the tune for Congress to dance to, but that is the fact. Look at the outcomes.

Look at climate change. There is no dispute about the science. We all know what needs to be done, but one big special interest—the fossil fuel industry, has shut down one political party. My strong bet is, if you looked at all of the dark money funding the Republican Party in Congress, you would find that it is 80 percent the fossil fuel industry. They have become the political wing of the fossil fuel industry, and they specialize in fake climate denial for that reason, and it is going to cost us. The lost decade on climate is going to cost us.

So dark money is not just a plague to the integrity of American democracy; it is a plague that harms our ability to deal with the other problems that are coming our way—wherever there is a big special interest that can play the game of hiding the money and moving it around.

Let me say one last thing.

Dark money? Not really. It is not dark to the candidate who is the beneficiary. When a big dark money donor sets up a shell corporation and gives it a couple of million dollars and then has that shell corporation launder the money through DonorsTrust and then has that money go into a super PAC to be spent for a particular candidate or against his opponent, do you think they don’t find out the candidate know what they did and why? The only people who are in on the joke are the American people, and we have got to put an end to this.

Democracy behind masks isn’t democracy at all. Let’s get rid of this stuff. The American public will be with us. It will provide health and hygiene to our democracy again, and we will start to see results for the American people in a way that the dark money has prevented.

I thank Senator MERKLEY for leading us in this enterprise. This is a public service. This is why we came here. This
is the democracy that needs defending, and, by God, we are going to defend it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am happy to join in this block of time in which Members are coming forward to talk about the For the People Act.

I thank Senator MERKLEY for being our leader and inspiration in many aspects of this and Chair AMY KLOBUCAR from the Rules Committee, who will have the honor of bringing this matter before our committee for debate and discussion.

Tomorrow is going to mark 11 weeks since we sat in this Chamber late into the night and debated the certification of the electoral college vote of the November 3 election. It was an experience none of us will ever forget.

Hours before we were told to rush out of this Chamber as quickly as possible because the insurrectionist mob was just a few feet away, we had been told they would come and they gave us this place safe for us. We were to sit at our chairs and gather our staffs along the walls. You will be safe. You will be just fine. Ten minutes later, they said: Run as fast as you can. It was an experience that none of us will ever forget.

We had been rushed out of the Chamber as this mob attacked the Capitol in an effort to stop us from fulfilling our constitutional duty in recognizing Joe Biden as the President of the United States. If that were in a novel 20 years ago, I would have said: It is preposterous. It will never happen in America, and many of them marched on this Capitol.

But I saw it. I lived it. Many of us did.

This mob had been fueled by weeks of lies, disinformation, and baseless allegations of fraudulent votes and a stolen election.

I couldn’t get over that, yesterday, a lawyer named Sidney Powell, who was the big defender of the big lie, said: Do you mean people actually believed me? How could they possibly believe me?

Well, that is how far it has come. The preposterous statements being made by the pro-Trump forces about stealing the election are now so laughable that people are trying to escape legal liability by saying: Surely, you didn’t take that that seriously.

We saw a whole lot of people did across America, and many of them marched on this Capitol.

Despite this horrific attack on the Capitol and our democracy, some of our colleagues, to amplify these wild claims, they continue to object to the electoral vote count and claim that Congress needed to do more to assure voters that the 2020 election was legitimate.

A few of those colleagues even proposed a sham Commission to audit the election. They were relying on an 1876 precedent that was responsible for the end of Reconstruction and the beginning of the Jim Crow era, a precedent that established rank discrimination against African Americans for decades and invited brutal voter suppression efforts that sadly, amazingly, we are still fighting today.

Here is the reality: If those colleagues were serious about protecting democracy, they would be standing on the floor with us right now. They would have stayed in their seats when the electoral college vote was certified. They wouldn’t have spent weeks challenging results of an election that their chosen candidate actually lost, and they would be on the floor with us, as I said, in support of the For the People Act.

Anyone who truly believes that we need to strengthen the integrity of our elections and democratic process should be cosponsoring this bill.

The For the People Act ensures that all eligible Americans can cast a ballot without these dangerous barriers that suppress the vote.

In 1890, there was established something called the Mississippi Plan. The Mississippi Plan was State legislation carefully crafted to make certain that African Americans didn’t have the right to vote.

Other States looked at it carefully and said: This is the answer. Literacy tests, poll taxes, every obstacle they could dream of became part of the Mississippi Plan, with the express purpose of disenfranchising African Americans recently emancipated.

That plan, unfortunately, lived out its days for decades and performed as expected, suppressed the vote. Again, we face this kind of challenge.

The bill that we are talking about here invests in election infrastructure and provides State and local officials with the resources they need for safe and secure elections.

The bill reforms a broken campaign finance system that elevates the voices of wealthy donors today and special interests, and it strengthens and enhances ethics and transparency requirements.

I am proud to be here today because this bill also includes the Fair Elections Now Act. I have introduced this every year since 2007. And occasionally, just occasionally, I would get a Republican cosponsor.

The idea behind it is simple: public financing of campaigns, a voluntary, small-donor public financing system for Senate candidates who agree to raise small-dollar contributions, not big money.

The fair elections public financing system would elevate the views and interests of a diverse spectrum of Americans rather than just the wealthy.

I am lucky to have a House sponsor, JOHN SARBANES. His father and I served in the Senate together, and he really has done a remarkable job promoting the bill in the House.

We would pay for these campaigns, public financing, without spending a dime of taxpayers’ dollars. It would be financed with assessments on wealthy bad actors and industry lawbreakers.

Voluntary, small-donor public financing of congressional campaigns would mean more candidates with more ideas and a Congress that works for more than just the top 1 percent in America.

I thank Senator MERKLEY for, once again, including this act in the bill, and, again, I thank Congressman SARBANES for his leadership in the House.

The Fair Elections Now Act is just one of the many critical reforms in this bill that will empower voters and combat corruption.

After months of the former President and his allies undermining faith in our electoral system with their unjustified claims, we must take immediate, concrete steps to repair our battered democracy.

I urge all my colleagues to join in this mission and support the For the People Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues who have come to the floor to speak so powerfully to the essential task of defending the ballot box, of stripping dark money out of our elections, of honoring the vision of equal representation by ending the practice of gerrymandering across this country.

Senior KLOBUCAR, who chairs the Rules Committee, the host and direct the committee hearing, the first ever for S. 1, For the People Act, made a powerful representation of how vote-by-mail gives every citizen a full opportunity to participate in elections without the manipulations that can occur on election day, when different people who do not want you to have access to a ballot can put all kinds of hurdles and obstacles in your way.

Senator VAN HOLLEN, who authored the DISCLOSE Act in the House, reported the DISCLOSE Act in the Senate, noted that there is a scheme of 501(c)(3) corporations and donor advice trusts and phony-baloney shell corporations, as he put it, all working to secure power to the powerful by manipulating the elections now exceeds $1 billion.

And Senator DURBIN, who has championed year after year after year the Fair Elections Now Act, presenting a powerful remedy for the role of Big Money donations in our campaigns through public financing—public financing, not with government funds.
but with funds that come from corporate malfeasance.

So I appreciate so much these colleagues who have been all involved in so many different ways in this battle to save our Republic.

There is an army of a powerful force seeking to manipulate the election process to their favor, and it is one of many tools that that powerful group brings to bear. There are the dozens of lawyers who work night and day, being paid from millions or dollars an hour, to secure power for the powerful. There are the public media campaigns that take tens of millions of dollars to frame issues to try to persuade Americans of their particular viewpoint or to drive a wedge between different groups of Americans. There is that dark money. There are those efforts in State legislatures to block the vote.

I want to just close by reminding us all that the Constitution clearly states that elections for Senators and House Members of Congress—has the ability to pass laws to make sure those elections are fair across this country because every American of any State has a clear stake in the legitimacy of the elections in other States because it is the collective voice here that makes decisions. So this is not only a responsibility provided to us, it is a responsibility that we must fulfill to defend the ballot box, to end gerrymandering violating equal representation, and clear that dark money pollutants are corrupting our campaign, out of the system forevermore.

Let’s get this essential bill, this essential defense of the pulsating heart of our democracy, the ballot box—let’s get this bill passed.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am an unabashed optimist. I am a glass-half-full not a glass-half-empty kind of guy, and I tell my staff that I am like the little boy who goes down on Christmas morning and finds a pile of manure and wonders where my pony is. That is how much of an optimist I am.

So I am optimistic about our progress made in the war against COVID-19 after this long year that we have all endured. So far, a quarter of Americans over the age of 18 have received at least one dose of the vaccine. More than two-thirds of people over 65 have gotten their first shot. In my State, they have recently said every body will get a shot by the end of the year. Very soon, any adult person over the age of 16 will be eligible to get the vaccine. That translates into good news across the board. New cases, deaths, and hospitalizations are all declining. Over the last week, the 7-day positivity rate in Texas dropped to the lowest point since last May.

While we continue to follow the public health guidance, and the well-being of the patient is the top priority, it is clear we are moving closer and closer to an eventual end of this pandemic, and there are a million reasons to be optimistic.

Despite the narrative pushed by some, all of this is not the result of the last couple of months, and it certainly is not the result of the partisan bill that was passed just 2 weeks ago. These efforts have been underway for more than a year now, and we owe a great deal of credit to Operation Warp Speed, the initiative set up by the Trump administration to accelerate the development of vaccines, treatments, and therapeutics.

Last summer, when President Trump speculated there would be an effective vaccine by the end of the year, he received some serious blowback. One media outlet published a fact check saying it would require nothing short of a “medical miracle.” Well, thanks to the leadership of the previous administration, the collaboration of scientists, pharmaceutical companies, and others, that so-called miracle has come true not just once but twice. Both the Pfizer and Moderna vaccines received emergency authorization last year, and Johnson & Johnson vaccine was authorized last month.

Rather than setting ambitious goals to bring an end to the pandemic, the Biden administration has embraced a different approach. An Associated Press headline in January evaluated the situation pretty well when it said that Biden’s early approach is to “underpromise” and “overdeliver.”

Well, in December, President-Elect Biden announced his administration’s vaccine goal: 100 million shots in the first hundred days. That announcement came about a week before the first doses of the vaccine were distributed, before we had a real-world test of the processes that had been in the planning stages for months. But it quickly became obvious that we were on a pace to meet that goal before President Biden even took the oath of office on January 20. The week of the inauguration, we averaged 1 million shots a day. On January 30, we received the vaccine. One physician and public health expert described the President’s goal as a “disappointingly low bar.” To no one’s surprise, the administration met that goal well ahead of the deadline.

Last week, the President claimed a victory for hitting 100 million vaccines in 58 days. Well, so did he follow up with a new goal, a truly ambitious one that would get us shots in arms even faster? Did he set up a new benchmark to encourage States to make their vaccination efforts more efficient and effective? Well, not yet. Maybe he will. Maybe he will announce a new goal this week. For the sake of our country, I hope he sets the bar high.

Given the fact that we are now vaccinating about 2.5 million Americans per day—a staggering number, really—it is time for the administration to take a truly bold step. The goal he set to reach a target you are almost certain to meet. After all, you didn’t see the previous administration set a target of a successful vaccine by the summer of 2021, which is what many experts believed at the time.

Unfortunately, the underpromise, overdeliver strategy doesn’t end with vaccinations. Just look at the President’s latest comments about small outdoor gatherings. In the same speech where he tried to take a victory lap for the “disappointingly low bar” set for vaccinations, he made a rather confounding promise to the American people.

He said:

If we keep our guard up, stick together, and stick with the science, we can look forward to the Fourth of July—a little bit more normal with small groups able to gather for cookouts in backyards.

Well, that was a little bit of a head-scratcher, when President Biden said that he anticipated everybody who wanted the vaccine could get it by May, and now he is talking about having outdoor gatherings on the Fourth of July.

I can tell you, these small outdoor gatherings have been a part of many Texans’ routines for almost all year now. Families and friends have spent time in driveways, backyards, open-air spaces, parks. They follow the public health guidelines to keep themselves and their loved ones safe, while managing some sense of normalcy.

The Centers for Disease Control has said it is safe for fully vaccinated individuals to gather not just outdoors but indoors as well. But based on the President’s remarks last week, he is trying to frame these gatherings as a reward if things go well over the next few months. If you do everything right, then you might be able to hang out with your family in the backyard in 3 months. Well, the administration’s own Centers for Disease Control has already told us that these gatherings are safe. Your current public health guidelines can’t also double as a goal for 3½ months from now.

Then there is another big inconsistency between what the experts are telling us and what the administration is doing, and that has to do with reopening schools. Some children have now hit the anniversary mark of virtual learning. Studies have shown consistently that this is having a huge negative impact on America’s kids academically, mentally, socially, and emotionally.

We need our schools to reopen, and, of course, we need that to happen safely, which they can. But in December, the President told us that he wanted to share that goal. He promised to safely reopen the majority of schools within his first hundred days in the White
The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention published a report in January that said:

There has been little evidence that schools have contributed meaningfully to increased community transmission.

In short, the schools are not a breeding ground for COVID-19, and as long as proper precautions are taken, school can reopen safely. In fact, it has already happened across most of Texas. Nearly two-thirds of Texas schools are fully in-person, and just 3 percent of districts are still fully remote. Two-thirds are fully reopened, and 3 percent are fully remote.

Unfortunately, in this case, the science is at odds with a key supporter of our Democratic colleagues, and that is the teachers unions. For months, teachers unions have fought a safe return and been inconsistent, even though the experts and real-world evidence tell us that it is safe. It has gone so far that they have now gotten into some pretty sticky situations.

A leaked post from a private Facebook group for the Los Angeles teachers union warned teachers not to post pictures of their spring break photos because it makes it difficult to argue that it is unsafe to return to school. Well, it is tough to tell parents that we need to close down the schools for their kids to go to school and then turn around and tell teachers it is fine to go on vacation; just don’t post pictures. Trusting science and listening to the experts means doing so all the time, not just when it is convenient or politically expedient.

We are seeing progress every day in our fight against COVID-19. That is the light at the end of the tunnel that is getting bigger and brighter, and the question is: ‘When will we get there?’ So, when? How quickly can we get more vaccines into arms? When will our children—all our children—return safely to the classroom? How long until families can hug one another without fear of spreading the virus to someone they love?

We all know this is a community effort. It is a team effort. It is a personal responsibility effort. Each of us has a role to play in stopping the spread of the virus. But leadership matters too.

The goals and benchmarks set by the administration will determine how quickly all of these things can happen. Now is not the time to walk back goals, set low bars, or bow to unions and political supporters. The administration needs a plan set by the experts—nothing less.

So we are getting close to safely crossing the finish line, and we shouldn’t let politics or any other consideration slow us down.

I yield the floor.

I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 238

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, at a moment, I am going to propound a unanimous consent request. But before I do so, I want to make some brief observations.

Earlier this month, Democrats passed their extreme partisan reconciliation bill—a bill that President Biden signed into law. When the Senate was considering the bill, I introduced an amendment to ensure that illegal aliens would not receive the $1,400 taxpayer stimulus payments provided in the bill. Every Democrat in this body voted against that amendment. It failed by a single vote. If even one Senate Democrat had voted for that amendment, it would have passed.

At the time, Senator DURBIN incorrectly told us that no illegal aliens would receive stimulus checks under this bill. It was clear then, and it is even more clear now, that that statement was very much in error, as even Senator DURBIN has admitted.

I would suggest that the last point I want to make is that not just one but 100 Democratic colleagues a chance for a do-over, once it became clear that there was a very substantial number of illegal aliens who would be receiving these checks. Unfortunately, the Democrats objected again and put themselves on record that they are just fine with millions of illegal immigrants getting taxpayer stimulus checks.

There has been some debate as to the exact number, but, just this week, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities released an economic report that catalogued that we are indeed talking about millions of illegal immigrants who are receiving these checks.

At the same time we were debating this partisan reconciliation bill, the Senate considered another amendment, which I had introduced and Senator CASSIDY had introduced, to prevent the payments from going to criminals currently incarcerated in prison. Again, unfortunately and astonishingly, every single Democrat in this Chamber voted against it. It failed by a single vote. If even one Democrat had demonstrated the common sense to say violent criminals who are currently in prison right now, shouldn’t be getting $1,400 taxpayer stimulus checks, that amendment would have passed. But every Democrat lined up in a party-line partisan vote to say no.

Today, I am going to give Democrats another chance at a do-over to recognize that that extreme position is a position, frankly, none of us could go home and explain to our constituents without being laughed at, even in the bluest of States. And I am going to give an opportunity in this instance for Democrats to vote on stopping the funds going to criminals currently incarcerated and sending those funds instead to the Crime Victims Fund, a program that is run by the Department of Justice to compensate victims of crime.

So this is a choice the Democrats have: Do you want $1,400 checks going to criminals in prison, or do you want instead to direct those funds to the victims of crime that have suffered at the hands of those criminals?

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 238, introduced earlier today. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, just two quick points. First, this is not really about prisoners. This is about disrupting payments to families all across the country who need the money to make rent and pay for groceries.

Here is why. The IRS administers the taxpayer stimulus for millions and millions of Americans. The Cruz amendment has the practical effect of keeping these folks who are hurting from getting that check that they are going to use to pay for essentials. That is because their check would be on hold while the IRS sets up the system envisioned by this amendment.

Now, I guess that is what my colleague from Texas wants. After all, he opposed the bill. He opposed these payments from the get-go. So if he passes this amendment, he gets what he wants, but for all those folks who are hurting, their checks are on hold.

The last point I want to make is that it wasn’t always this way for Republicans and our colleague from Texas. Republicans were for these payments before they were against them. They voted for two rounds of relief checks going out to all the people who are being discussed here when they controlled the White House and the Senate.

Senator Cruz voted for the CARES Act. It passed unanimously. There were 44 Republicans for the December relief bill, with no exception like the Senator from Texas want. His system was so happy with the checks going to prisoners that he put his name on them. The only difference between the CARES Act relief checks that Republicans unanimously supported and America Rescue Plan relief checks is the party in the White House.

Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.
The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon, I guess, demonstrates the principle that hypocrisy is the tribute that vice pays to virtue, because the Senator from Oregon suggests that somehow payments to people who are not criminals will be delayed if we don’t pay criminals in prison. That claim, on the face of it, is absurd.

