United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2021 No. 73

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, a Senator from the State of Delaware.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, give our lawmakers the wisdom to remember to be grateful for all the things You have already done.

Lord, You have sustained our Nation during seasons of war and peace. You have helped us find creative ways to strive for a more perfect Union. You have provided us with solutions to difficult problems just when we needed You most.

Eternal Spirit, let this day be a time when Senators feel gratitude for Your bountiful blessings and faithfulness. May they express this gratitude by striving to live one day at a time, focusing on Your mercy, love, and grace.

We pray in Your loving 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:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 28, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, a Senator from the State of Delaware, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. COONS 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.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO ''OIL AND NATURAL GAS SECTOR: EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW, RECONSTRUCTED, AND MODIFIED SOURCES REVIEW''

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 48, S.J. Res. 14, the methane CRA.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the joint resolution, S.J. Res. 14.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 48, S.J. Res. 14, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review.''

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the provisions of title 5, U.S.C., chapter 802, there will now be up to 10 hours of debate, equally divided.

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, at the start of the year, the Senate Democrats pledged that one of our top priorities would be tackling climate change. I directed all of our incoming committee chairs to hold hearings and prepare legislation on the climate crisis. I promised that any infrastructure bill would be green and focused on creating the green jobs of the future. Both of these efforts, I am happy to report, are well under way.

And, today, as we approach the 100-day mark of this new Congress, the Senate will take the first major step in combating climate change on the Senate floor, by reinstating safeguards against methane emissions.

Specifically, today's vote will use the Congressional Review Act to reimpose commonsense regulations against methane leaks from the oil and gas industry, from production and processing to transmission and storage.

And let me note that this would be the first time that the Senate Democratic majority has used the Congressional Review Act. It is no mistake that we have chosen to use the law first on the subject of climate change.

Under this Democratic majority, the Senate will be a place where we take decisive, ambitious, and effective action against climate change. And this CRA, the reinstatement of the rule dealing with methane emissions, will be the most significant act that the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Senate has taken on climate change in more than a decade—and maybe several decades. This measure will help us address the climate crisis in a very serious way.

Methane doesn't get as much attention as CO_2, carbon dioxide, but it packs a bigger punch. Over 20 years, a ton of methane warms the atmosphere 86 times more than carbon dioxide. Thankfully, methane degrades faster in our atmosphere, and curbing methane emissions is relatively cheap.

So when it comes to global warming, tackling methane delivers a huge bang for your buck. Even a little bit of methane reduction goes a long way, and it moves far more quickly than carbon dioxide reduction. So as we move on this bill, which will have its effect on global warming within a year, it gives us some time, although we don't have much, to deal with the longer term and even more difficult issues of carbon dioxide.

That is why President Obama put the rules in place nearly 6 years ago. And at the time, amazingly enough, even the oil and gas industry welcomed them. Industry doesn't want leaks in their pipelines and production any more than we do.

But President Trump, inexplicably, did away with these safeguards last September. It seems he does these things out of pique, mindlessly opposing something just because his predecessor, Barack Obama, did it. It is very possible that the President didn't even understand what he was doing. But he so often acted out of anger and vindictiveness, not out of what was good for the country, that he ended up doing this.

I am greatly looking forward to righting that wrong today, hopefully, in a bipartisan fashion. We have at least one Republican Senator who has joined us, and I hope that many more will follow suit. If the leaders of the oil and gas industry are for this, how could our Republican friends not vote for it? I won't speculate on the reasons, but none of them are good.

I want to commend my colleagues who have been leaders on this issue: Senator HEINRICH, Senator KING, Senator MARKEY. President Biden has challenged the United States to cut its greenhouse gas emissions in half by 2030. The best way to achieve this ambitious goal is through bold action by this Congress, through legislation to reduce greenhouse pollution while creating millions of jobs and economic prosperity in the new clean energy economy.

This is the first and a large step in that direction. We have many more steps we must take, of course. The Senate begins the important work of dealing with the climate crisis today by passing these very, very significant, commonsense rules on methane.

AMERICAN FAMILIES PLAN

Mr. President, now on a different matter, this morning, President Biden unveiled landmark legislation designed to give American families a better chance to succeed in the 21st century economy, combining investments in education, childcare, and workforce training.

The American Families Plan, as it is called, makes exactly the types of investment our country should have been making for a very long time. In many of these areas, the United States has lagged well behind other developed countries. Governments throughout Europe dedicate a significantly higher portion of their GDP to workforce retraining and offer more flexible family leave policies.