The Federal prisons are administered by the Bureau of Prisons. Government may not be good at everything, but I feel quite confident that the Federal Government can produce a list of currently incarcerated prisoners. I know the States can.

The IRS, likewise, is perfectly capable of recognizing whether it is mailing checks to prisoners in prison. This is not whether you have ever been convicted of a crime. It is, Are you sending the checks to Sing Sing? If so, don't send it.

The claim that somehow Joe Six-Pack at home is not getting his check because we don’t want to send checks to prisoners is demonstrably untrue.

The Senator from Oregon also claims Republicans oppose stimulus checks when he knows that is simply not the case. As he noted, this body overwhelmingly passed bipartisan COVID relief five times last year. It is only when Senate Democrats took the majority that bipartisan legislation ended because Democrats decided to push a hard partisan bill instead.

A clean bill providing relief checks would have passed with an overwhelming bipartisan majority in this body, and the Senator from Oregon knows that.

We have now discovered, though, that given a straight-up choice between sending checks to criminals in prison versus sending checks to the victims of crime, Senate Democrats stand for the criminals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, you know, it could be hard in these partisan days to know what the truth is. Both sides yell at each other. They insult each other. It is hard to know who is telling the truth.

I ask the folks at home who are listening to this debate to exercise a little bit of common sense. The Senator from Oregon just told you the Federal Government has no idea who are murderers currently in prison. I want to suggest that doesn’t make any sense.

I feel quite confident the Department of Justice could produce a list of currently incarcerated murderers in Federal prisons within 24 hours. I am absolutely certain the State of Texas could produce that list. I am confident the State of Connecticut could produce the list of the murderers currently incarcerated in Connecticut prisons. I am even confident the State of Oregon could produce a list of the murderers convicted of homicide currently incarcerated in the State of Oregon.

The claim that we don’t know who the murderers are who are in our prisons serving time for murder—it doesn’t pass the laugh test.

The first unanimous consent request I put before this body today. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I am going to suggest an even narrower situation. Perhaps we can’t agree on victims of crime. How about murderers?

We just had a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee on gun violence. We saw a horrific mass murder in Colorado. Can’t we agree that murderers shouldn’t get checks—$1,400 stimulus checks—from the taxpayers? Let’s take the money going to murderers and put it in the crime victims task force fund instead.

And so, Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 929, introduced earlier today, I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.
Democrats now say we will send taxpayer stimulus checks to millions of illegal immigrants. We have seen Democrats say we will send the taxpayer stimulus to criminals in prison. We have seen the Democrats say we will send the taxpayer stimulus checks to murderers in prison. We have seen them say we will send the checks to rapists in prison. And we now just saw them say we will send the checks to child molesters in prison.

It should be the essence of common sense to keep this money to violent criminals; give it to victims of crime instead. In a sane world, that would be a hundred-to-nothing proposition.

I challenge any one of you in the brightest of blue States: Go home and explain to your constituents that you refused to take the money from child molesters and give it to the victims of that crime. That is the position of every Democrat in this Chamber because every Democratic Senator was the deciding vote rejecting the amendment on the floor.

It is unfortunate just how extreme the left is right now, but it is far out of touch with the American people, and it has long abandoned any semblance of common sense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, once again, our colleague from Texas is offering an idea that would disrupt the system that would keep millions and millions of Americans who are hurting from getting help in a timely way. He has come back with, essentially, one version after another because he thinks that, somehow, this is the kind of sensational idea that will cause he thinks that, somehow, this is the kind of sensational idea that will cause people to rally to his side.

I believe what he has been proposing—now, I gather, four times—is so disruptive, so unworkable that it is going to hurt the millions of people whom this Congress wanted to help, and that is what the Senator from Texas has sought to do from the very beginning, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, there is an old saying that you don’t learn anything from the second kick of a mule.

The first time the Senator from Oregon said that I sought to disrupt stimulus payments, perhaps he did so because he didn’t know my views on that topic, but he has since been corrected that I voted for stimulus payments to American citizens in the time of economic crisis and didn’t oppose them. So he is now repeatedly stating falsehoods that are far from the truth.

You know, all of us were there when Joe Biden gave his inauguration speech making a call to unity, making a call to healing, and there was a chance we could have done that. On COVID relief, you don’t have to ask theoretically. Last year, when Republicans had control of the Senate, we passed five bipartisan COVID relief bills, coming together with overwhelming bipartisan majorities.

The Democrats decided, when they took control, they didn’t want to do that. You want to know just how far out of touch and how radical today’s Democratic Party is? We have seen the

Democrats now say we will send taxpayer stimulus checks to millions of illegal immigrants. We have seen Democrats say we will send the taxpayer stimulus to criminals in prison. We have seen the Democrats say we will send the taxpayer stimulus checks to murderers in prison. We have seen them say we will send the checks to rapists in prison. And we now just saw them say we will send the checks to child molesters in prison.

It should be the essence of common sense to keep this money to violent criminals; give it to victims of crime instead. In a sane world, that would be a hundred-to-nothing proposition.

I challenge any one of you in the brightest of blue States: Go home and explain to your constituents that you refused to take the money from child molesters and give it to the victims of that crime. That is the position of every Democrat in this Chamber because every Democratic Senator was the deciding vote rejecting the amendment on the floor.

It is unfortunate just how extreme the left is right now, but it is far out of touch with the American people, and it has long abandoned any semblance of common sense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Here is what we are for. We are for making sure that needy people get help to pay for groceries and make rent rather than have one of our colleagues come out with something that is unworkable and disruptive and is going to keep those people from getting help. That is what this debate is all about, something that is unworkable.

I read the direct comment from the IRS with respect to not having the information or getting help to people who are hungry.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon suggested that the concern of the Democrats is to get taxpayer funds to needy people. People currently incarcerated are not needy. The Senator from Oregon said we need to help Americans struggling with rent. You know what? People currently incarcerated pay zero in rent. They don’t have rent costs.

So the argument of the Democrats is: We don’t know who the criminals are who are currently in jail. That does not comport with reality, and any fair-minded person watching this knows that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am sure you have been to Paris. The architect, as you undoubtedly know, who designed the Louvre’s iconic glass pyramid was actually an American. He was an American. His name was I.M. Pei. Mr. Pei emigrated from China to the United States in the 1930s.

By the time he passed at the age of 102, he had designed a number of famous buildings. He had done that all across the world, including the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library.

America is proud of Mr. Pei. He is just one of millions of Asian Americans who talent have helped America continue to be an exceptional nation, a nation made up of exceptional people who take advantage of all of the opportunities that these United States have to offer.

The contributions of individual Asian Americans have helped our country pioneer—and the Presiding Officer knows this—advances in architecture, in medicine, in art, and in technology.

But, more than that, Asian Americans are our friends, and they are our neighbors.

The recent murder of Asian-American women in an evil assault in Atlanta was an assault not just on the Asian community but on the United States of America. President Biden has correctly denounced these attacks, and he is not alone.

I know the Presiding Officer can join me in this. I condemn these evil murders in the strongest possible terms. No one can justify—no one—the brutal theft of eight lives. Every community—every single one—across our country is grieving for the victims and is grieving for the families.

These victims were all made, they were each made, in God’s image, and Americans know that. I also feel the same way about the shooting in Boulder. We all do.

America pioneered government that is based on inalienable rights that God gives each person. God has imbued every man and woman with dignity, and Americans answer that dignity with respect, respect for each individual and the rights to make the most of the manifold opportunities our country offers.

Unfortunately, President Biden’s rhetoric in defense of the Asian-American community is not altogether matched by respect for the right of Asian Americans to reap the reward of their talent and grit.

The Biden administration, thus far—it has time to correct its course—has shown and did show right out of the gate that it discriminate against Asian Americans.

Last year, as the Presiding Officer knows, the Justice Department sued Yale University. The Justice Department contended that Yale rejected many qualified Asian-American applicants on the basis of race—on the basis of race.

The decision by the Justice Department came 2 years after several Asian-American organizations filed a complaint with the Department of Justice
and the Department of Education that accused Yale of what I just described: racial discrimination.

Yet only a few weeks—only a few weeks after President Biden set up shop in the Oval Office, the Department of Justice withdrew its lawsuit based on racial discrimination against Yale University, and that is an actual fact. Watch what we say, not what we do.

Unfortunately, Harvard University also seems determined to discriminate against Asian-American applicants. In 2014, Students for Fair Admissions sued Harvard, claiming that the school was using an application system that intentionally reduces the number of Asian Americans through evaluations that are subjective and potentially racially biased.

You see, Harvard apparently believes it knows how to discriminate in the right way. It believed the same thing a number of years ago when it limited the number of Jewish people who could attend Harvard.

When Harvard considers an applicant, the school doesn’t just look at their grades or their test scores or their academic awards. In fact, the admissions team at Harvard often looks past these objective indicators to a student’s—this is what Harvard calls it—personal ratings, which is an unfair, ridiculous, and a subjective standard.

These personal ratings, as Harvard calls them, supposedly take into account character traits like humor, sensitivity, helpfulness, and courage. For years, Harvard has consistently granted lower personal ratings scores to Asian Americans than it has to other applicants, and that, too, is a fact.

The judge in the Students for Fair Admissions’ lawsuit wrote the following:

> These are the judge’s words, not mine.

> The data demonstrates—

> These are the judge’s words, not mine.

> The data demonstrates a statistically significant and negative relationship between Asian American identity and the personal rating assigned by Harvard admissions officers, holding constant any reasonable set of observable characteristics.

I didn’t say that; the judge in the case did.

Now, I want to be fair. It may look smart or wise for Harvard to look for well-rounded applicants—I get that—but I would think about that these personal ratings are not just subjective; they are subversive. If you think about it, the scores, these scores—they are not objective like test scores or grades or extracurricular activities; these personal ratings are value judgments that can easily be tainted by racial bias. It is clear that the personal ratings minimize the accomplishments of Asian Americans in particular.

Just look at the numbers. Harvard’s admissions scores work like this: They use a scale of 1 to 6. One is the strongest score, or grades, not the extracurricular activities. When it comes to personal ratings, only 17.6 percent of Asian-American applicants receive a score of 5 or 6, whereas 26.5 percent of non-Hispanic Asian Americans do so. For African Americans, that number is 19.01 percent. For Hispanic Americans, it is 12.2 percent. In fact—and these are the numbers—Harvard gives Asian Americans the weakest personal ratings of any ethnic group, bar none.

Harvard admissions officials have reportedly handed out these scores without even interviewing all of the candidates in question—personal ratings without interviewing the applicants. This happens now despite the fact that Asian Americans have the highest grades and test scores. So on the objective criteria—test scores, grades—Asian Americans have the highest scores. What pulls them down? The personal ratings.

Harvard officials admitted in 2013 that if Harvard considered only academic achievement, then proportional Asian-American representation that year would have doubled. Think about that. If Harvard went by the objective criteria—extracurricular activities, grades, test scores—twice as many Asian Americans would have been admitted to the university. Why weren’t they? Because of the personal ratings. They call it “personal” even though many of the applicants are never even interviewed.

The Department of Justice has historically supported the Students for Fair Admissions lawsuit. In 2018, the Justice Department filed a statement of interest in the case. Last year, the Justice Department filed an amicus brief in the case. A Federal judge ruled against the plaintiffs in 2019 in the case. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit upheld that decision last November—despite the fact that the Federal district court judge in the case openly acknowledged that Harvard grants lower personal ratings scores to Asian-American applicants.

The fruits of Harvard’s policy are pretty clear. You don’t have to be Mensa material to figure this out. The Ivy League school has repeatedly rejected highly qualified Asian-American candidates because of their race.

But there is still hope for justice for our Asian-American students. The Supreme Court may well take up this case, and the White House could defend the cause of merit against Harvard’s alleged racial discrimination.

So let me say this as clearly as I can. If President Biden—if the Biden team is committed to fighting racial discrimination against Asian Americans, if President Biden and his team want to lift up Asian Americans, as they say they do, it is not hard to see how counterintuitive it would be for the privileged halls of Harvard—a school that receives Federal dollars—it is not hard to see how supporting that litigation must be part of President Biden’s commitment. So today, with all the respect I can muster, I am calling on President Biden and his Justice Department to support the Asian-American students who have brought their case against Harvard.

Harvard is an extramural school. Nothing I say is meant to denigrate the quality of that great university. But being a pillar of higher education doesn’t mean that Harvard is above the law. If President Biden and his team refuse to join the Justice Department to defend the Asian-American students who have brought their case against Harvard, then we will not see the changes that we need to see.

President Biden should stand up for the rights of Asian Americans to be treated fairly by America’s schools. His Justice Department should support this lawsuit.

To be is to act. All we are is the sum of our actions. Everything else is just conversation. Don’t just talk about supporting Asian Americans; do it. Do it. Please don’t be selective in the reality you choose to accept.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. Tester. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining cloture motions filed during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 18, ripen at 11:30 a.m., tomorrow, Wednesday, March 24.

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

Mr. Tester. Mr. President, I yield back all time and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all postcloture motions have expired.

Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll. The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 43, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**[Rollcall Vote No. 131 Ex.]**
In Vietnam, virtually no family was unscathed. Hundreds of thousands are still missing among the estimated 3 million Vietnamese who died. The majority were civilians, whose families suffered grievous losses and severe hardships as the fighting raged around them. Many of their stories remain untold.

In the decades since, memories of that time have faded and the world’s attention has turned elsewhere. Yet during the Obama administration, since the normalization of relations with Vietnam, there has been a sustained effort by both countries to address some of the worst legacies of the war. By doing so, we have built a new partnership and set an example for other former enemies.

It began in the late 1980s with the first use of the Leavy War Victims Fund by the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, to assist people with severe war-related disabilities that was authorized by President George H. W. Bush, after he and I discussed the need to assist Vietnamese who had been injured during the war. It led to funding by the State Department to locate and destroy unexploded landmines and bombs, which litter the Vietnamese countryside and have maimed and killed tens of thousands of innocent people, including children, since the war ended.

Nearly 15 years ago, those war legacy programs began to address the cruel legacy of Agent Orange, and it is in this that General Vinh and I became acquainted.

Since then, General Vinh has been my principal Vietnamese counterpart in working to address the legacy of dioxin contamination at former U.S. military bases and the needs of Vietnamese with severe physical and cognitive disabilities resulting from exposure to dioxin. I consider him a friend and colleague.

Nearly 15 years ago, those war legacy programs began to address the cruel legacy of Agent Orange, and it is in this that General Vinh and I became acquainted.

From 1961 to 1971, the U.S. Air Force sprayed nearly 19 million gallons of herbicides in Vietnam, of which at least 11 million gallons were Agent Orange, in an effort to defoliate trees and shrubs and kill agricultural crops that were providing cover and food to North Vietnamese soldiers. Decades later, we learned that some of the land where there was contaminated with dioxin, which can cause problems with reproduction, development, and the immune system. Dioxin can disrupt hormones and lead to cancer. It is also a persistent pollutant that can remain in the environment for thousands of years.

Millions of Vietnamese were exposed, and hundreds of thousands suffered severe physical and cognitive disabilities. My wife Marcelle and I have met three generations of Agent Orange victims, from young children to their parents and grandparents. Hundreds of thousands of Americans who served in Vietnam were also exposed, and thousands have been battling cancers for years.

Fortunately, thanks to studies funded by the Ford Foundation, it was possible to identify key “hotspots” with significant contamination, and work closely with General Vinh and USAID, we cleaned up the contaminated soil and sediment at the former U.S. airbase in Da Nang. Seven years and $150 million dollars later, it is once again a busy commercial airport.

In fact, Air Force One landed there in 2017, when President Trump visited Vietnam. That project would not have been possible without the leadership and perseverance of General Nguyen Chi Vinh, and I will never forget visiting the site with him when we formally launched the project in 2014.

Since then, we have moved on to Bien Hoa, on the outskirts of Ho Chi Minh City, the site of the largest U.S. airbase during the war where Agent Orange was stored and loaded onto aircraft. Today, it is a shadow of what it once was, and it is contaminated with dioxin that has been leaching into the nearby Dong Nai River for half a century.

In 2019, General Vinh and I, along with Deputy Prime Minister Truong Hoa Binh and U.S. Ambassador Daniel Kritenbrink, and in the presence of eight other U.S. Senators, inaugurated a joint U.S.-Vietnam project to clean up Bien Hoa, including a U.S. commitment to contribute $300 million over 10 years, half from the U.S. Department of Defense and half from USAID. I had several conversations with Secretary of Defense James Mattis about Bien Hoa, and the Pentagon’s contribution is the result of his recognition that we have a responsibility and a national interest in helping Vietnam address war legacy issues.

At the same time, USAID launched a 5-year, $65 million effort to expand our herbicide and dioxin work in Vietnam, which are being implemented in eight provinces that were sprayed with Agent Orange.

Over more than four decades, the Government of Vietnam has provided essential access and support in locating the remains of hundreds of American MIAs. This year, we are embarking on a $15 million program, jointly funded by the U.S. Department of Defense and USAID, to help the Vietnamese locate some of their own people missing or killed during the war.

Much has been written, and I suspect more will be, about the collaboration between our two countries in addressing the legacies of the Vietnam war. Issues that for years were a cause of anger and resentment are today examples of how two former enemies can work together for the betterment of the people of both countries. These projects opened the door for the United States and Vietnam to cooperate on a wide array of other issues, from climate change and wildlife trafficking, to public health and regional security.
Tens of thousands of Vietnamese students are studying in the United States, and we are supporting institutions of higher education in Vietnam.

This has been possible because of the efforts of many people over many years. Senators John McCain and John Kerry, among many others, have led the charge towards the normalization of relations. By doing so, they set the stage for both countries to build trust based on mutual respect by addressing sensitive war legacy issues, which Ambassadors of both countries have also strongly encouraged.

It is in this that Senior Lieutenant General Nguyen Chi Vinh has built his own legacy. The partnership that has developed from our cooperation on war legacies and which today extends to programs jointly funded and implemented by Vietnam’s Ministry of Defense and the U.S. Department of Defense would not have been possible without General Vinh’s vision, his leadership, and his good will. For that, we owe him our lasting appreciation and respect.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, on Monday, March 15, due to a snowstorm in Denver, I was unable to travel to Washington, D.C. However, I voted in favor of the measure to impose sanctions on Russia, including their transshipment of weapons to Syria.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, on Monday, March 15, due to a snowstorm in Denver, I was unable to travel to Washington, D.C. However, I voted in favor of the measure to impose sanctions on Russia, including their transshipment of weapons to Syria.

REMEMBERING JOSEPH MARTIN ROSE, SR.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Joseph Martin Rose, Sr., Moka’ang Glizis or “Rising Sun” in the Ojibwe language, a beloved elder and member of the Eagle Clan of the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Ojibwe. As a member of the Three Fires Midewiwin Grand Medicine Lodge, Joe was a teacher, culture keeper, pipe carrier, and treasure to his community. His life was one of far too many claimed by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Joe was born on April 24, 1935, to Carl Rose, Sr., and Mary “Dolly” (Jackson) Rose in Oklahoma. When his father volunteered to repair naval ships in Alaska during World War II, his mother brought the family back home to Odanah to live with her parents on the Bad River Native American Reservation. Joe often told stories about growing up in Odanah, calling it a “time of kerosene lamps, outhouses, and wood heat.” He credited his grandfather, Dan Jackson, with instilling in him a strong connection to the natural world by teaching him about traditional plants, ceremonies, and medicines. He spent his youth netting fish in the spring, wild ricing in late summer, duck hunting in fall, then ice fishing and enjoying bonfires in the winter.

He attended DePauw High School in Ashland, where he played nose tackle on the football team, wrestled, and sang in the school choir. His athleticism earned him a scholarship to Northland College, where he majored in biology and secondary education, earning a certification to teach high school science and math. After teaching in South Dakota and Wyoming, coaching youth sports, and two children, taught full time, and earned a master’s degree in guidance counseling before returning to Bad River in 1970.

Back in Wisconsin, he became the homeschool coordinator and guidance counselor at Ashland High School. As an advocate for Bad River children, he taught them Native American arts and crafts and offered courses about culture. In 1974, he was asked to develop the newly formed Native American Studies Program at Northland College, one of the first such programs in America. As its director, he created a culture-based curriculum that emphasized environmental stewardship and the connection of Native people with Lake Superior.

Joe’s experiential learning courses were memorable for the visits to his home on Waverly Beach, birch bark canoes, ceremonial lodges, and a round house built by his students. He helped create the Traditional Ways Gathering, an annual event celebrating Ojibwe culture through teachings, basket making, and flintknapping. He formed a relationship with the recently dedicated David R. Obey Northern Great Lakes Visitor Center in Ashland and curated its exhibits on Lake Superior tribal history and culture.

As a staunch defender of Native American treaty rights, Joe and his son, Joe Dan, were among Lake Superior Ojibwe who exercised their rights to spearfish lakes in the ceded territory. Joe sometimes engaged in demonstrations in opposition to those rights. He later served on the Voigt Intertribal Task Force, which facilitates the cooperative management of shared natural resources in ceded territory.

Joe retired as an associate professor in 2007, although he continued to teach and serve in leadership roles until the end of his life. Even after retirement, Joe continued his activism against environmental degradation. Joe worked to protect Lake Superior, including nuclear waste, oil exploration, garbage incineration, factory farming, and taconite mining in the Penokee Hills. His most recent fight was against the Enbridge Line 5 oil pipeline that crosses the Bad River Reservation, one of his primary issues of concern as a member of the Ashland County Board. One way or another, Joe was a part of virtually every significant environmental and treaty-rights struggle in the region over the past half century.

While soft-spoken, Joe had a voice that proved powerful and deeply resonant. He believed that he had the responsibility to “go out and share this knowledge and wisdom of how to live in harmony and balance with the natural world.” With this ethos and an indomitable faith in grassroots organizing, he never turned down an opportunity to fight for the rights and share his compelling message with others.

Countless people who were fortunate enough to know and learn from Joe Rose, Sr., will keep his memory alive and continue his good work for generations to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE KINDRED HIGH SCHOOL VIKINGS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, my State enjoys many legendary sports rivalries. But make no mistake, it is the Class B Boys High School Basketball Tournament played every March in Ashland, Wisconsin, that makes it the premier sporting event. This year, 108 teams began the basketball season in 16 districts and 8 regions. The 16 district champions met the third weekend of March to compete for the State title.

This week, I stand a little taller as a proud 1979 graduate of Kindred High School. The Kindred Vikings won their first-ever boys basketball State championship title in Minot Saturday night, defeating the Edgeley-Kulm-Montpelier Rebels 40–34. Their 21–4 season was capped with impressive tournament matchups, where the Vikings showcased their agility and skill against some of the best basketball players in the State. In their semi-final victory against Four Winds-Minnewaukan, Kindred’s Matthew Pearson sunk six three-pointers to score 18 points, as Paul Olson scored 10. In their 40–34 championship win over Four Winds-Minnewaukan, Paul Olson scored 23 points, making 8 of 9 shots and 8 rebounds. Paul, Jaiden, and Gavin Keller were the Vikings named to the all-tournament team.

I want to recognize this year’s team members: Brock Woehl, Cole Campbell, Ethan McKenney, Jeremiah Dockter, Matthew Pearson, Jorgen Swenson, Eric Heinrich, Paul Olson, Maxwell McQuillan, Trey Heinrich, Jaiden Peraza, Chase Miller, Gavin Keller, Presley Peraza, and Riley Sunram, along with manager Jack Davis and statisticians Rylie Ranking, Leah Rolstad, and Zoe Sharp.

As a Kindred High School student athlete who lettered 4 years in football, basketball, and track, I realize my high school skills would not qualify me to be the ball boy for this year’s squad. I congratulate the team, as well as Coach Brad Woehl, his assistants Scott Milbrandt, Matt Hagen, and Jimmy Hoy, and the hometown fans on winning this championship. I join the rest...
of North Dakota in thanking the Kindred Vikings for being an inspiration to all of us by demonstrating what can be achieved by combining a passion for excellence with determination and teamwork.

**REMEMBERING ANDY HOFFMAN**

- Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I first met Andy Hoffman at a chili cook off in Butte, NE, in October of 2004. I was running for my first term in the Nebraska Legislature. I was walking from group to group, talking with the cooks and tasting their chili, when I came upon a young man in jean overalls. I introduced myself, and we ended up talking for over 30 minutes.

  Actually, it would be more accurate to say he “grilled” me for over 30 minutes with a smile on his face. He was kind, and he later became a supporter and a dear friend.

  We stayed in touch during my 8 years in the unicameral. Never one to keep strongly held opinions to himself, Andy would call me every now and then to tell me how he felt about bills in the legislature. When I decided to run for U.S. Senate, I asked him to serve as one of my county chairs.

  Andy agreed, but a few weeks later, his son Jack was diagnosed with brain cancer. Jack was just 5 years old at the time.

  Andy and his wife, Bri, had their lives turned upside down. But instead of giving up, they supported Jack every step of the way as he fought cancer. And they started the Team Jack Foundation in his honor, which helps fund pediatric brain cancer research and raise awareness about this terrible disease. Andy spent the years since Jack’s diagnosis traveling the country and appearing on national television, where he spoke about how important this funding is for children like Jack.

  Like most Nebraskans, Jack loves Husker football. In 2013, his favorite player, Rex Burkhead, invited him to join the team for their annual spring game. Jack won Best Moment at the ESPY Awards that year when he ran 69 yards for a fourth-quarter touchdown and into the hearts of millions of people around the world. “Sports Illustrated” even made him one of their five nominees for Sportsman of the Year.

  Jack and Rex were kind enough to sign their jerseys for me, and I still have them hanging in my office today.

  To recognize the Hoffman family’s heroic efforts, I was pleased to work with the White House to arrange an Oval Office visit with President Obama for Jack and the Hoffmans. And at that same time, I led a U.S. Senate resolution making Jack’s birthday, September 26, National Pediatric Brain Cancer Awareness Day.

  Andy was relentless in bringing attention to this disease. Under Andy’s leadership, Team Jack has raised over $8.4 million to help make sure no child has to go through what Jack has. He even published a book last year, “Yards After Contact”, about Jack’s fight.

  Andy led a successful law practice with offices in Atkinson, O’Neill, and Central City. He was also a passionate runner, even qualifying for the Boston Marathon in 2014. And he was especially fond of hunting, fishing, and spending all the time he could outdoors.

  Andy passed away on March 1, at age 42, after his own hard-fought battle with glioblastoma, an extremely aggressive type of brain cancer. Our State lost a remarkable Nebraskan. His wife, Bri, and three children, Jack, Ava, and Reese, lost a loving husband and father, and Bruce and I lost a wonderful friend.

  We are heartbroken that Andy is gone, but we take comfort in the fact that his legacy will live on through the incredible work of the Team Jack Foundation.

  The world is a better place today because of Andy’s life. At the end of the day, I think that is all that any of us can ask for.

  I ask that you join me in honoring Andy’s life. Please keep the Hoffman family in your prayers.

**TRIBUTE TO FAY BRICKMAN**

- Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I would like to wish Ms. Fay Brickman of Charleston, SC, a very happy and healthy 100th birthday.

  Ms. Brickman married her high school sweetheart, Jack, after he returned from serving in World War II. They were married for 70 years before his passing. Together, they touched the lives of countless people in their community by generously supporting Charleston’s academic institutions and consistently devoting time to their synagogue, Brith Shalom Beth Israel, where Fay was the president of the sisterhood.

  I would like to recognize Ms. Brickman for the impact she made on our State and the legacy she built through her work and family. She is blessed with six brilliant children, all of whom hold law degrees, and 11 grandchildren, who visit regularly. I wish the family a wonderful time as they gather to celebrate Fay’s 100th birthday.

**TRIBUTE TO DALE GILBERT**

- Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, today I would like to take a moment to recognize the great work of Dale Gilbert. Mr. Gilbert served as a meteorologist for nearly 25 years at WWFY-TV, which is a local station in Greenville, SC.

  Dale Gilbert began his career at WWFY in the early 70s, becoming one of the youngest people on the air for the network. During his time at WWFY, he received the South Carolina Broadcasters Association Masters Award. Mr. Gilbert was well loved by his community, and will be missed for the local legend that he has become.

**MEASURES REFERRED ON MARCH 22, 2021**

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

- H.R. 6. An act to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME**

The following bill was read the first time:

- S. 937. A bill to facilitate the expedited review of COVID-19 hate crimes, 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–644. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal years 2013 through 2018 Operation and Maintenance (O&M) funds and was assigned case number 19–46; to the Committee on Appropriations.

- EC–645. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2020 Annual Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Assessments from the Secretaries of Defense and Energy, the Director of National Intelligence, the Commanding General, United States Strategic Command (OGS–2021–0133); to the Committee on Armed Services.

- EC–646. A communication from the Attorney–Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

- EC–647. A communication from the Supervisory Workforce Analyst, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Strengthening Wage Protections for the Temporary and Permanent Employment of Certain Immigrants and Non-Immigrants in the United States, Delay of Effective Date” (RIN1035–AC09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

- EC–648. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds;
Implementation of Vacatur” (RIN1615-AA22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2021, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-654. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Financial Officer, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2021, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WARNER, from the Select Committee on Intelligence:


By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

Special Report entitled “Report on the Activities of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the United States Senate During the 116th Congress” (Rept. No. 117-3).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services:

Space Force nominations beginning with Col. Dennis O. Bythwood and ending with Col. James E. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 6, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Sharon R. Bannister and ending with Maj. Gen. A. Friedriche, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.


Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Christopher D. Alexander and ending with Capt. Mark A. Schafer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (ih) John A. Okon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 24, 2021.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Col. Joseph R. Clearfield and ending with Col. Ahmed T. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 3, 2021.

Marine Corps nomination of Col. Sean N. Day, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (ih) William E. Chase III and ending with Rear Adm. (ih) John A. Okon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 24, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Gladden and ending with Maj. Gen. William J. Cooney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Maj. Gen. John M. Russ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.


Navy nominations of Vice Adm. Samuel J. Paparo, Jr., to be Rear Admiral.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the Recons on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tem. Without objection, it is ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Tariif Ahmed and ending with Isaac D. Yourison, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Haider W. Ajiewari and ending with Thomas M. Woolf, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Daniel James Aber and ending with Daniel Scott Zevitz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Erinn E. Artz and ending with Seth P. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Michelle R. Alders and ending with April Laeshel Woody, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Benjamin Berzinis and ending with Clinton K. Wahl, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jose C. Aguirre and ending with Scott M. Zelasko, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Nicholas J. Scotti and ending with Richard D. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Diane M. Caldera and ending with William A. Pashley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Bryan Mark Bailey and ending with Jason P. Aresco, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Adam H. Fisher and ending with Sylvette Ortiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Thomas W. Bentziger and ending with Gia Marie Wilson-Mackey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Gary L. Fissard and ending with Brian J. Fisk, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Amiee D. Douglas and ending with Semih S. Kumru, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Robert E. Beyler and ending with Nicole P. Wishart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Louis Edward Bellace and ending with Cynthia M. Washington, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jennifer A. Alfaro and ending with Matthew L. Hudkins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Paul Joseph Sajet, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations of Christopher J. Blaney, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Richard D. Engle, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Elizabeth A. Beal, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jeffrey D. Atkins and ending with Melissa M. Tallent, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nomination of David L. Walker, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations of Raeeh H. Macaaca, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Joshua B. Allen, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Michael Jon Bates and ending with David M. Jackson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nomination of Laurie Ann Flagg Inacio, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Mitchell C. Allen and ending with Shaun M. Willhite, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Peter Brian Abercrombie II and ending with Christopher C. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Gregory M. Adams and ending with Ryan A. Zottler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Air Force nominations beginning with Obi Agborsong and ending with Bryce D. Warren, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.
Army nominations beginning with Kevin W. Byrd and ending with William L. Weiford, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Michael L. Barnett and ending with James B. Prisock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Pedro E. Avila Morales and ending with Katelyn M. Zeringue, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Mark S. Born and ending with Henry Cartagena, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Alvin D. Schwapp, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph A. Marty and ending with Brian W. Mccoy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Harris A. Abbasi and ending with Donnie B. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Silas C. Abrenica and ending with Daniel J. Yourk, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Timothy M. Benedict and ending with Susan Stankorb, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Jonathan E. Abshire and ending with D015486, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with James A. Acevedo and ending with Lashell Y. Davis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph A. Anderson and ending with John M. Win-

nion III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Con-
gressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Ikechukwu L. Eweama, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Rob R. Billings and ending with Ovid Villarreal, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Michael L. Barnett and ending with James B. Prisock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Pedro E. Avila Morales and ending with Katelyn M. Zeringue, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Mark S. Born and ending with Henry Cartagena, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Michael L. Barnett and ending with James B. Prisock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Pedro E. Avila Morales and ending with Katelyn M. Zeringue, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Mark S. Born and ending with Henry Cartagena, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Michael L. Barnett and ending with James B. Prisock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Pedro E. Avila Morales and ending with Katelyn M. Zeringue, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Mark S. Born and ending with Henry Cartagena, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Michael L. Barnett and ending with James B. Prisock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 22, 2021.
S. 120. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BROWN, Ms. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 918. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a comprehensive recycling and outreach grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 290. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the negotiation of and response to domestic abuse and child abuse and neglect among military families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 911. A bill to require the training of new and existing aircrew, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HAYES, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. WARREN):

S. 917. A bill to repeal section 3003 of the Civil Levin and Howard "Chuck" McKown National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 916. A bill to provide adequate funding for the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 921. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to further protect officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 922. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide funding to States for extending broadband service to unserved areas in partnership with broadband service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. STABENOW, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 923. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a comprehensive recycling and outreach grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 924. A bill to establish a demonstration program to provide payments on eligible loans for individuals who are eligible for the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 925. A bill to establish the Federal Agency Sunset Commission; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SHAHEEN, Mr. COTZ MASTO, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SANDERS, Mr. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TITUS, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 926. A bill to improve the provision of health care and other benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans who were exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.
S. 930. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that the 2021 recovery rebates as provided for in the American Rescue Plan Act are not provided to prison inmates convicted of rape that such sums shall be redirected to the Department of Justice to be paid out in the form of restitution to compensate victims of crime; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:
S. 931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that the 2021 recovery rebates as provided for in the American Rescue Plan Act are not provided to prison inmates convicted of murder and that such sums shall be redirected to the Department of Justice to be paid out in the form of restitution to compensate victims of crime; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):
S. 932. A bill to establish the Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel, to provide agency and higher level reviews of classification decisions, to provide expedited review of classification decisions for members of Congress, and to provide protections for those challenging classification decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:
S. 933. A bill to designate the Battleship IOWA, located in the City of Los Angeles, California, as the National Museum of the Surface Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):
S. 934. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve rural health clinic payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SMITH, Ms. RABBIANO, Ms. EINST, and Mrs. CAPITO:
S. 935. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make technical corrections to rural health clinic payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CAS-SIDY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. TILLIS):
S. 936. A bill to require online marketplaces to collect, verify, and disclose certain information, to be paid out to high-volume third party sellers of consumer products to inform consumers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. DWUCKWORTH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KAIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. VAN Holtren, Mr. WAR-NEK, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. WAREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SANDERS):
S. 937. A bill to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. SANDERS:
S. 938. A bill to require the President to declare a national emergency relating to climate change under the National Emergencies Act, in response to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS
The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CORY, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. CRUZ):
S. Res. 130. A resolution remembering the 5th anniversary of the terrorist attacks at Brussels Airport and the Maalbeek metro station in Belgium and honoring the victims of the terrorist attacks; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARRERO, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. ROMNEY):
S. Res. 131. A resolution condemning the Government of the People’s Republic of China’s treatment of the Uyghurs and other ethnically minoritized peoples in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region (XUAR) and calling for an investigation into the abuses and crimes committed in the XUAR; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KAINE:
S. Res. 150. A resolution recognizing the 4th of July as a day to honor our service members and their families.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS
S. 65
At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People’s Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes.

S. 89
At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 89, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to secure medical opinions for veterans with service-connected disabilities who die from COVID–19 to determine whether their service-connected disabilities were the principal or contributory causes of death, and for other purposes.

S. 150
At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Ten-nessee (Ms. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 150, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the inclusion of certain audio-only diagnoses in the determination of risk adjustment for Medicare Advantage plans, and for other purposes.

S. 169
At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill 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 for other purposes.

S. 196
At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 196, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency materials pilot program.

S. 232
At the request of Mr. MORAAN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRapo), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 232, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women’s Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the “Six Triple Eight”.