Some say these kinds of policies are not infrastructure, but they very much are. Childcare is a necessity in the 21st century, and a lack of access to childcare can be a throttle on future economic growth because it affects millions of American families.

As technology and automation replace jobs in certain sectors of the economy, workforce training is a must. Giving our children a head start earlier in life with pre-K education has benefits that span a child's entire life and so will affect our country positively for decades to come, economically, socially, and in renewing the American spirit, which is so important to our future.

These things are just as important. The kinds of policies that deal with human infrastructure are just as important as roads and bridges, which, of course, are, no doubt, important in their own right. This is not an either/or—human infrastructure or brick-and-mortar structure. We must say yes to both. We don't want to choose one versus the other. That is like choosing between children, both of whom we love.

In the modern world, we need both infrastructure that matches a 21st century economy and human infrastructure that allows our workers and families to succeed in it. So I applaud President Biden for putting this plan together. It is just the right approach.

I would add one final comment here. All of our Republican colleagues—every single one—regrettably, chose to oppose the American Rescue Plan, despite the fact that a majority of Republican voters approved of the legislation. There seems to be a huge dichotomy between Republicans in Washington and Republicans in the rest of the country who approve of many of the policies in President Biden's plans.

Republicans in the rest of the country approved of the checks and investing in vaccines, and they approve of investing in infrastructure. I suspect many of these policies in the American Families Plan will get high marks as well. Childcare is popular. Early pre-K is popular. Early school-hood training is popular. Free community college is popular. The list goes on.

Will our Republican colleagues start to listen to their constituents as well as the rest of the country, or are they still the party of Donald Trump, a party that opposes the other side at all costs? That is no good for America; that is no good for bipartisanship; and it is not even good for the Republican Party's future.

FIRST 100 DAYS

Mr. President, now, tonight President Biden will address a joint session of Congress to mark the progress of our first 100 days and talk about where we, as a country, still need to go. I expect President Biden, unlike his predecessor, will lay out the facts and appeal to our better angels. That is what he has been doing over these past 100 days: restoring respective, truthful, and responsive government.

Almost as important is what President Biden is not doing. President Biden is not constantly stoking division, outrage, and racial animus. He doesn't fan the flames of every single culture war. He doesn't seek to personally dominate every single news cycle. He doesn't insult, degrade, or constantly lie. And it matters.

Newspapers are littered with firsthand accounts of Americans who feel they can finally sleep at night without worrying about what new scandal, outrage, or unhinged tweet the next morning would bring. As one Republican operative put it recently, ''Now there's a sense of relief. Imagine there's a car alarm that's been going off for a long time and suddenly it's quiet.''

Politics is an important part of American life, but it is not meant to be all-consuming. It is not supposed to keep average citizens up at night. Politics is supposed to be where we come together to solve our differences amicably, not an arena of endless partisan warfare or a bottomless pit of chaos.

So as President Biden prepares to address the Nation tonight, it is worth noting that, as much as we have accomplished in the first 100 days, the contrast in style, tone, and effectiveness between President Biden and President Trump is important too.

As we seek to repair the wounds left by January 6, as we seek to restore faith in government and in our democracy, it is important—so important—to have political leaders who act with dignity, honor, and have fidelity to the truth.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, tonight President Biden will deliver his first address to a joint session of Congress. I will be there, and, like my fellow Kentuckians watching at home, I will be curious to hear how President Biden tries to square his rhetoric with the administration's actions over the past 100 days.

Back in January, many Americans hoped they could take the incoming President at his word. After a year spent beating back a historic pandemic

and grappling with civil unrest, President Biden pledged he would be ''a President for all Americans,'' with plans to ''repair,'' ''restore,'' and ''heal.''

The American people elected a 50–50 Senate, a closely divided House, and a President who preached moderation. He promised that his whole soul was committed to uniting our people. Many hoped his administration would reflect that promise, but the first 100 days have left much to be desired.

Over a few short months, the Biden administration seems to have given up on selling actual unity in favor of catnip for their liberal base, covered with a hefty coat of false advertising.

That is how the so-called American Rescue Plan, a grab-bag spending bill that directed less than 10 percent to vaccines and pandemic healthcare, was marketed as a COVID–19 relief measure. In actuality, it sent sums of money to State governments whose revenues had already rebounded and declared war on the formerly bipartisan consensus that welfare spending should actually be linked to work.

Or take H.R. 1, the sweeping effort by Democrats to mount a partisan takeover of all 50 States' voting laws, along with the Federal Election Commission for good measure. After a Republican won the White House in 2016, this was billed as a massive overhaul for a broken democracy. Now a nearly identical plan is, instead, being marketed as a modest dose of preventive maintenance. It is still the same takeover it has always been.

And now we have the American Jobs Plan, another multitrillion-dollar smorgasbord of liberal social engineering that would decimate entire industries and spend only a small fraction on roads and bridges. It is being sold as a serious effort to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure. It is pretty brazen misdirection.

At both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, Democrats have chosen to live in an alternate universe where both the campaign promises they made and the mandate the American people delivered were actually completely different than what happened right here on planet Earth.

Unfortunately, the real-life effects of this false advertising campaign have come thick and fast: pain and uncertainty at home and dwindling leverage and virtue-signaling abroad.

First came mixed messages on the status of the pandemic. Existing vaccine distribution efforts surpassed President Biden's supposedly ambitious daily target on the day he was sworn in.

When their own top health officials accidentally let slip the hard science on school reopenings, the administration bowed to Big Labor and walked back their comments.

And the President continues to issue directives that are strangely out of step with the science, like his big announcement several weeks ago that, if citizens behave themselves—behave themselves—he would actually permit them to enjoy small outdoor gatherings on July 4th that the CDC guidance already said would be safe right now.

Then there is the environmental policy. On day one, President Biden rushed to cancel a pipeline project that would have employed thousands of Americans and freeze permitting for more safe, reliable domestic energy. He also announced an urgent return to an Obama-era deal that has proven unable to curb the signatories' carbon emissions and unnecessary for the United States to reduce our own.

Why would he do that? Because the far left demanded it. In fact, the most radical liberals in Congress have taken credit for the input of their Green New Deal manifesto over this President's new agenda.

Meanwhile, Democrats have decidedly avoided taking ownership of the results of their own campaign rhetoric on immigration. Reckless mixed messaging has come home to roost in the form of a humanitarian and security crisis on our southern border. Soaring numbers of migrants are arriving, some wearing Biden campaign shirts, convinced, as one put it, that ''Biden promised us that everything was going to change.'' Among them are record numbers of unaccompanied children, cramped into overflow facilities, who have become the tragic face of this story. Yet through it all, the White House's foremost concern seems to have been to avoid calling this what it is: a crisis.

And while broken immigration policy threatens security at our borders, a dangerously misguided foreign policy threatens our safety and standing overseas. Years of carefully assembled multilateral sanctions had created an economic straitjacket around Iran's terrorist state. But in its haste to turn the clocks back to the Obama era, President Biden's negotiators have offered to give up massive portions of this leverage just to get Iran back to a failed nuclear deal.

Further east, American forces have been ordered to make a hasty, total withdrawal from Afghanistan; to leave coalition partners and vulnerable Afghans high and dry, especially women and girls; to pave the way for Taliban rule; and to enable an al-Qaida resurgence that could again threaten our homeland.

And while national security experts are nearly unanimous in urging the administration to focus on competition with Russia and China, the White House has proposed to cut defense spending after inflation and put our Armed Forces on the back foot—ignoring the facts, passing the buck, and squandering leverage.

This is not what the American people bargained for, and they know it doesn't have to be this way. Past Presidents and Congresses have found ways to work effectively to make lasting and bipartisan progress on important issues. For example, when we have crafted smart policies to improve actual infrastructure, big bipartisan majorities have signed on.

Just last year, when we worked across the aisle on targeted rescue packages to help American families weather a once-in-a-century pandemic, not one—not one—of the five bills we passed last year earned fewer than 90 votes right here in the Senate. This year, the story has been different.

Behind President Biden's familiar face, it is like the most radical Washington Democrats have been handed the keys, and they are trying to speed as far left as they can possibly go before American voters ask for the car back.

But it is not too late. This White House can shake off its daydreams of a sweeping socialist legacy that will never happen in the United States. They can recommit to solving our Nation's actual problems, to fostering consensus instead of deepening our divide.

That is what the American people want and what they deserve, not an administration that chooses to govern like it owes everything—everything—to the radical left.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

S.J. RES. 14

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I am proud to join with the majority leader and with my colleagues from Maine and Massachusetts to lead this effort to restore responsible methane emission standards at the EPA. We can take commonsense action right now to slow climate change and simultaneously reduce the incredible waste of a valuable energy resource.

Methane is the primary constituent in natural gas. It is an incredibly potent driver of the greenhouse effect. Over the short term, it is actually 86 times more powerful than CO_2 emissions. It is estimated that about a quarter of all the human-caused global warming that has occurred since the Industrial Revolution can be attributed to methane emissions.

In the United States, the lion's share of these human-caused methane emissions are from the production of oil and gas. That is due in part to outdated—oftentimes, even faulty—equipment and pipes that leak methane into the air, wellheads that leak methane.