S. 377
At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 377, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 406
At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 406, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 437
At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARRREN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) were added as cosponsors of S. 437, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 846
At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added
as cosponsors of S. 632, a bill to amend chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, to require the voluntary collection of demographic information for patent inventors, and for other purposes.

S. 636

At the request of Ms. Ernst, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 636, a bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to submit to Congress an annual report on projects that are over budget and behind schedule, and for other purposes.

S. 662

At the request of Mrs. Fischer, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer) 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. 675

At the request of Mr. Coons, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Leahy) was added as a cosponsor of S. 675, a bill to provide for the reporting to State and local law enforcement authorities of cases in which the national instant criminal background check system indicates that a firearm has been sought to be acquired by a prohibited person, so that authorities may pursue criminal charges under State law, and to ensure that the Department of Justice reports to Congress on prosecutions secured against prohibited persons who attempt to acquire a firearm.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. Tester, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Blumenthal) and the Senator from Minnesota (Klobuchar) were added as cosponsors of S. 692, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 702

At the request of Mrs. Hydesmith, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Cassidy) was added as a cosponsor of S. 702, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of State firearm ownership databases, and for other purposes.

S. 723

At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar) was added as a cosponsor 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. 730

At the request of Mr. Braun, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Risch) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Cotton) 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. 760

At the request of Ms. Ernst, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 760, a bill to require recipients of Federal funds to disclose information relating to programs, projects, or activities carried out using the Federal funds.

S. 761

At the request of Ms. Ernst, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. Hyde-Smith) was added as a cosponsor of S. 761, a bill to require the publication of fossil-fuel powered travel by the President, the Vice President, and political appointees, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. Marshall, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Kennedy) was added as a cosponsor of 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 National Firearms Act, and for other purposes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. Rubio, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Kennedy) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, 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. 848

At the request of Mr. Braun, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cornyn) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Smith) were added as cosponsors of S. 848, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve the service obligation verification process for TRACH Grant recipients, and for other purposes.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. Lankford, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 860, a bill to develop and deploy fireball circumvention tools for the people of Hong Kong after the People’s Republic of China violated its agreement under the Joint Declaration, and for other purposes.

S. 884

At the request of Mr. Lee, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cruz) was added as a cosponsor of S. 884, a bill to close loopholes in the immigration laws that serve as incentives to aliens to attempt to enter the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 34

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. Murray), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Kelly) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 34, a resolution recognizing the 200th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

S. RES. 97

At the request of Mr. Risch, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. Collins) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Booker) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 97, a resolution calling on the Government of Ethiopia, the Tigray People’s Liberation Front, and other belligerents to cease all hostilities, protect human rights, allow unfettered humanitarian access, and cooperate with independent investigations of credible atrocity allegations pertaining to the conflict in the Tigray Region of Ethiopia.

S. RES. 105

At the request of Mr. Merkley, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Peters) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 105, a resolution condeming the coup in Burma and calling for measures to ensure the safety of the Burmese people, including Rohinyga, Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. Reed. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Mid-Atlantic Fishermen’s Fairness Act along with my colleague Senator Whitehouse. This legislation seeks to address a longstanding inequity in our nation’s fisheries management system that denies Rhode Island a voice in the management of many stocks that our fishing industry relies on.

Under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, Rhode Island has voting membership on the New England Fishery Management Council (NEFMC) since NEFMC-managed stocks represent a significant percentage of landings and revenue for our state. However, Rhode Island has an even larger stake in Mid-Atlantic fisheries. Yet, it does not have standing representation on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (MAFMC), which currently consists of representatives from New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina.

According to data provided by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), between 2015 and
2019, Rhode Island accounted for approximately a quarter of the commercial landings from stocks under MAFMC’s sole jurisdiction, both by weight and value. The significance of commercial landings from stocks managed by the MAFMC is growing even more pronounced for Rhode Island, currently accounting for 58% of Rhode Island’s federally managed commercial fisheries landings in 2019.

After making an appearance during last summer’s Democratic National Convention, Rhode Island calamari quickly became a social media sensation, and for good reason. Calamari (or squid) is by far the most important commercial species in the Ocean State. In 2019 alone, Rhode Island landed over 5.5 million more pounds of squid than any other state on the East Coast. But, Rhode Island does not have a formal say in how this species is managed because it does not have representation on the MAFMC.

The legislation we are introducing offers a simple solution with a sound precedent. North Carolina was added to the MAFMC as part of the Sustainable Fisheries Act in 1996. Like Rhode Island, a significant portion of North Carolina’s important species managed by the MAFMC, yet the state was not represented on the council.

Just like the 1996 law that added North Carolina, the Rhode Island Fishermen’s Fairness Act would create two seats for our state on the MAFMC. One seat would be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce based on recommendations from the Governor of Rhode Island, and a second seat would be filled by Rhode Island’s principal state official with marine fishery management responsibility. To accommodate these new members, the bill would increase the MAFMC from 21 to 23 voting members. This would guarantee Rhode Island the minimum representation as other states currently on the council, without altering their status.

With mounting economic, ecological, and regulatory challenges, it is more important than ever that Rhode Island fishermen have a voice in the management of the fisheries they depend on. I urge our colleagues to join us in supporting this commonsense legislation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 912. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide information regarding 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 Finance.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that will help to improve adult vaccination rates throughout this country. I am thankful to Senators CAPITO, WHITEHOUSE, and SCOTT of South Carolina for their partnership on this important legislation.

Before there were vaccines, nearly everyone got measles, and diseases like whooping cough, polo, and rubella were commonplace among children and adults. Luckily for us, vaccines are now a cornerstone of our nation’s disease prevention efforts. They have a tremendous impact on reducing the spread of debilitating and potentially deadly conditions—from measles to flu to pneumonia—saving lives and reducing health care costs. A successful vaccine campaign is also essential to fully reopen the country and preventing future COVID–19 outbreaks.

Unfortunately, adult vaccines rates are not nearly as high as they could and should be. Prior to the pandemic, more than 50,000 adults per year died from vaccine-preventable diseases in the United States, while millions more became ill as a result, causing them to miss work and leaving some unable to care for those who depend on them. The health care costs associated with low adult vaccine rates are enormous—each year, the U.S. spends $15 billion treating Medicare beneficiaries alone for these vaccine-preventable diseases.

Because the immune system deteriorates as people age, adults 50 and over are especially susceptible to many vaccine-preventable diseases and account for a disproportionate number of deaths and illnesses from these disease. As Americans age, the impact of these diseases and their complications is likely to grow quickly and substantially improve use of and access to adult vaccines, especially among Medicare beneficiaries.

By increasing vaccine access, we can save thousands of lives and potentially billions of dollars. Unfortunately, older adults seeking access to and coverage for vaccines encounter many barriers. They may not know where or how to get vaccinated and cost can be an obstacle for both patients and providers. That’s why I introduced the Protecting Seniors Through Immunization Act of 2021. The bill improves vaccine information and education for Medicare beneficiaries, including the risks and consequences of vaccine-preventable disease, and ensures older adults know what vaccines are right for them at the right time.

The bill also eliminates the cost burden of vaccines on our nation’s aging population. Vaccines are available for free under Medicare, but under Medicare, vaccine coverage is split between Medicare Part B and Medicare Part D. Seniors can access vaccines covered under Part B—such as flu, pneumonia, and Hepatitis—with no cost-sharing. However, vaccines covered under Part D, such as shingles (herpes zoster) and pertussis (Tdap), can include a wide range of cost-sharing requirements. For seniors, many of whom live on fixed incomes such as Social Security benefits, these additional costs may preclude them from being vaccinated.

A 2018 study of Tdap and herpes zoster vaccine claims under Medicare Part D demonstrated that higher out-of-pocket cost-sharing is associated with higher rates of cancelled vaccination claims—in other words, when the costs of vaccines are too high, seniors can’t or won’t get them. The study found that cost-sharing of $51 or greater was associated with a 2 to 2.7-times greater rate of cancelled vaccination claims compared with $0 cost-sharing.

There are more than 300,000 cases of shingles reported in the U.S. each year. About 50 percent of people who experience shingles will have postherpetic neuralgia, a debilitating, painful, and long-lasting disease. This is just one example of the types of conditions that vaccines can prevent.

We have a lot of room for improvement for uptake of these vaccines. Passing the Protecting Seniors Through Immunization Act of 2021 will help us to do so. By reducing cost barriers and improving access and raising awareness, we can get these vaccines better and set the stage for healthy aging.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 913. A bill to conduct a study on the spread of COVID–19-related disinformation and misinformation on the internet and social media platforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the COVID–19 Disinformation Research and Reporting Act. I thank Representatives JENNIFER WEXTON for working with me on this important piece of legislation, which will help shine a light on the ways social media and other online platforms amplify and spread misinformation and disinformation about the coronavirus pandemic to the detriment of public health. I also thank my colleagues: Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, KLOBUCHAR, WARREN, and REED—for cosponsoring this bill.

As I stand here today nearly 30 million Americans have been diagnosed with COVID–19 and over 540,000 have died from the virus. The numbers alone are staggering. But when you hear and read the personal stories of individuals and families who are suffering, it is truly tragic. It makes you mournful that for many of the individuals who died, they died alone in the absence of their loved ones.

While many things contributed to this massive loss of life, I am here to talk about one in particular: the insidious spread of coronavirus-related misinformation and disinformation online. This “infodemic” has undercut the efforts of public health officials at every turn, and threatens to prolong the virus’s impact on the health of our people. A corollary is that a safe and effective vaccine is available.

The online spread of misinformation about public health is nothing new.
Claims that the 2014 Ebola epidemic was a form of population control spread across social media. Anti-vaccination groups have long used Facebook and YouTube to share junk science and recruit new members.

However, social media platforms’ response to coronavirus was supposed to be different. Early in the pandemic, the major social media platforms announced new measures to combat misinformation while making sure users had access to accurate, authoritative information about the virus. Facebook added a COVID–19 Information Center to the top of users’ News Feeds and announced it would remove misinformation that could contribute to imminent physical harm. Twitter verified accounts that provided credible updates on the pandemic and committed to removing false or misleading content that contradicted information from health authorities. YouTube began directing users who searched for COVID–19 information to the WHO or other health authorities and banned false information contradicting health authorities on treatment, prevention, diagnosis, or transmission of COVID–19.

Unfortunately, these measures proved lacking and insufficient. The conspiracy film Plandemic was viewed more than 8 million times across social media platforms, and the sequel was viewed over 100,000 times on YouTube during its first week alone. An August 2020 study by advocacy group Avaaz found that misinformation about vaccines and other health topics had been viewed an estimated 3.8 billion times on Facebook in the previous year—four times more than factual, authoritative content from institutions like the WHO and CDC. The study found that only 16% of previously fact-checked health misinformation on Facebook carried a warning label.

Spend even a small amount of time on the internet or social media and you will find rampant misinformation and conspiracy theories about COVID–19. Some examples of these falsehoods include: Bill Gates created the virus to make a vaccination; Bill Gates created the virus to make a profit; Bill Gates used a vaccine as a cover to implant microchips into Americans. No, actually, Dr. Fauci created the coronavirus to seize political power. You shouldn’t wear a mask to protect against the coronavirus, because wearing a mask actually weakens your immune system. And do not worry if you catch the coronavirus—you can treat it by drinking bleach.

These claims might seem ridiculous, but they have real world consequences. A study published in the American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene found that 5,800 people had been hospitalized and at least 800 people died in the first three months of 2020 alone as a direct result of coronavirus-related misinformation. As recently as August, the Georgia Department of Health and the Texas Poison Control Center had to warn people not to drink bleach to treat COVID. A recent poll found that only 51 percent of people wear a facial covering in public, despite its proven efficacy in preventing the spread of COVID. And, perhaps must troubling, polls suggest that over 30% of the U.S. population will not get a COVID vaccine.

If we hope to get past the coronavirus and avoid similar public health crises in the future, we must understand where misinformation originates, how it spreads, and strategies to stop it.

This is exactly what the COVID–19 Disinformation Research and Reporting Act will do. It directs the National Science Foundation to partner with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to conduct a study on the spread of COVID–19-related disinformation and misinformation on the internet and social media platforms. This study will provide critical information on the roles disinformation and misinformation have played in the public response to COVID–19, including public acceptance of and demand for COVID–19 vaccines; the sources of COVID–19-related disinformation and misinformation and the ways it has influenced the public debate; the role social media plays in promoting this disinformation; and potential strategies for combating misinformation and disinformation in the future.

This information will not stop the next pandemic from coming. And, it will not force the next Administration to take it seriously and follow the advice of doctors and scientists. But it can give us the knowledge and tools necessary to avoid another infodemic and ensure the American public receives accurate and authoritative information when it is most needed.

I therefore encourage my colleagues to support the COVID–19 Disinformation Research and Reporting Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 933. A bill to designate the Battleship Iowa Museum, located in Los Angeles, California, as the National Museum of the Surface Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the “Battleship Iowa National Museum of the Surface Navy Act,” which I introduced today.

This simple bill would designate the Battleship USS Iowa Museum located in Los Angeles, California, as the “National Museum of the Surface Navy.” The Battleship USS Iowa Museum, would be the official museum to honor the millions of Americans who have proudly served and continue to serve in the United States Surface Navy since the founding of the Navy on October 13, 1775.

The Battleship USS Iowa is an iconic ship that served as a home to hundreds of thousands of sailors from all 50 states. Commissioned in 1943, the Battleship Iowa has received accolades as the “World’s Greatest Navy Ship” and had several namesakes, including the “Mighty I” and the “Big Stick,” which referred to President Teddy Roosevelt’s famous adage: “Speak softly and carry a big stick.”

The USS Iowa was also known as the “Battleship of Presidents.” In 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt used the ship for meetings with British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Soviet Primer Joseph Stalin. President George H.W. Bush re-commissioned the USS Iowa in 1984 while serving as Vice President of the United States. Prior to the USS Iowa’s decommissioning in 1990, President Ronald Reagan used the ship for our nation’s Celebration of Liberty in New York City on July 4, 1988.

The USS Iowa earned nine battle stars for service in World War II and two for service during the Korean War. The ship was also awarded the Navy Meritorious Unit Commendation, the Navy Occupation Service Medal, the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, and the Navy “E” Ribbon—four times.

In 2012, the Navy donated the Battleship Iowa to the Pacific Battleship Center, which established the Battleship USS Iowa Museum at the Port of Los Angeles. Since its opening, the Museum has welcomed millions of visitors.

The Museum also hosts numerous military activities, including enlistments, re-enlistments, commissionings, promotions, and community service days. The museum also provides on-site training for federal, state, and local law enforcement personnel.

Due to the coronavirus pandemic, the museum has closed all of its indoor exhibits and has struggled to attract visitors. As a non-profit organization, the museum is supported solely by admissions, donations, event space rentals, and gift shops.

How the bill would help

Our bill would designate the USS Battleship Iowa Museum as the “National Museum of the Surface Navy” to raise awareness and educate the public on the important role of the United States Surface Navy.

The “National Museum of the Surface Navy” would build on the success of the Battleship USS Iowa Museum by introducing new exhibits and programs with a focus on education, veterans, and community.

Conclusion

It is imperative that we preserve the legacy of those who have served on the Battleship USS Iowa and all Surface Navy ships.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. TILLIS):
S. 936. A bill to require online marketplaces to collect, verify, and disclose certain information regarding high-volume third party sellers of consumer products to inform consumers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 936

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 “Integrity, Notification, and Fairness in Online Retail Marketplaces for Consumers Act” or the “INF Online Act.”

SEC. 2. COLLECTION, VERIFICATION, AND DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION BY ONLINE MARKETPLACES TO INFORM CONSUMERS.

(a) COLLECTION AND VERIFICATION OF INFORMATION—

(1) COLLECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An online marketplace shall require any high-volume third party seller on the platform to provide, not later than 2 business days after qualifying as a high-volume third party seller, the following information to the online marketplace:

(B) ACCOUNT.—

(i) BANK ACCOUNT.—

(ii) CONTACT INFORMATION.—Contact information for such seller that includes the individual’s name and physical address.

(B) LIMITATION ON EXCEPTION.—If an online marketplace becomes aware that a high-volume third party seller has requested and received a provision for a partial disclosure under subparagraph (A) or that a high-volume third party seller has failed to provide any information required under subsection (a)(2)(A) or (B), the online marketplace shall suspend any future sales activity of such seller or any payments to such seller for prior sales activity until such seller provides such certification.

(2) EXCEPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An online marketplace shall—

(i) verify the information collected under paragraph (1); and

(ii) disclose the information described in subparagraph (I) not later than 3 business days after such collection; and

(iii) inform any such seller to electronically certify, not later than 3 business days after receiving such instruction, that:

(aa) there have been no changes to such seller’s information; or

(bb) such seller has provided any changes to such information to the online marketplace.

(B) PRESUMPTION OF VERIFICATION.—In the case of a high-volume third party seller that provides a copy of a valid government-issued tax document, any information contained in such document shall be presumed to be verified as of the date of issuance of such document.

(b) DISCLOSURE REQUIRED.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An online marketplace shall—

(i) require any high-volume third party seller on such online marketplace’s platform to provide the information described in subparagraph (B) to the online marketplace; and

(ii) disclose the information described in subparagraph (B) to consumers in a clear and conspicuous manner on the product listing of any high-volume third party seller.

(B) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this subparagraph is the following:

(I) FULL NAME.—A violation of subsection (a) or (b) by a high-volume third party seller who has received a copy of a valid government-issued identification, such as a driver’s license, shall be subject to the penalties, and entitled to the remedies, under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(2) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall enforce this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(B) PRIVILEGS AND IMMUNITIES.—Any person that violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be subject to the penalties, and entitled to the remedies, under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(3) REPORTING MECHANISM.—An online marketplace shall disclose to consumers in a clear and conspicuous manner on the product listing of any high-volume third party seller—

(A) a reporting mechanism that allows electronic and telephonic reporting of suspicious marketplace activity to the online marketplace; and

(B) a message encouraging consumers seeking goods for purchase to report suspicious marketplace activity to the online marketplace.

(c) COMPLIANCE.—If a high-volume third party seller does not comply with the requirements to provide and disclose information under this subsection, the online marketplace shall suspend any future sales activity of such seller or any payments to such seller for prior sales activity until such seller complies with such requirements.