Many oil and gas operators also engage in a practice known as flaring, where operators ignite and burn off excess gas, and, worse yet, venting, where uncombusted natural gas is simply released into the air.

Now, beyond the obvious consequences for climate change, these types of methane emissions waste incredibly valuable energy resources.

Fugitive methane also harms public health by polluting the air that we breathe. When methane leaks from oil and gas wells or pipelines or other infrastructure, harmful carcinogens—

carcinogens like benzene and other volatile organic compounds—also leak into the air alongside it. That means more children suffering from asthma attacks and more seniors having trouble breathing.

Methane pollution is real and present in many States, and it is a real problem in my State of New Mexico. We saw clear evidence of this over the Four Corners region in northwestern New Mexico—the San Juan Basin—and southwestern Colorado, when a giant cloud of methane, about the size of the State of Delaware, became so large by the mid-2000s that it could actually be seen by NASA satellite images.

This chart right here is a map from NASA of the western United States. You can see right here the cloud of methane over the Four Corners, which coincides exactly with the San Juan Basin, where much of our oil and gas has been produced over the course of the last several decades.

You can see from this map, from the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, how real and urgent the issue is. In recent years, researchers have detected increasing levels of dangerous methane pollution now over southeastern New Mexico, over the Permian Basin, where oil and gas operations have been booming for the last decade.

It is clear that this oil and gas producing region has joined the San Juan Basin as another major contributor to our methane emissions challenge.

Late last year, the EPA and the New Mexico Environment Department conducted helicopter flights over both the San Juan and Permian Basins. They used forward-looking infrared technology that can detect emissions from oil and gas operations that would normally be invisible to the naked eye.

I think if you could see methane, we would have solved many of these problems a long time ago.

For an example of what this technology can help us see at an individual oil and gas operation level, look at this side-by-side image from the group Earthworks. As you can see, this is what the human eye sees—simple oil and gas infrastructure, the number of tanks, some piping. But by using infrared imaging, you can see the enormous amount of methane simply being vented or leaking into the air. That entire plume is invisible to the naked eye, and, were it not so, I would, once again, suggest that we would have solved these problems a long time ago.

The overflights that were conducted by the New Mexico Environment Department found that methane leak rates over New Mexico's Permian Basin in 2020 had increased by 250 percent over 2019 levels. It is simply unacceptable.

Nationally, the Environmental Defense Fund has found that while oil and gas production has not yet rebounded from a crash brought on by the pandemic last year, methane emissions are already soaring back to prepandemic levels.

That is completely unacceptable when companies have the knowledge, have the technology, have the workforce to fix these leaks and stop the wasteful practices of venting and flaring.

When we set clear rules and emission standards, most oil and gas operators are onboard with updating their equipment and their practices to minimize methane leaks and to bring that natural gas that they produce to market. That is their business plan, not wasting methane.

We saw this bear out in practice in New Mexico over these past 2 years, as our State's oil conservation commission convened conservation and public health advocates and local oil and gas producers to establish State-level methane emissions rules.

New Mexico's new rules govern not just oil and gas production sites but also things like pipelines and storage sites that also oftentimes leak methane into the atmosphere.

And under our new State rules, oil and gas operators have the flexibility to choose the best technologies to meet the target of capturing 98 percent of their natural gas by 2026.

A spokesperson for the New Mexico Oil and Gas Association recently said that the group supports this goal and the newly finalized rules, which promote ''safe, responsible production of oil and gas.''

New Mexico has now joined other western States—States such as Colorado, North Dakota, and Wyoming—that have already adopted strong State-level methane emissions rules.

Until just recently, we also had strong Federal methane rules in place at the EPA. Now, unfortunately, these rules became one more target of the Trump administration's reckless rollbacks of protections of our clean air and clean water in this country. Late last year, President Trump dismantled an EPA rule that required oil and gas producers to monitor for methane leaks at their wells, at their compressor stations, and at their other operations.

This rule, or rollback of a rule, is simply a disaster for our climate and for public health. It was even rejected by much of the industry that it was purporting to help. Many leading American oil and gas producers and companies simply panned President Trump's rollback of these commonsense methane standards. As just one example, Gretchen Watkins, Shell's president in the United States, called the Trump administration's rollback ''frustrating and disappointing,'' and pledged to voluntarily continue reducing their methane emissions.

Why would they do that? Because it is the right thing to do, because it makes business sense, because the rollback was, frankly, nonsensical.

So repairing leaks and installing new leak detection technologies will also create a number of good-paying jobs. It is really the epitome of a win-win situation.