(1) IN GENERAL.—A violation of subsection (a) or (b) by an online marketplace shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or deceptive act or practice prescribed under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(2) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall enforce this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(B) PRIVILEGS AND IMMUNITIES.—Any person that violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be subject to the penalties, and entitled to
the privileges and immunities, provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(3) REGULATIONS.—The Commission may promulgate regulations under section 5 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to the collection, verification, or disclosure of information under this section, provided that such regulations are limited to what is necessary to collect, verify, and disclose such information.

(4) AUTHORITY RESERVED.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.

(4) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this section and the application of such provision to other persons similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected by the invalidation.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(2) CONSUMER PRODUCT.—The term “consumer product” has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty—Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act (15 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.) and section 700.1 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) HIGH-VOLUME THIRD PARTY SELLER.—The term “high-volume third party seller” means a participant on an online marketplace’s platform who is a third party seller and who, in any continuous 12-month period during the previous 24 months, has entered into 200 or more discrete sales or transactions of new or unused consumer products resulting in the accumulation of an aggregate total of $5,000 or more in gross revenues.

(4) ONLINE MARKETPLACE.—The term “online marketplace” means any person or entity that operates an electronically based or accessible platform.

(A) includes features that allow for, facilitate, or enable third party sellers to engage in the sale, purchase, payment, storage, shipping, or delivery of a consumer product in the United States; and

(B) is used by one or more third party sellers for such purposes:

(5) SELLER.—The term “seller” means a person who sells, offers to sell, or contracts to sell a consumer product through an online marketplace’s platform.

(6) THIRD PARTY SELLER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “third party seller” means any seller, independent of an online marketplace, who sells, offers to sell, or contracts to sell a consumer product in the United States through such online marketplace’s platform.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “third party seller” does not include, with respect to an online marketplace, a seller—

(i) who operates the online marketplace’s platform; or

(ii) who is a business entity that has made available to the general public the entity’s name, business address, and working contact information.

(II) has an ongoing contractual relationship with the online marketplace to provide for the manufacture, distribution, wholesale, and retail sale of shipments of consumer products; and

(III) has provided to the online marketplace identifying information, as described in subsection (b), that has been verified in accordance with that subsection.

(7) VERIFY.—The term “verify” means to confirm information provided to an online marketplace pursuant to this section by the use of one or more methods that enable the online marketplace to reliably determine that any information and documents provided are valid, corresponding to the seller or an individual acting on the seller’s behalf, not misappropriated, and not falsified.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 130—REMEMBERING THE 5TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TERRORIST ATTACKS AT BRUSSELS AIRPORT AND THE MAALBEEK METRO STATION IN BELGIUM AND HONORING THE VICTIMS OF THE TERRORIST ATTACKS

MRS. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 130

 Whereas, on March 22, 2016, 35 people were killed and more than 300 were wounded by 3 bombs that detonated at Brussels Airport in Zaventem, Belgium, and the Maalbeek metro station in Brussels, Belgium (referred to in this preamble as the “terrorist attacks”);

 Whereas, justin Shults, Stephanie Shults, Gal Miglnana Martinez, and Bruce Baldwin were Americans who lost their lives, among the many other victims, as a result of the terrorist attacks;

 Whereas Justin Shults, an east Tennessee native who was 30 years old and working as an accountant while living in Brussels at the time of the terrorist attacks, was a graduate of Vanderbilt University and a devoted husband to his wife, Stephanie; 

 Whereas Stephanie Shults, a Kentucky native who was 29 years old and working as an accountant while living in Brussels at the time of the terrorist attacks, was a graduate of Vanderbilt University and a devoted wife to her husband Justin; 

 Whereas Gail Miglnana Martinez, a Texas native who was 41 years old at the time of the terrorist attacks, was a mother of 4 children and wife to her husband Kato, who were all injured in the terrorist attacks; and

 Whereas Bruce Baldwin, a Missouri native who was 66 years old at the time of the terrorist attacks, was a husband to his wife, Virginia, who had worked for the Department of State, and was a member of the Army who served in Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) remembers the 5th anniversary of the March 22, 2016, terrorist attacks at Brussels Airport and the Maalbeek metro station in Belgium (referred to in this resolution as the “terrorist attacks”); and

(2) honors the memory of Justin Shults, Stephanie Shults, Gail Miglnana Martinez, and Bruce Baldwin, the 4 Americans who lost their lives in the terrorist attacks; and

(3) expresses its deepest condolences—

(A) to the other victims who were killed or wounded as a result of the terrorist attacks; and

(B) to the families of the victims; and

(C) to the home countries of each victim; and

(4) pledges continued resolve to stand against terrorism and extremism.
AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED
SA 1401. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS
SA 1401. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM LOANS AND SECOND DRAW LOANS FOR APPLICANTS CONVICTED OF A FELONY IN RELATION TO A RIOT OR CIVIL DISORDER.

(a) In general.—Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (36), by adding at the end the following:

"(W) PROHIBITION.—An applicant is not eligible to receive a covered loan if an owner of 20 percent or more of the equity of the applicant has, as of the date of the application, been convicted of a felony in relation to a riot or civil disorder during the 2-year period preceding the date of the application;"; and

(2) in paragraph (37), by adding at the end the following:

"(P) PROHIBITION.—An applicant is not eligible to receive a covered loan if an owner of 20 percent or more of the equity of the applicant has, as of the date of the application, been convicted of a felony in relation to a riot or civil disorder during the 2-year period preceding the date of the application;"

(b) applicability.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to an application for a loan under paragraph (36) or (37) of section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36)) that is submitted on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET
Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
The committee for Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 23, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.
Committee on Foreign Relations

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 23, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 23, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 23, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

Committee on the Judiciary

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 23, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

Select Committee on Intelligence

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 23, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

Unanimous Consent Request—H.R. 1868

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1868, an act to prevent additional money.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, re-serving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the Democrats have just passed a $1.9 trillion spending package. They filled the bill with lots of partisan priorities. They refused to work with Members on this side of the aisle. Almost all of what we are doing here—have done there is going on a credit card. That is going to have to be paid for by our children and their children.

Democrats also ignored the Medicare sequester as part of that $1.9 trillion bill. As a doctor, I have cared for patients in Wyoming for more than two decades. I cannot ignore this decision. There are more cuts to healthcare providers serving seniors. That is what these have done. They go into effect starting April 1. They are coming.

Congress must help those working on the frontlines fighting the COVID-19 pandemic. It should be our highest priority. Ignoring cuts to Medicare while spending $1.9 trillion on other things, to me, is irresponsible.

Instead, just a few days after their partisan spending bill was signed into law, here we have the chairman of the Budget Committee back asking for additional money.

Now, he knows the right thing to do is to help these Medicare providers on the frontlines, and I want to do exactly the same thing. Once again, instead of working on a bipartisan basis, Senate Democrats are rushing through another partisan spending package.

There is a better way. Senator CORTEN and I have introduced the Protecting Seniors Access to Healthcare Act. Our legislation takes a small amount of the money from State and local governments as part of that $1.9 trillion bill. Instead of billions going to Gavin Newsom and instead of billions going to Andrew Cuomo, our legislation gives a small fraction of that money to help our healthcare providers on the frontlines of this pandemic.

Our bill also includes commonsense provisions to ensure that taxpayer money is not given to illegal immigrants or prisoners. Our bill simply says that if you are here illegally, you don't get the payments in the Democratic spending bill.

Mr. BARRASSO. And I know we can't hand out American taxpayer dollars to illegal immigrants. That is why our border is being flooded right now—because President Biden offers benefits for illegal immigrants. We also shouldn't be cutting checks to people sitting in jail.

The question is whether Washington Democrats are interested in solving problems or just playing politics. I think we can provide needed relief for Medicare providers, and we should. It is completely irresponsible for the Democrats and the administration to spend $1.9 trillion and fail to help the healthcare providers who are working to serve Medicare patients.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the Senator modify his request to instead take up H.R. 1868 with my substitute amendment at the desk and ask unanimous consent that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I understand we are not in a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct.

DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am down here today to talk about something that I have talked about many times before, and that is the need to have a strong defense budget so we can deter our adversaries.

You know, it is not like it used to be in the old days. It is for real. These guys—China, for example, is in a position they have never been in before. I think it is important that we talk about this budget that is coming up again. It is more important now than ever.

Over the past few weeks, the Senate Armed Services Committee has been having hearings in which we have heard from top military leaders, defense experts, and Pentagon officials. What we have heard has been grim.

Last week, Admiral Faller, who leads the U.S. Indo-Pacific Command, said, ‘‘I think our conventional deterrent is actually eroding in the region.’’

Last week, Admiral Faller, who leads the U.S. Southern Command, said, ‘‘Now more than ever, I feel a sense of urgency about global threats we face in our neighborhood.’’

Now, I agree. I thought the Cold War was bad, but the threats we are facing now, especially from China, are more complex and more dangerous than they ever have been before. In fact, I look back sometimes wistfully at the days of the Cold War when things were different.

We had there. We knew what they had; they knew what we had. Mutual assured destruction meant something. It really doesn't anymore. Times have changed. I agree that the Cold War was bad, but it is worse today.

I am glad to hear President Biden and members of his administration say that China is our top pacing threat. Both Secretary Austin and Deputy Secretary Hicks told the Armed Services Committee during their nomination hearings that was the situation.

What concerns me is, I haven't seen the Biden administration take any action that backs up these words. Instead, we are hearing rumors that the Biden administration is considering a flat defense budget, which is actually a 2-percent cut when you adjust for inflation. At the same time, China is increasing theirs by 6.8 percent.

It kind of reminds me of the last 5 years under the Obama-Biden administration. That would have been from 2010 to 2015. During that 5-year period, the budget for the military was reduced by 25 percent. At the same time that it
was reduced by 25 percent, China was increasing theirs by 83 percent. This was happening out in the real world. People are not aware of this.

This sort of thing tells me that the administration isn’t serious about pushing back on China. And why don’t we know what? It also tells China the same thing. So talk is cheap, but defending our country is not.

If we really want to send the right signal to Beijing—a signal that says you can’t ever win against us—we need sustained investment in our defense.

We have seen what happens when we cut defense spending before. Look no further than the Obama administration’s 25 percent cut over 5 years. If we had just increased defense spending with the rate of inflation over the past decade, we could have invested another $400 billion in modernizing our military—money we wouldn’t have to spend today. Instead, we are playing catchup with China, which added at least that much. In 2018, we know it. We never know for sure with China—to its defense budget over the same time period. Chinese military modernization has been nothing short of astonishing. Their ability to move fast and increase production rates is leaving us back in the dust.

We have invested heavily in the advanced capabilities we know we need, like hypersonic weapons, biotechnology, and quantum computing. We spread our investments in our military too thin. Our service members have been asked to do too much with too little for too long.

But we know how we can put our military on a better track. We have a blueprint—the 2018 National Defense Strategy. This strategy actually has been very effective. It was put together back in 2018 by six Democrats and six Republicans, and they all had expertise in the area, where it has not been questioned. So we actually have a document here that shows us what we can do.

If we had increased—the Chinese military modernization has been nothing short of astounding. Their ability to move fast and increase production rates is leaving us back in the dust.

Here we have something that we can follow, and it has been successful so far. We have all agreed that this is what we should be doing, but we have not done it. Successfully, we know the strategy is right when it comes to priorities and the long-term nature of this competition. Secretary Austin and Secretary Hicks said as much in our committee hearings.

So why are they talking about adding more missions, including the Department’s role in climate change and pandemic response and not countering China?

So we know what the strategy needs to be and how it’s going to get us where the demands of our force look like. Those demands keep growing. Now we need to mesh the budget with the strategy. We know what it looks like, and that is at least a 3- to 5-percent real growth above inflation.

Now, that is what was determined some time ago, in 2018, and that is what we really need to be doing, but we are not doing it. And yet we know what should be done, but we are going to have to get down and actually get it done. It means, in real dollars, an increase of at least $75 to $125 billion each year. Now, that would be if we stuck with the 3- to 5-percent increase that is predicted as being necessary in this book. This kind of investment for 5 years in a row would completely close the difference between U.S. and Chinese defense spending.

And what does the investment get us? It allows us to keep our commitment to our service members to not only take care of them and their families but also to give them the tools and training to do their jobs.

You know, often we hear about the fact that we are spending too much on the military. We talk about that we spend more on the military than both China and Russia put together. But there is a reason for that. The most expensive line that we have in our military is taking care of the troops, their families. You know, in the communist countries, they don’t have to do that. They give them the guns; they go out and kill people. They don’t have to spend the money. But we do it, and we do it right. But we need to continue to increase so we can get dug out of the hole that we have dug over decades of insufficient funding and overuse of the force. The bills have been $77 to 23. Even in the Democrat-led House, it was defeated on a 3- to 1 margin.

Now, I am hesitant to even entertain this idea, but I think it is important to talk about this and whether there are some out there who would like to see the President go even further and cut defense spending by 10 percent. This is wrong, and Congress has already flat rejected it on a bipartisan basis last year. In the Senate it was defeated by 77 to 23. Even in the Democrat-led House, it was defeated on a 3- to 1 margin.

Now, take it from the President’s own Deputy Secretary of Defense, Kath Hicks, who wrote that a 10-percent cut would turn the United States into a regional power, increase nuclear proliferation, and weaken our allies. This is completely opposite of everything President Biden says he wants to do. It would preemptively surrender the 21st century to the Chinese Communist Party.

A strong defense budget is the first step. It underpins all of our efforts when it comes to diplomacy, the economy, and technology.

Is China going to slow its military investments any time soon? No, it is not. In fact, we know their actual level of spending is a lot larger than it looks. Economics, yes, but the Chinese Communist Party also lies about its military budget—no surprise. We know that they lied about COVID-19, and they continue to lie about their human rights atrocities against the Uighurs.

So if we don’t properly resource our military and put our right forces in the right place at the right time with the right staff, we are going to fall further behind.

So it is kind of early right now, and it is this time, though, that we need to be talking about it immediately to be preparing for that future.

The bipartisan 2018 NDS Commission report already said the U.S. military could very well lose the next state-on-state war it fights.

We need the Biden administration to lead here—to walk the walk and not just talk the talk when it comes to China. And if the Biden team won’t lead, I will make sure that we use our role in Congress to send the message. Not just Beijing needs to see that we are serious, but our allies and our partners need to see this as well.

The best signal we can send is a strong defense budget. If we cannot do that, we cannot do anything. We cannot simply wait any longer. This is common sense, and this is something, I think, that we will, on a bipartisan basis, recognize that we need to do and prepare for immediately. That is what we need to do, and that is what is expected of us at this time.

With that, I will yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following morning business, on Wednesday, March 24, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of Calendar Nos. 40, Rachel Levine, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, and Calendar No. 38, David Turk, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy en bloc; further, that at 11:30 a.m., the Senate vote on cloture on Calendar Nos. 40 and 38, in that order; further, that if cloture is invoked on either of these nominations, all postcloture time be considered expired at 4:45 p.m. and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further, that if either nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be stricken. I 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.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 96–388, as amended by Public Law 97–84, and Public Law 106–292, appoints the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council for the 117th Congress: The Honorable Bernard Sanders of Vermont; The Honorable Benjamin L. Cardin of Maryland; and The Honorable Jacky Rosen of Nevada.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 101–509, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Denise A. Hibay of New York.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 100–458, sec. 114(b)(2)(c), the appointment of the following individual to serve a six-year term as a member of the Board of Trustees of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development: The Honorable Christopher A. Coons of Delaware (term expiring 2026).

The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 70–770, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on Combating Synthetic Opioid Trafficking: Dewardric LeRon McNeal of Maryland vice The Honorable Kathleen H. Hicks, PhD, of Virginia.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 116–92, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Theodore Roosevelt Island Foundation: The Honorable Martin J. O'Malley of Maryland (reappointment).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–329, appoints the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission) during the 117th Congress: The Honorable Benjamin L. Cardin of Maryland (and designate him Chairman) The Honorable Sheldon Whitehouse of Rhode Island; The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen of New Hampshire: The Honorable Richard Blumenthal of Connecticut; and The Honorable Tina Smith of Minnesota.

NATIONAL WOMEN’S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 123.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. 123) designating March 2021 as “National Women’s History Month”.

There being no objection, the Committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KING. 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.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 123) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the Record of March 18, 2021, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

RECOGNIZING THE HERITAGE, CULTURE, AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICAN INDIAN, ALASKA NATIVE, AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN WOMEN IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 125.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 125) recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States.

There being no objection, the Committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KING. 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.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 125) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the Record of March 18, 2021, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 937

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 937) to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 2021

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 24; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the nominations, as provided under the previous order.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING. 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, following the remarks of Senator Sullivan.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from Alaska.

NOMINATION OF MARTIN JOSEPH WALSH

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is not often I come down to the floor to say I have a lot in common with the Senate majority leader, Senator Schumer from New York. In fact, in my 6 years in the Senate, I don’t think I have ever done that.

But after reading his remarks prior to the vote that we took yesterday on the Secretary of Labor, Marty Walsh, I thought I would come down and make a few points on that nominee, that vote, and some issues I have in common with the majority leader and now-Secretary Walsh and maybe some issues I don’t have so much in common with the majority leader but I think I do have with Secretary Walsh, which is why I voted for him.

First, as I mentioned, I, too, supported our now-Secretary of Labor, Marty Walsh, for some of the reasons that Senator Schumer did. Let me explain. Secretary Walsh started in the Laborers’ Union, Local 223, in Boston, age 21, following in his father’s footsteps. Now, as many people know, the Laborers are the biggest building construction union in the country. They build things—pipelines, roads, oil wells, bridges. They have made America strong. I am a big fan of Laborers and leaders like Joey Merritt back home and Secretary Walsh from whom I am going to talk a little bit about.

Secretary Walsh followed his father’s example and joined the Laborers in
Boston. He is also the son of Irish immigrants, which is something that is near and dear to my heart. And Senator SCHUMER said he has something very much in common—yesterday, when he spoke about Secretary Walsh—with Secretary Walsh because his great-grandfather was an immigrant from Eastern Europe who also, when he came over to America, got very involved with the labor movement. That is really a very common, powerful story of the American dream, common to my great-grandfather, Senator SCHUMER’s great-grandfather, Secretary Walsh’s family, and it is certainly a story that I have in common with those two.

You see, my great-grandfather was from a family of Irish immigrants, and he was also very involved in the labor movement. In fact, he was one of the original cofounders of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the IBEW. He was its first grand marshal.

I have something I am quite proud of here. It is a page from the history books of the IBEW, talking about my great-grandfather’s great work for the IBEW when it first got off the ground.

I look forward to working with Secretary Walsh on helping the men and women of America, certainly in my State, who build things. They have succeeded. They rise up and help others rise up—other working men and women—the way Secretary Walsh’s father did, the way Senator SCHUMER’s grandfather did, the way my great-grandfather did. It is a great American story.

But I must say that my views and Senator SCHUMER’s diverge on some of the other things he may have been speaking about when he talked about Secretary Walsh’s nomination yesterday.

One, he was critical of some of the Trump administration’s Department of Labor and Commerce actions as related to the Keystone XL pipeline and women who build things—those working men and women—despite the fact that prior to the pandemic, with some of the policies that we implemented here, the United States had the strongest economy in decades, the lowest unemployment rate in 50 years, wages were finally going up after 2 decades of stagnation. And very importantly for the working men and women of this country, there was a huge expansion in the American energy sector, “all of the above” energy: oil, gas, renewables, as important to the President as it is to Alaska.

Let me describe one other narrative that I believe certainly is true that I have seen in my professional life in Alaska—in America but certainly back home in my State—and that is the narrative that I am not so sure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to highlight. But I am going to highlight it because I think it is really important to highlight this: When national Democrats, whether during the Obama administration or now, during the Biden administration, are set up with the choice where they have to choose between the interests of the working men and women in this country who build things versus the interests of the extremists—radical environmental groups who want to kill jobs and shut them down—they almost always choose the side of those who kill jobs, not the working men and women of America, not the working men and women of Alaska.

This is true. My colleagues sometimes don’t see it. Do you know who else has seen it, and do you know who else I believe knows it is true? Secretary Walsh as a laborer. He has seen it. That is another reason why I voted for him.

He and his fellow laborers, whether in Boston or Alaska, also know that this issue is true. When there is a choice between the working men and women of America who build things versus the extremists who want to shut things down, way too often, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle go with the extremists, not the men and women who build things in this country.

Now, this narrative is not only continuing under the Biden administration, where there was a choice of working men and women who build things and women who build things versus the extremists who want to shut things down, way too often, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle go with the extremists, not the men and women who build things in this country. This is true. My colleagues sometimes don’t see it. Do you know who else has seen it, and do you know who else I believe knows it is true? Secretary Walsh as a laborer. He has seen it. That is another reason why I voted for him.

He and his fellow laborers, whether in Boston or Alaska, also know that this issue is true. When there is a choice between the working men and women of America who build things versus the extremists who want to shut things down, way too often, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle go with the extremists, not the men and women who build things in this country.

Now, this narrative is not only continuing under the Biden administration, where there was a choice of working men and women who build things and women who build things versus the extremists who want to shut things down, way too often, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle go with the extremists, not the men and women who build things in this country. This is true.

Here is a snapshot of what is going on in my State. In the first 4 weeks of the Biden administration, there were eight Executive orders focused on Alaska—eight. No other State has had that many Executive orders focused on Alaskan working families.

Day one, ANWR—trying to shut that down. We got that done in this body. They also killed the Keystone Pipeline—10,000 jobs, laborers’ jobs. Marty Walsh knows a lot about that. It goes on and on and on. There are Executive orders right now that, from my State’s perspective, are focused on hurting working men and women.

Here is a snapshot of what is going on in my State. In the first 4 weeks of the Biden administration, there were eight Executive orders focused on Alaska—eight. No other State has had that many Executive orders focused on Alaskan working families.

Day one, ANWR—trying to shut that down. We got that done in this body. They also killed the Keystone Pipeline—10,000 jobs, laborers’ jobs. Marty Walsh knows a lot about that. It goes on and on and on. There are Executive orders right now that, from my State’s perspective, are focused on hurting working men and women.

There is another one I will talk about. It is a project we have, a big energy project in Alaska called the Wilcox project. This has been permitted by Democratic and Republican administrations for 25 years to finally get it planned. In multinationals like China and Russia, the Obama administration, the Trump administration, everybody. It is in the National Petroleum Reserve of Alaska, a place set aside by Congress over 70 years ago for oil and gas development and good jobs. It is not controversial at all. The Biden administration has put a hold on that. Here is the estimate. It is a $7 billion project that will produce American energy and an estimated 2,000 direct jobs on the Wilcox project. This isn’t some pie-in-the-sky project that is going to happen this winter. There were 2,000 direct jobs, 75 percent of which are union jobs, and they are saying “We are going to put a hold on it”—thousands of additional support jobs, and they are going to put a hold on that. Why? Well, we know why, because in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, some of the most extreme radical environmental groups in the country sued to stop it, and they won.

So guess what happened in Alaska this winter during a recession. The 2,000 men and women who were working on this project were given pink slips and told to go home. That is what happened.

Mr. President, don’t just take my word for it. I want to quote again from Terry O’Sullivan. He is the head of the Laborers, the biggest construction union in the country. This was his reaction after day one of the Biden administration, where there was a choice of working men and women who build things like pipelines or the radical extremist environmental groups who want to shut down and kill American jobs. It is a choice: day one, the radical environmentalists versus the extremists.

Here is what the head of the Laborers—remember, Marty Walsh, Secretary Walsh is a Laborer from Boston. Here is what the head of the Laborers, the great American Terry O’Sullivan, said:

The Biden administration’s decision to cancel the Keystone XL pipeline permit on day one of his presidency is both insulting and disappointing to the thousands of hardworking IUNA members.

Those are the Laborers—who will lose good-paying, middle-class family-supporting jobs.

By blocking this 100 percent union project, and pandering to environmental extremists—

Remember, this is Terry O’Sullivan talking, not Senator SULLIVAN talking.

—a thousand union jobs will immediately vanish and 10,000 additional jobs will be foregone.

That is Terry O’Sullivan. Remember the choice: Men and women who build things and make America better versus the extremists who want to kill jobs.

Here is Mark McManus, general president of the United Association of Union Plumbers and Pipefitters. They were going to build the Keystone Pipeline, too, just like LIUNA members:

In revoking this permit, the Biden Administration has chosen to listen to the voices of fringe activists instead of union members and the American consumer on Day 1 of the Biden administration. Let me be . . . clear.

This is Mark McManus still talking.

When built with union labor by the men and women of the United Association, pipelines like Keystone XL remain the safest and most efficient modes of energy transportation in the world. Sadly, the Biden Administration has now put thousands of union members and workers out of work.

This is why the Secretary of Labor we just confirmed—again, I am glad to support him—I am a Laborer. He knows how to build things. He knows these politics. This is why it is important to have his voice because...
the voice of the extremist is much stronger in this administration. It is not just policies of killing union jobs—the men and women who build things for America—but if you listen, it is how the new members of this administration talk about these jobs. Listen. You and what you are saying is a condescending tone as it relates to these jobs. You may have heard John Kerry and Gina McCarthy, the climate change czars in the White House, who were saying in one of their press conferences, we must to do more to help make "better choices" on their jobs. That is pretty condescending. They are talking about laborers. They are talking about my oil and gas workers in the great State of Alaska or in Colorado.

The Secretary of Energy, in her confirmation hearing, talked about how some of the jobs might have to be "sacrificed."

Even in the Environment and Public Works Committee—and I am a very bipartisan guy—some of my Senate colleagues on the other side of the aisle were recently talking about: We need to encourage people to get more "relevant jobs."

What is more relevant than powering America?

Until recently, the men and women who built America—pipelines, oil and gas rigs, roads, bridges, the men and women with dirt under their fingernails, who are the real heroes—they make "better choices" on their jobs. They powered this country. They won wars for this country. By the way, they often fought in wars for this country. Then they came home. They got good jobs in the building trades as laborers, operating engineers, pipeliners, teamsters, IBEWs—the IBEW like my great-grandfather helped start. Not so long ago.

In the past, the Secretary of Energy, that is why I voted for Secretary Walsh over Mr. Moniz. Mr. Moniz, the new Secretary of Energy is now the great-grandfather of the Secretary of Energy. I believe that, when the decisions are made and when the decisions are coming before the Biden administration, the new Secretary of Labor is going to stand up for the workers. Men and women, stand up for the workers. He knows that exactly what I am talking about. He is concerned. They are concerned. Why? Because they know that exactly what I have been talking about here is happening—the radical, extremist environmental groups want to kill and are killing jobs. They are saying, don’t use that term. It is condescending. Men and women who have to make "better choices" on their jobs are nervous.

By the way, as for that lawsuit I talked about on the Willow Project, 200 Alaskans were sent home during a rejection. Men and women who have to pay mortgages and pay tuitions were sent home.

So my workers in the great State of Alaska are concerned. They know that these groups they are sending have a beeline into the White House and that they are killing jobs. They are killing jobs in my State and in America. They are worried that the majority now, the Senate majority, has similar views, so they are nervous.

Yet I am hopeful on one thing. Given his background and his heritage—now I am talking about the Secretary of Labor, Secretary Walsh.

I believe that, when the decisions are made—and I hope when the decisions are being made in the Biden administration, the new Secretary of Labor is going to stand up for the working men and women, stand up for the workers. Men and women who know so well or the laborers in Alaska whom he knows so well and look at the other Cabinet members and say: Not on my watch. We are not going to kill any more of these jobs.

That is what I am hopeful for. That is what he committed to me to do, and that is why I voted for Secretary Walsh as the new Secretary of Labor.

**FILIBUSTER**

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I have one more topic I would like to talk about today. It is another important one, and it is one that many have been talking about here on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Many have spoken very eloquently about this topic, and depending on when they have spoken about it—this year, last year, a decade ago, a century ago—it is a topic that is really fundamental to this institution and it looks as if Members in this institution are trying to change the institution forever. Now, I am talking about the filibuster. As you know, there has been much talk recently about the possibility of getting rid of the filibuster. This is an action that will fundamentally transform this institution, certainly, but I believe, frankly, it will transform our country. I don’t think this is a wise move at all. The irony is—and I am going to talk about it—until very recently, the vast majority of my colleagues, Republican and Democratic, were in agreement on this topic in that getting rid of the legislative filibuster was not a wise move for the Senate and not a wise move for America. Now, this might seem like an insular issue—something that people in Washington, DC, get incensed about, wave up about, and the people back home might not necessarily care because it might not impact them—but I don’t think that is the case at all. This rule, the filibuster, is at the very heart of what keeps extreme legislation, pushed by a small minority of the public, from passing. It is a rule that, in the Senate, certainly encourages, if not demands, compromise and bipartisan work both when one’s party is in or out of power.

Now, look, our instincts as Senators and our instincts as Americans are to get things done for our States, for our country, but what is good for Alaska isn’t always good for Colorado, and what is good for Colorado isn’t always good for New York. What is good for the majority isn’t always good for the minority and vice versa and it isn’t always good for the Nation. That is the heart of federalism. It is also why the majority can’t wield unfettered power in the U.S. Senate. With the exception of a few laws, what is required here is typically 60 votes on legislation. It is what separates this body, the Senate, from the House.

For the good of the country, if you look at our history, we must work together, find compromise, find common ground. Even on major legislation, to get a broad-based buy-in from all Americans or most Americans. This is what the filibuster has required.

Remember, the Framers understood that they were in a different world. It would be different from the House. We would be the bulwark against what James Madison called an anchor, a necessary fence, against the fickleness and passions that pervade the House. No offense to our colleagues, but as George Washington is said to have told Thomas Jefferson, the Framers created the Senate to cool House legislation. It was the cooling saucer you had with regard to the tea in the cup.

Indeed, the Senate—often referred to as the "world’s greatest deliberative body" in its earliest days—was founded on the right of unlimited debate. That is what the filibuster is. Even in the formation of the Senate in 1789, Senators used this right to debate and debate and debate in order to delay consideration of legislation. It wasn’t until the mid-1800s that this tactic was coined the "filibuster."

The point is that this procedural rule in the Senate has been here, in one form or another, since the founding of the Republic, and when you hear my colleagues talk about it as some new, recent procedure, it is just not factually accurate. Before there was no formal procedure to even end debate if a Senator chose to talk a bill to death. It wasn’t until 1917, during a debate about arming Merchant Marine vessels during World War I, that the Senate established the cloture tool, giving the body the ability to end debate by a certain margin of Senators.

Now, as some of my colleagues have been debating recently and have mentioned throughout its history, we have seen the filibuster, cloture used for good. We have used it to stop legisla-
fifties and sixties, legislation which was filibustered by Democratic Senators until the filibuster was finally broken in the sixties. It has also been used for many other purposes, but Members on both sides have used it for centuries. In the 19th century, the rationale was that the very first Senate filibuster was over a bridge across the Potomac River. I am not sure why, but I guess it was an important issue back then.

So slowly things down, cooling passions, that is what this body was designed to do, and that is what this procedure has done for decades. That is why my friends on the other side, who are undertaking a push to get rid of this, need to think. They need to stop. They need to think. The American people need to understand the consequences, and our good friends in the media who are covering the Senate need to write some real history about this.

As my friends on the other side of the aisle know, this is one of these issues that, when the shoe was on the other foot, we did not take action. What am I talking about? Recently, the Republicans held the majority in the Senate, and, currently, with President Trump, we had a Republican in the White House. There was frustration, and they wanted to move things quicker, and the President, President Trump, was pressuring many Senators: Let’s get rid of the filibuster. We didn’t. We didn’t. We told the President: It is not a good idea for the Senate, and it is not a good idea for the country.

That is what we did when the shoe was on the other foot. We said no. It is not good for this body, and it is not good for the country. The Republican President was pushing: We need to get things done. We need to get rid of it. No.

Let me just read a few of the things that have been said recently about the necessity of keeping the filibuster.

My friend from Delaware, in 2018, said: I am committed to never voting to change the legislative filibuster.

Now, he said that when Republican President was in the White House.

My friend from New Jersey, in 2009, said: My colleagues and I—everybody I have talked to—believes the legislative filibuster should stay here, and I will personally resist any efforts to get rid of it.

My Democratic friend from Montana said just a little over a year ago: I am a “no” on changing the filibuster. The move to make the Senate like the House, I think, is a mistake. I could go on.

I don’t want the Senate to become like the House. The consequences of getting rid of the filibuster are too great.

These are all words spoken very recently by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Even more impressive, just a few years ago, we had 61 Senators—33 Republicans, 25 of whom are still here, and 30 Democrats, 27 of whom are still in the Senate today—who sent a letter. I have it right here.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter sent to the Senate majority leader, Mitch McConnell, and the Democratic leader, Senator Schumer, saying we have to maintain the 60-vote threshold for filibusters involving legislation.

There being no objection, the material was duly printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE, Washington, DC, April 7, 2017.

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

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER, Democratic Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER SCHUMER: We are writing to urge you to support our efforts to preserve existing rules, practices, and traditions as they pertain to the right of Members to engage in extended debate on legislation before the United States Senate. Senators have expressed a value in the appropriateness of limiting debate when we are considering judicial and executive branch nominations. Regardless of our past disagreements on the rules and procedures of the Senate, we are united in our determination to preserve the ability of Members to engage in extended debate when bills are on the Senate floor.

We are mindful of the unique role the Senate plays in the legislative process, and we are steadfastly committed to ensuring that this great American institution continues to serve the way it was intended to—by the founders, who established a deliberative body. Therefore, we are asking you to join us in opposing any effort to curtail the existing rights and prerogatives of Senators to engage in full, robust, and extended debate as we consider legislation before this body in the future.

Sincerely,


The New York Times wrote the following:

The Republicans see the filibuster as an annoying obstacle, but it is actually one of the checks and balances that the founders, who worried greatly about the concentration of power, built into our system.

It is the New York Times saying the founders built the filibuster into our system.

People who call themselves conservatives should find a way of achieving their goals without declaring war on one of the oldest traditions in American democracy.

The filibuster. That is the New York Times. So Republicans needed the advice of the New York Times. It doesn’t happen a lot, but it did.
So let’s see where the New York Times was on this one just about a month ago.

The filibuster is a centuries-old parliamentary tool that has been transformed into a weapon for strangling functional government. The filibuster must go.

Well, so much for the New York Times’s convictions. I wonder why they are changing their tune. I wonder why they are changing their tune. Probably the same reason that some of my Democratic colleagues are changing their tune after signing this letter.

So I will end with one final quote. This is from a politician we all know well, all very familiar with him. It is from a speech on the Senate floor by U.S. Senator—in 2005, U.S. Senator Barack Obama. He spoke about how the American people expect their politicians to work to create a more perfect union.

What they do not expect is for one party, be it Republican or Democrat—

This is former Senator, former President Obama speaking right here on the floor—to change the rules in the middle of the game so that they can make all the decisions while the other party is told to sit down and keep quiet.

Sounds a little bit like what is going on with this filibuster debate.

I understand that Republicans are getting a lot of pressure to do this—

‘This’ meaning get rid of the filibuster—

from factions outside the [Senate] Chamber, but we need to rise above the “ends justify the means” mentality because we are here to answer the people—all of the people, not just the ones who are wearing our particular party label.

That was Senator Obama—former Senator Obama, former President Obama saying in 2005: Don’t do it, Republicans. You have the power. You have the Presidency. You have the Senate. Don’t get rid of the filibuster.

Well, I couldn’t agree more with our former President. Again, when we had the ability to do this just 3 years ago, we said no.

I hope our friends in the media will write about this. Don’t hold your breath. But here is one instance when the shoe was on the other foot. Because it was so important to America, so important to this institution, we declined to make the power move.

It would be really good—whether it is President Obama, who has spoken out about this now; or the New York Times, who has changed their tune; or all 25 of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who signed this letter 3 years ago saying “Don’t do it”—come on down, speak to the American people. Tell them why you have had such a drastic change of heart.

But I will tell you this: If we do do it, you are going to regret it; we are going to regret it; the American people are going to regret it. And do you know what? In my discussions with some of my Democratic colleagues, and I am not going to name names, they know that. They know that. They are getting a lot of pressure. Majority Leader Schumer is getting a lot of pressure from the far left.

Don’t let the far left ruin this institution. Don’t let the far left bludgeon you guys into changing America, because I think deep down in your heart of hearts, especially all of you who signed this letter 3 years ago know what the right thing to do for the U.S. Senate is and the right thing to do for the United States of America is, and it is to continue to keep what the Founding Fathers devised for this body.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:47 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 24, 2021, at 10:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 23, 2021:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SHALANDA D. YOUNG, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

VIVEK HALLEGERE MURTHY, OF FLORIDA, TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, AND TO BE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.
IN RECOGNITION OF KELLIE GOODMAN SHAFFER
HON. JOHN JOYCE OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Kellie Goodman Shaffer of Osterburg, Pennsylvania, for receiving Pittsburgh Professional Women’s 2021 Influential Leadership Award.

In her capacity as President and CEO of the Bedford County Chamber of Commerce, Kellie has worked tirelessly to make Bedford County a better place to live and work. Since she assumed her position in 2010, she has consistently advocated for Bedford’s small businesses, community and helped to grow our economy.

Amid the COVID-19 pandemic, Kellie has been a tireless advocate for Bedford County’s businesses, ensuring that they are able to utilize programs and opportunities designed to support small businesses during this challenging time.

Kellie is an outstanding Pennsylvanian and leader. It is my privilege to work alongside her to serve the people of Bedford County, and I wish her every continued success as she advocates for our community.

RECOGNIZING JOANNE GOODWIN AND HER SERVICE TO THE SOUTH FLORIDA COMMUNITY
HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Joanne Goodwin for her years of dedicated and unwavering service to our country and to the South Florida area. For decades, Joanne has made it her goal every day to make other people’s lives around her better, and has enjoyed a record of success throughout her career, everyone ought to strive for. Born in 1947, in New York, she made her way to the South Florida area, settling in Broward County in her early years, and would eventually go on to pursue careers in law, education, and other security and military organizations.

In 1969, she went on to work for the Guam Retirement Fund Board of Directors for nearly 11 years. Prior to her judgeship, she was a Distinguished Graduate from the People’s College of Law and expanded her role in educating our island’s youth through her appointment as Deputy Director of the Department of Education. The following year, she was confirmed to serve as the DOE Director and continued her service through this position until 1991. During her tenure at DOE, she simultaneously contributed to our island community as Chairperson for the Government of Guam Retirement Fund Board of Directors for eight years. Her role as an educator also extended beyond the public school system with an assistant professorship at the University of Guam’s Criminal Justice program. In this capacity, she helped to develop minds that would eventually go on to pursue careers in various areas of law, police, probation, social work, and other security and military organizations.

Upon closing her chapter with DOE, Judge Sukola established a private practice alongside late Justice Monessa G. Lujan and served Guam through this partnership for nearly 11 years. Prior to her judgiship, she further fortified her legal expertise through service as an attorney with the Public Defender Service Corporation, Legal Counsel for Guam.

Major Naske and his wife, Caitlin, have two beautiful daughters, Ava and Mara and his family continues to support him and his service to our nation.

We wish Major Naske the best of luck in his new role leading an operational C-17 unit as the Director of Operations. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the U.S. Congress and a grateful Nation, I extend our deepest appreciation to Major Daniel Naske for his dedicated service to the U.S. Air Force, and to our Nation.

COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING JUDGE ANITA SUKOLA ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT
HON. MICHAEL F. Q. SAN NICOLAS OF GUAM
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true public servant and a fine example of women leadership, the Honorable Anita A. Sukola. I congratulate her on her retirement after 36 years of service to the people of Guam in our government as a respected educator, attorney, and judge.

Early in her career, Judge Anita Sukola maintained a firm commitment to the betterment of our community through education. After graduating from John F. Kennedy High School in 1969, she went on to Washington State University and earned her bachelor’s degree in History and Secondary Education. Hoping to foster her same passion for growth and learning in others, she became a full-time educator in the public school system while working towards her master’s degree in Administration and Supervision. By 1983, Judge Sukola obtained her Juris Doctor from the People’s College of Law and expanded her role in educating our island’s youth through her appointment as Deputy Director of the Department of Education. The following year, she was confirmed to serve as the DOE Director and continued her service through this position until 1991. During her tenure at DOE, she simultaneously contributed to our island community as Chairperson for the Government of Guam Retirement Fund Board of Directors for eight years. Her role as an educator also extended beyond the public school system with an assistant professorship at the University of Guam’s Criminal Justice program. In this capacity, she helped to develop minds that would eventually go on to pursue careers in various areas of law, police, probation, social work, and other security and military organizations.

Upon closing her chapter with DOE, Judge Sukola established a private practice alongside late Justice Monessa G. Lujan and served Guam through this partnership for nearly 11 years. Prior to her judgiship, she further fortified her legal expertise through service as an attorney with the Public Defender Service Corporation, Legal Counsel for Guam.
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Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my deepest condolences to the family, friends, and staff of Ms. Heather Schafer. Ms. Schafer served as the first full-time Executive Director of the National Volunteer Fire Council (NVFC) for 27 years. Ms. Schafer was the driving force behind the NVFC’s mission to support and provide resources to the nation’s volunteer fire services. She was a champion of volunteer firefighters and emergency responders, and her leadership and commitment to the fire service industry has left an indelible mark on the field.

Ms. Schafer, who served as the first female Executive Director of the NVFC, used her passion and leadership to advocate on behalf of the nation’s volunteer fire services. Her work with the NVFC included the development of the National Volunteer Fire Service Act of 1979, which established the National Volunteer Fire Council, and the creation of the Volunteer Fire Service Act of 1984, which provided federal funding for volunteer fire departments.

Ms. Schafer’s leadership was instrumental in the NVFC’s efforts to improve training, equipment, and resources for volunteer firefighters. She was a fierce advocate for volunteer firefighters and emergency responders, and her dedication to the safety and wellbeing of those who serve in the fire service industry is unparalleled.

Ms. Schafer leaves behind a legacy of great accomplishment and a passionate commitment to serving her fellow firefighters. She was a role model for women in the fire service industry, and her dedication to the safety and wellbeing of volunteer firefighters is a testament to her character.

Ms. Schafer was a true champion of the volunteer fire service industry, and her legacy will continue to inspire and motivate firefighters and emergency responders for years to come. She will be deeply missed by her colleagues, friends, and family.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and career of Ms. Heather Schafer. She was a true leader in the fire service industry, and her legacy will continue to inspire and motivate firefighters and emergency responders for years to come. She will be deeply missed by her colleagues, friends, and family.

Ms. Schafer leaves behind a legacy of great accomplishment and a passionate commitment to serving her fellow firefighters. She was a role model for women in the fire service industry, and her dedication to the safety and wellbeing of volunteer firefighters is a testament to her character.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BENGALI HINDU GENOCIDE

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in sad remembrance of the 50th anniversary of the Bengali Hindu Genocide, and celebrate and honor the lives of the more than two million Bengali Hindu persons who were systematically killed by the Pakistani Army when it launched an offensive into East Pakistan, present-day Bangladesh, thus beginning the 10-month reign of terror known as “Operation Searchlight.”

Over that time, approximately 2 to 3 million people were killed, over 200,000 women were raped in organized rape camps, and over 10 million people were displaced, most finding refuge in India.

I offer my prayers and condolences to the victims and their families who still feel the very real effects of this heinous crime against humanity.

March 25th officially marks the beginning of the genocide in Bangladesh.

The brutality unleashed by the Pakistani army and the targeting of Bengali Hindus simply because of their religion must be strongly condemned as religious freedom is one of the most sacred of human rights.

It has been 50 years since the genocide in Bangladesh, and the survivors and their descendants are still fighting for recognition; they are still fighting for an apology from Pakistan, as the Prime Minister of Bangladesh formerly asked her Pakistani counterpart as recently as January of 2021; and they are still fighting for justice and for closure.

On March 28, 1971, Archer K. Blood, U.S. Consul General stationed in Dacca, East Pakistan, present-day Bangladesh, during the genocide, sent a cable back to Foggy Bottom with the subject reading “Selective Genocide.”

In this cable, the Consul General informs his superiors at the State Department that “Here in Dacca we have horrified witnesses to a reign of terror by the Pak military,” and that the full horror of its atrocities “will come to light sooner or later.”

That is why I rise; to remember and acknowledge that history so that victims and survivors of the Bengali Hindu Genocide know that the people of the United States stand in solidarity with them.

IN RECOGNITION OF JILL SELLERS

HON. JOHN JOYCE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jill Sellers on her new role as the Executive Director of Main Street Gettysburg, a non-profit organization committed to the preservation and revitalization of historic Gettysburg.

In this new role, Jill will collaborate with community leaders and volunteers to steward the mission of Main Street Gettysburg. Since first visiting Gettysburg two decades ago, Jill has been a passionate advocate for this town and community.

Jill has extensive leadership and management experience. Prior to moving to Adams County, Jill founded a public relations firm and served as the President of the Weston County Hospital in Wyoming. Earlier in her career, she served as an intelligence officer with the Defense Intelligence Agency as a program manager for Northrop Grumman. Jill is a graduate of the Middlebury Institute of International Studies, where she earned a master’s degree in international policy.

Jill Sellers will be an incredible partner to small businesses and the tourism community in Adams County. I congratulate Jill on this new chapter, and I look forward to working alongside her to serve the Gettysburg community.

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to Ms. Heather Schafer, former Chief Executive Officer of the National Volunteer Fire Council (NVFC). She passed away unexpectedly on March 15, 2021.

Celebrating its 45th year of service, the NVFC is the leading nonprofit association representing the interests of the volunteer fire, EMS, and rescue services. Ms. Schafer began her career with the NVFC in 1993, and within one year of service became the NVFC’s Executive Director and CEO.

Madam Speaker, I know you are well aware of my passion for supporting our firefighters and emergency services personnel. They are our first responders to all disasters. They face daunting challenges which require high levels of training and specialized equipment.

They need strong voices at the local, state, and national levels to ensure that their needs are addressed by government officials. Heath Schafer provided such a voice, always advocating forcefully for our volunteer firefighters. Her passion for nonprofit work led her to the NVFC and her bold leadership and vision grew the organization and advanced the interests of the volunteer fire service and the health and safety of its members.

As we celebrate National Women’s History Month, let us remember women like Ms. Schafer who serve as role models for young women seeking careers in professions traditionally occupied by their male counterparts. The fire and emergency services is one such profession.

Ms. Schafer leaves behind a legacy of great accomplishment over her 27 years of steadfast service managing the NVFC. Her contribution to a more equitable society for women and all Americans is surely among her greatest achievements.

On behalf of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus, I extend my deepest sympathies to Ms. Schafer’s family, friends, and staff for the loss of a remarkable and talented leader of our nation’s volunteer fire and emergency services.

HON. JOSEPH D. MORELLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I regretfully missed Roll Call vote 86 H.R. 1620 The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 on March 17, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.
RECOGNIZING THE SIGNING OF A DECLARATION OF INTENT BETWEEN THE JEWISH ADOPTION AND FAMILY CARE OPTIONS AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL MINISTRY OF LABOR, SOCIAL AFFAIRS AND SOCIAL SERVICES

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Jewish Adoption and Family Care Center’s declaration of intent agreement with the State of Israel. JAFCO continues to provide support to children affected by disabilities at risk of abuse or neglect in the United States.

JAFCO was established as a non-profit in 1992. The JAFCO Children’s Village is among the rarest programs of its kind around the country. The partnership with the Israel Ministry of Labor, Social Affairs, and Social Services, or MOLSA, will help both entities refer requests for foster care, consultation, support services and more.

JAFCO and MOLSA have seen their efforts overlap over the past 25 years, making this partnership all the more important towards providing help to children in need. Both have done phenomenal work serving special needs kids. This partnership can help mend any unmet necessities for children in the Jewish community.

I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting this partnership and commending the invaluable work JAFCO and MOLSA have done over the years to bring help to children and families in need.

INTRODUCTION OF THE KEEPING OUR MANUFACTURERS FROM BEING UNFAIRLY TAXED WHILE CHAMPIONING HEALTH ACT (KOMBUCHA)

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I introduced the Keeping Our Manufacturers from being Unfairly taxed while Championing Health Act (KOMBUCHA). This legislation would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to properly tax kombucha, a fermented tea, naturally rich in probiotics and healthy acids, that can contain trace amounts of alcohol.

Last month, on February 21, we commemorated World Kombucha Day and acknowledged the many contributions of kombucha brewers in my home State of Oregon, across the United States, and around the world. With the introduction of KOMBUCHA, the United States Congress now can extend that acknowledgement to legislative action by providing the industry with much-needed relief.

Under the Internal Revenue Code, kombucha beverages with more than 0.5 percent alcohol-by-volume are subject to excise taxes intended for beer. As a result of the fermentation process that is necessary to produce kombucha, some final products may contain more than 0.5 percent alcohol-by-volume, subjecting the industry to onerous excise taxes. But kombucha drinkers do not choose the product because of its alcohol content, they choose it as a healthy beverage option.

My legislation would increase the alcohol-by-volume limit for kombucha to 1.25 percent, properly categorizing the product and allowing the kombucha industry to continue its growth. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and Senator WYDEN in the Senate to provide this relief as soon as possible.

RECOGNIZING LIFESTREAM BEHAVIORAL CENTER’S 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize LifeStream Behavioral Center as they commemorate 50 years of service in bringing hope to life during the month of March. LifeStream is dedicated to their mission of supporting recovery, promoting health and creating hope. Over the years LifeStream has grown to meet the needs of our communities and become a leader in behavioral health, substance use disorders, and social services.

In 1969, LifeStream began as a component of Waterman Memorial Hospital in Eustis, Florida, providing community-based care as an alternative to institutionalization. In 1971, LifeStream became a non-profit organization, originally founded as Lake/Sumter Community Mental Health Center, with 18 inpatient beds located inside Waterman Hospital and two outpatient clinics located in Lake and Sumter Counties.

Since its founding, LifeStream has expanded to multiple facilities with over 50 programs and 1,000 staff providing services throughout Central Florida, proudly serving the individuals and families of Lake, Sumter, Citrus, Hernando, Marion, Orange, and Hillsborough Counties. As a leader in behavioral healthcare, LifeStream offers a multi-disciplinary approach helping people reclaim their lives and take what for many is their first step towards hope. Their integrated health system provides behavioral health, substance use, primary healthcare, and social services. For 50 years, LifeStream has helped thousands of individuals in our community achieve recovery and reach their highest potential.

This is a momentous year for LifeStream, and I am honored to join my friend, Jonathan Cherry, CEO/President of LifeStream in celebrating this milestone. The community and families of Central Florida are blessed to have a committed behavioral health center such as LifeStream, and I commend them for the measures they are undertaking to support recovery and provide hope to those in need.

IN RECOGNITION OF ST. GEORGE GREEK ORTHODOX CATHEDRAL’S CELEBRATION OF THE BICENTENNIAL OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate St. George Greek Orthodox Cathedral on their celebration of this, the Bicentennial of Greek Independence. Their continued efforts to support, preserve and promote their Greek culture, as well as honor the heroes of 1821 and the sacrifices they made in pursuit of Greek independence, are truly remarkable and deserving of the highest praise.

The parishioners of St. George Greek Orthodox Cathedral are stewards of their culture’s rich history, celebrating and honoring the sacrifices made by their forefathers during their fight for freedom. With the signing of the Treaty of Edirne in 1829, eight years after the inception of the War of Greek Independence, the independent state of Greece was finally established. St. George Greek Orthodox Cathedral has been a vital member of the Greater Springfield community since 1907, and generations of parishioners have faithfully commemorated Greek independence for more than a century.

Madam Speaker, I would like to once again acknowledge St. George Greek Orthodox Cathedral for their extraordinary efforts and support. Their dedication to preserving the traditions of their religion and their culture is admirable, and I wish them many more years of health and prosperity.

RECOGNIZING THE FRONTLINE HEALTHCARE WORKERS OF SOUTH DAKOTA

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 2021

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize, celebrate, and honor the frontline healthcare workers of the great state of South Dakota.

Some of these South Dakota heroes are Ashley Beck, Jordan Beck, Joshua Beck, Charleen Beckel, Bonnie Becker, Janet Beckere, Michele Becker, Ellen Becker, Carianne Behl, Rebecca Beckler, Jody Becker, Amber Becker, Heidi Becker, Brooklyn Becker, Beth Becker, LaTora Becker, Myranda Becking, Vicki Beckler, Nicholas Beckler, Crystal Beckman, Danielle Beckmann, Lindsay Beckstrand, Erin Beckstrom, Briana Beckstrom, Sheri Beckwith, Nicki Beckwith, Krista Beckwith, Loni Bedard, Cassandra Beech, Kelsey Beeck, Darla Beede, Andrew Beede, Amy Beegly, Allison Beeman, Debra Beermann, Amelia Beernink, Chelsi Beers, Erika Beers, Amanda Beeson, Daleene Beetem, Naomi Beesch, Marsha Begeman, Katelyn Begeman, Cynthia Beeley, Carrie Beglen, Margaret Behl, Rebecca Behl, Keith Behl, Ashley Behl, Brenda Behlings, Nancy Behr, Kristina Behrend, Christina Behrends, Travis Behrens,


Rhonda Christensen, Janice Christensen, Cynthia Christensen, Gaylene Christensen, Dawn Christensen, Renee Christensen, Julie Christensen, Joanna Christensen, Lorna Christensen, Debra Christensen, Teresa Christensen, Holly Christensen, James Christensen, Susan Christensen, Rhonda Christensen, Christina Christensen, Renae Christensen, Brenda Christensen, Alyssa Christensen, Doreen Christensen, Andrea Christensen, Katie Christensen, Taya Christensen, Shay Christensen, Amanda Christensen, Ashley Christensen, Jessica Christensen, Daniel Christensen, Nick Christensen, Allison Christensen, Courtney Christensen, Kaisha Christensen, Brandi Christensen, Nicole Christensen, Briane Christensen, Jody Tatora, Jessica Christensen, Sarah Christensen, Janell Christensen, Lee Christensen, Delynda Christensen, Gina Christensen, Brian Christiaansen, Camille Christian.

Becca Christian, Amber Christian, Hannah Christian, Carolyn Christians-Brekke, Dianne Christiansen, Jill Christiansen, Jessica Christiansen, Ashley Christiansen, Holly Christiansen, Sarah Christie, Brittany Christion, Marlene Christman, Shawn Christoffers, Pamela Christopher, Megan Christopher, Carrie Christopherson, Heather Christopherson, Deborah, Christopher, Tami Christman, Rachel Christman, Nicole Christenson, Deborah, Christopherson, Okeleamaka Chukwuyem, Dayonge Chung, Teresa Church, Carrie Churchill, Diane Ciancio, Jean Cizynski, Jennifer Cichosz, Jamie Cikak, Sean Cikak, Patrick Cimburek, Elizabeth Cimburek, Kelly Cimpl, Jackie Rau, and Jeannette Saugstad.

Over the past year, they have faced challenges most of us cannot even imagine. They have shown incredible resolve in the face of adversity. They have shown us all how to seek positivity and hope in each day as we weather the storms that come our way. I couldn’t be more thankful to represent the incredible people across South Dakota and all over the nation who work hard each day, not for fame, not for recognition or for money, but for the betterment of their communities. This is what makes America strong. I am grateful for the opportunity to recognize these hard-working individuals.

Mrs. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise today in observance of Women’s History Month and its 2021 theme—Valiant Women of the Vote: Honoring the Women of Steel, an advocacy-arm of the United Steelworkers, which evolved from the early women’s caucuses that demanded women have their rightful place in the workplace. 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. Ola was a resident of Gary, Indiana, who passed away in 2009. Ola worked for 28 years at Hammond Valve. A devoted community leader, she was involved in many union and civic organizations and was one of the founding members of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists in addition to being a member of the NAACP and holding various positions at Union 127, District 31 of the Steelworkers union. In 1976, she was elected the first female member of USW Local 65’s Executive Board and is currently a member of the Steelworkers Organization of Active Retirees where she continues to advocate for future generations.

I would like to take a moment to recognize those women who have recently celebrated more than five decades at ArcelorMittal, which is now Cleveland-Cliffs: Gail Richardson, a native of East Chicago and a safety advocate at Indiana Harbor; Judith Studer, a senior clerk in the maintenance, environmental and utilities department at Burns Harbor; and Maria Garcia, a materials management coordinator in the logistics department at Indiana Harbor.

Today, the Women of Steel continue to advocate for women in leadership and carry on the march to fight for full gender equality in the workplace. I commend these women and the many others who fought and continue to fight alongside them for women of every creed, class, and ethnic background. These fearless, strong, and vocal women are exemplary role models who reflect the 2021 theme, Valiant Women of the Vote: Refusing to be Silenced.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to join in celebrating Women’s History Month and recognizing the role Women of Steel have played to organize, unionize, rally, and inspire workers to fight for justice. I ask that you and your distinguished colleagues join me in celebrating the impact these extraordinary women have made in labor history and their continued contributions to the labor movement and our nation.
Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Mikkie Belvedere for her years of public service in South Florida. Mikkie was born in Israel, lived in New York City, in St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands, and has been a resident of South Florida since 1992.

Commissioner Belvedere is a financial professional who has spent years putting her expertise to good use to better her local community. She was first elected to the Coconut Creek City Commission in 2009, where she has served in the roles of Mayor and Vice Mayor of Coconut Creek. Prior to her service as a city commissioner, Commissioner Belvedere spent years working to better Coconut Creek, serving on the city’s Planning and Zoning Board, the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee, and as the chair of the Coconut Creek Environmental Advisory Board. Commissioner Belvedere served as an ambassador committee representative and charter member for the Coconut Creek Chamber of Commerce.

In addition to her years of public service, Commissioner Belvedere has had a positive impact on communities in Coconut Creek and throughout South Florida. The founder of the Coconut Creek Multicultural center, Mikkie Belvedere also is a member of the Wynmoor Hurricane Emergency Network and a member of the Coconut Creek Community Emergency Response Team. She is a Trustee of the Sisterhood of Liberal Jewish Temple and the president of the Hebrew club of Wynmoor. She is a former member of the Sawgrass Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors and a former participant of the Broward Mentoring Program. For the past decade and a half, Commissioner Belvedere has volunteered with the Broward County Prime Time Program, where she reads to children.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mikkie Belvedere and her service to the South Florida community and Florida’s 22nd Congressional District.
Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1681–S1721

Measures Introduced: Forty-eight bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 891–938, S.J. Res. 13, and S. Res. 130–131. Pages S1706–08

Measures Reported:


Special Report entitled “Report on the Activities of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the United States Senate During the 116th Congress”. (S. Rept. No. 117–3) Page S1705

Measures Passed:

National Women’s History Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 123, designating March 2021 as “National Women’s History Month”, and the resolution was then agreed to. Page S1717

Recognizing the Heritage, Culture, and Contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Women: Committee on Indian Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 125, recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States, and the resolution was then agreed to. Page S1717

Appointments:

United States Holocaust Memorial Council for the 117th Congress: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 96–388, as amended by Public Law 97–84, and Public Law 106–292, appointed the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council for the 117th Congress: Senators Sanders, Cardin, and Rosen. Page S1717

Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 101–509, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Denise A. Hibay of New York. Page S1717

Board of Trustees of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training Development: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 100–458, sec. 114(b)(2)(c), the appointment of the following individual to serve a six-year term as a member of the Board of Trustees of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development: Senator Coons (term expiring 2026). Page S1717

Commission on Combating Synthetic Opioid Trafficking: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 116–92, appointed the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on Combating Synthetic Opioid Trafficking: Dewardric LeRon McNeal of Maryland vice Kathleen H. Hicks, PhD, of Virginia. Page S1717

Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 70–770, the reappointment of the following individual to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: Senator Heinrich (reappointment). Page S1717

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission): The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, appointed the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission) during the 117th Congress: Senators Cardin (and designate him Chairman), Whitehouse, Shaheen, Blumenthal, and Smith. Page S1717

Levine, Turk, and Adeyemo Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the remaining motions to invoke cloture filed on Thursday, March 18, 2021, on the nominations of Rachel Leland Levine, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, David Turk, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy, and Adewale O. Adeyemo, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of...
the Treasury, ripen at 11:30 a.m., on Wednesday, March 24, 2021.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Wednesday, March 24, 2021, Senate resume consideration of the nominations of Rachel Leland Levine, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, and David Turk, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy, en bloc; further that at 11:30 a.m., Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Rachel Leland Levine, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, and David Turk, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy, in that order; that if cloture is invoked on either of these nominations, all post-cloture time expire at 4:45 p.m., and Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked.

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 63 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. EX. 129), Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 62 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. EX. 128), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

By 57 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 131), Vivek Hallegere Murthy, of Florida, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of four years.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 57 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 130), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

NOMINATION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Admiral John C. Aquilino, USN, for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Commander, United States Indo-Pacific Command, Department of Defense, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Hirono, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 4,113 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Space Force.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Markey, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

BOLSTERING DEMOCRACY IN GEORGIA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation concluded a hearing to examine bolstering democracy in Georgia, after receiving testimony from George Kent, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, and Kara McDonald, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, both of the Department of State.

2020 CENSUS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the 2020 census and current activities of the Census Bureau, including the need for the Census Bureau to ensure transparency over data quality and finalize plans for data protection, after receiving testimony from Ron S. Jarmin, Acting Director, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce; and J. Christopher Mihm, Managing Director, Strategic Issues, and Nick Marinos, Director, Information Technology and
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Cybersecurity, both of the Government Accountability Office.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security concluded a hearing to examine why the U.S. pays the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, including S. 908, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the negotiation of lower covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries and the establishment and application of a formulary by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under Medicare part D, S. 909, to significantly lower prescription drug prices for patients in the United States by ending government-granted monopolies for manufacturers who charge drug prices that are higher than the median prices at which the drugs are available in other countries, and S. 920, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the importation of affordable and safe drugs by wholesale distributors, pharmacies, and individuals, after receiving testimony from Aaron S. Kesselheim, Harvard Medical School and Brigham and Women’s Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts; Nav Persaud, University of Toronto and St. Michael’s Hospital, Ontario, Canada; Alex Brill, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C.; and Elia Spates, Derby, Vermont.

GUN VIOLENCE
Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine constitutional and common sense steps to reduce gun violence, after receiving testimony from Chief Fernando Spagnolo, Waterbury Police Department, Waterbury, Connecticut; Selwyn Rogers, University of Chicago Medicine, Chicago, Illinois; Robyn Thomas, Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence, and Chris Cheng, both of San Francisco, California; Amy E. Swearer, The Heritage Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Geneva Solomon, Redstone Firearms, Burbank, California, on behalf of the National African American Gun Association; Robin Brule, Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Suzanna Gratia Hupp, Lampasas, Texas.

INTELLIGENCE
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 66 public bills, H.R. 2118–2183; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 33; H. Con. Res. 24; and H. Res. 266–270, were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Sarbanes to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1615.

Quorum Calls—Votes: There were no Yea and Nay votes, and there were no Recorded votes. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

Committee Meetings

WOOD INNOVATION: SUSTAINABLE FOREST PRODUCTS TO REINVIGORATE RURAL ECONOMIES
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Wood Innovation: Sustainable Forest Products to Reinvigorate Rural Economies”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ADDRESSING THE MATERNAL HEALTH CRISIS
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Addressing the Maternal Health Crisis”. Testimony was heard from Lisa Asare, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Family Health Services, Department of Health, New Jersey; and public witnesses.
FUTURE DEFENSE SPENDING
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing entitled “Future Defense Spending”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEARNING FROM AND PREVENTING FUTURE TRAINING MISHAPS
Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “Learning From and Preventing Future Training Mishaps”. Testimony was heard from General Joseph M. Martin, Vice Chief of Staff, Department of the Army; Admiral William K. Lescher, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy; General David W. Allvin, Vice Chief of Staff, Department of the Air Force; and General Gary L. Thomas, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps.

FY 2022 BUDGET PRIORITIES: MEMBERS’ DAY
Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “FY 2022 Budget Priorities: Members’ Day”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Kilmer, and Representatives Cloud, Tonko, Wittman, Norton, Graves of Louisiana, Timmons, Moore of Wisconsin, Case, Boebert, Larson of Connecticut, Jackson Lee, and Gohmert.

BUILDING ON THE ACA: LEGISLATION TO EXPAND HEALTH COVERAGE AND LOWER COSTS
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Building on the ACA: Legislation to Expand Health Coverage and Lower Costs”. Testimony was heard from Dean Cameron, Director, Department of Insurance, Idaho; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT’S AND FEDERAL RESERVE’S PANDEMIC RESPONSE
Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Treasury Department’s and Federal Reserve’s Pandemic Response”. Testimony was heard from Janet L. Yellen, Secretary, Department of the Treasury; and Jerome Powell, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

UNITED STATES STANDING IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations, and Global Corporate Social Impact held a hearing entitled “United States Standing in International Organizations”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RECLAIMING CONGRESSIONAL WAR POWERS
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Reclaiming Congressional War Powers”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUILDING BACK BETTER: EXAMINING THE FUTURE OF AMERICA’S PUBLIC LANDS
Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing entitled “Building Back Better: Examining the Future of America’s Public Lands”. Testimony was heard from Brad Little, Governor, Idaho; and public witnesses.

A YEAR IN REVIEW: THE STATE OF COVID–19 IN AMERICAN INDIAN, ALASKA NATIVE, AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN COMMUNITIES–LESSONS LEARNED FOR FUTURE ACTION
Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States held a hearing entitled “A Year in Review: The State of COVID–19 in American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Communities–Lessons Learned for Future Action”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ARTICLE I: REFORMING THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY
Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Article I: Reforming the War Powers Resolution for the 21st Century” [Original Jurisdiction Hearing]. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE INTERACTION BETWEEN THE PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM AND FEDERAL ACQUISITION RULES: WHAT IT MEANS FOR GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS
Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Infrastructure held a hearing entitled “The Interaction Between the Paycheck Protection Program and Federal Acquisition Rules: What it Means for Government Contractors”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2020: STATUS OF ESSENTIAL PROVISIONS
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment
held a hearing entitled “The Water Resources Development Act of 2020: Status of Essential Provisions”. Testimony was heard from Matthew J. Strickler, Secretary of Natural Resources, Virginia; Gene Seroka, Executive Director, Port of Los Angeles, California; Mary Ann Bucci, Executive Director, Port of Pittsburgh Commission, Pennsylvania; and public witnesses.

**VA COMPENSATION AND PENSION EXAMS DURING THE COVID–19 PANDEMIC: A PATH FORWARD**

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability and Memorial Affairs held a hearing entitled “VA Compensations and Pension Exams During the COVID–19 Pandemic: A Path Forward”. Testimony was heard from Elizabeth Curda, Director, Education, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; David McLenachen, Executive Director, Medical Disability Examination Office, Veterans Benefit Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Toby Mathew, Chief Officer, Office of Disability and Medical Health, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and Brent Arronte, Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Audits, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs.

**MEMBER’S DAY**

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Member’s Day”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Deutch, and Representatives Ryan of Ohio, Sherrill, Norton, Underwood, Malinowski, Lois Frankel of Florida, Phillips, Langevin, Gottheimer, Sablan, Craig, Schrader, Brownley, Peters, Beatty, Titus, Barragan, Porter, and Bass.

**Joint Meetings**

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 2021**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

**Senate**

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, to receive a closed briefing on Department of Defense cyber operations, 9 a.m., SVC–217.

Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings to examine sexual assault in the military, 2:30 p.m., SD–106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the quarterly CARES Act report to Congress, 10 a.m., 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, 10 a.m., SH–216.

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, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider S. 400, to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Transportation located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, in Washington, DC, as the “William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building”, an original bill entitled, “Drinking Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Act”, and the nominations of Brenda Mallory, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Council on Environmental Quality, and Janet Garvin McCabe, of Indiana, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider S. 615, to establish an interagency program to assist countries in North Africa and West Africa to improve immediate and long-term capabilities to counter terrorist threats, S. 413, to establish the China Censorship Monitor and Action Group, S. 335, to reauthorize the Tropical Forest and Coral Reef Conservation Act of 1998, S. Res. 22, reaffirming the partnership between the United States and the Republic of Ecuador and recognizing the restoration and advancement of economic relations, security, and development opportunities in both nations, S. Res. 37, expressing solidarity with the San Isidro Movement in Cuba, condemning escalated attacks against artistic freedoms in Cuba, and calling for the repeal of laws that violate freedom of expression and the immediate release of arbitrarily detained artists, journalists, and activists, S. Res. 44, denouncing the Maduro regime’s fraudulent legislative elections, the absence of acceptable conditions to ensure free, fair, and transparent electoral processes in Venezuela, and the further erosion of Venezuelan democracy, S. Res. 81, honoring Las Damas de Blanco, a women-led nonviolent movement in support of freedom and human rights in Cuba, and calling for the release of all political prisoners in Cuba, S. Res. 34, recognizing the

**NEW PUBLIC LAWS**

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D242)

20th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States, S. Res. 117, expressing 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. 35, condemning the military coup that took place on February 1, 2021, in Burma and the Burmese military’s detention of civilian leaders, calling for an immediate and unconditional release of all those detained and for those elected to serve in parliament to resume their duties without impediment, S. Res. 36, reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Mongolia and recognizing the 30th anniversary of democracy in Mongolia, S. Res. 99, observing the 10th anniversary of the uprising in Syria, S. Res. 97, calling on the Government of Ethiopia, the Tigray People’s Liberation Front, and other belligerents to cease all hostilities, protect human rights, allow unfettered humanitarian access, and cooperate with independent investigations of credible atrocity allegations pertaining to the conflict in the Tigray Region of Ethiopia, S. Res. 114, commending the United States African Development Foundation on the occasion of its 40th anniversary for creating pathways to prosperity for underserved communities on the African continent through community-led development, an original bill entitled “Ukraine Security Partnership Act”, an original 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, and an original resolution reaffirming the importance of United States alliances and partnerships; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the state of democracy in Latin America and the Caribbean, 9:30 a.m., SD–106/VTC.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Cynthia M. Hannon Act, focusing on coping during COVID, 3 p.m., SD–G50.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SVC–217.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Management, Performance Challenges, and COVID Response at the Department of Justice”, 10:30 a.m., Webex.


Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “The Rural Economy”, 2 p.m., Webex.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Remediation and Impact of PFAS”, 2 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Extremism in the Armed Forces”, 12 p.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Education and Labor, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 7, the “Paycheck Fairness Act”; H.R. 1065, the “Pregnant Workers Fairness Act”; and H.R. 1195, the “Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act”, 12 p.m., Zoom.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Power Struggle: Examining the 2021 Texas Grid Failure”, 11:30 a.m., Webex.


Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance, hearing entitled “Preserving a Lifeline: Examining Public Housing in a Pandemic”, 12 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism, hearing entitled “State and Local Responses to Domestic Terrorism: The Attack on the U.S. Capitol and Beyond”, 9:30 a.m., Webex.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties, hearing entitled “Examining the Need to Expand Eligibility Under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act”, 2 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled “How the Biden Administration’s Build Back Better Plan Can Benefit the U.S. Territories”, 10 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Honoring ‘Equal Pay Day’: Examining the Long-Term Economic Impacts of Gender Inequality”, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing entitled “Examining R&D Pathways to Sustainable Aviation”, 11 a.m., Webex.
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 610, the “San Francisco Bay Restoration Act”; H.R. 1144, the “Promoting United Government Efforts to Save our Sound Act”; H.R. 587, the “Ocean Pollution Reduction Act II”; H.R. 1921, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Act to reauthorize the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program, and for other purposes; H.R. 2008, the “Local Water Protection Act”; H.R. 1765, the “Washington Channel Public Access Act”; H.R. 468, the “Expedited Delivery of Airport Infrastructure Act of 2021”; H.R. 1262, the “Notice to Airman Improvement Act of 2021”; H.R. 390, to redesignate the Federal Building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee as the “Odell Horton Federal Building”; H.R. 1703, the “National Children’s Museum Act”; H.R. 1917, the “Hazard Eligibility and Local Projects Act”; H.R. 593, the “Preventing Disaster Revictimization Act”; H.R. 1951, the “Increase Federal Disaster Cost Share Act of 2021”; H.R. 2016, the “Federal Disaster Assistance Coordination Act”; and General Services Administration’s Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions, 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “The Pandemic and VA’s Medical Supply Chain: Evaluating the Year-Long Response and Modernization”, 2 p.m., Webex.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will resume consideration of the nominations of Rachel Leland Levine, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, and David Turk, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy, and vote on the motions to invoke cloture thereon at 11:30 a.m. If cloture is invoked, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nominations at 4:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2 p.m., Friday, March 26

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 2 p.m.
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