Without clear Federal rules in place at the EPA, however, industry-led voluntary emissions reductions simply won't go far enough to curb the problem that we have. We need clear standards that create clear requirements for reducing waste and harmful pollution.

And it is not just me saying this. Since we announced this effort to use the Congressional Review Act, more and more leading companies in the oil and gas sector have come forward to say that they would welcome reinstating the EPA's methane emissions standards.

That includes the EQT Corporation, one of the Nation's leading natural gas producers, which operates in West Virginia and Ohio and Pennsylvania. In a statement, EQT's president and CEO, Toby Rice, called the reinstating of uniform Federal methane standards ''sound federal policies'' and committed to ''producing our natural gas in accordance with high environmental and social standards.''

The major oil company Total USA says:

> We welcome direct federal regulation of methane emissions and support resolution via the Congressional Review Act.

Shell U.S. tweeted:

> Sound policy surrounding natural gas is critical to its role in the energy transition. We need to restore the direct federal regulation of methane emissions—and we urge Congress to approve the methane resolution under the Congressional Review Act.

Not my words; Shell—one of the world's major producers of oil and gas.

These are the words of industry leaders who welcome us setting clear standards on methane emissions.

We are voting to reinstate the commonsense methane requirements for the oil and gas industry's production and processing segments and the methane and volatile organic compound requirements for oil and gas transmission and storage facilities.

With this vote, Congress will once again affirm that the Clean Air Act requires the EPA to take action to protect the air that Americans breathe from dangerous and harmful pollutants like methane, just like we did back in 2017 when the Senate came together on a bipartisan basis to uphold similar rules that govern oil and gas production on Federal Bureau of Land Management lands. In that vote, our former colleague Senator John McCain and our colleagues Senator SUSAN COLLINS and Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM joined with Senate Democrats in retaining the BLM's methane rule that promoted responsible development of natural gas resources on our public lands.

I would hope that all of us, and I mean all of us, sincerely—this is an effort that should receive the support of every single Senator in this body. I would hope that all of us can come together on a bipartisan basis once again to restore and strengthen responsible Federal methane standards for oil and gas operators. I am so pleased that

Senator COLLINS has already joined us as a cosponsor on this resolution.

Finally, I would like to point out that these rules are important not just to the health of oil and gas producing States like New Mexico or Wyoming or Colorado, because these rules will ensure the safety of not just oil and gas production sites but also of the gas pipelines and the storage sites that exist in every State in this country and in communities across this country.

These upstream segments of the oil and gas industry are in every single community you can imagine in all parts of the Nation. Just like we all know we need to remove poisonous lead from our drinking water pipes, we need to be sure that the natural gas lines that run into our homes and into our businesses are not leaking harmful methane pollution in the very spaces where we all breathe and live.

As we transition towards a 100-percent clean energy future, a future without pollution, we must do all that we can to mitigate the harmful pollution caused by our current use of fossil fuels, and that is exactly what these rules are designed to do.

As President Biden demonstrated just last week when he convened leaders from around the globe, Americans are ready for us to move past former President Trump's backward and reckless vision on climate. Restoring and strengthening methane standards at the EPA will be one of the most powerful steps we can all take here in this Senate today to confront the existential threat posed by greenhouse pollution and a warming planet, and it will make the air over all of our communities cleaner and healthier and easier to breathe.

For all of these reasons, I would encourage once again not just a few of my colleagues but all of our colleagues to join us in voting for this bipartisan resolution to restore some commonsense and some responsible Federal standards for the waste and leakage of methane.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Republican whip.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this evening President Biden will deliver his first address to Congress. I have been asked, I think as most Members have, by the media: What do you expect to hear? What do you want to hear?

Honestly, I am interested to hear the direction the President will set in his speech. The President's inaugural address leaned heavily into the theme of unity and bipartisanship, but unity and bipartisanship have not been a distinguishing feature of the Biden Presidency.

The President's first major bill, a COVID relief bill, broke the streak of bipartisanship on COVID legislation—a streak that goes back to March of last year. Since that time, when we were the majority, we passed five bills, all of them with big bipartisan majorities. Under President Biden, Democrats shoved through a totally partisan bill filled with non-COVID-related liberal priorities.

Republicans were more than ready to work with Democrats on additional coronavirus legislation. In fact, 10 Republicans developed a COVID proposal and then met with President Biden to discuss it. But Democrats and the President were having none of it. It was ''their way or the highway'' on COVID legislation. No bipartisanship. No compromise. It was, support the Democrats' bill and its wasteful spending on non-COVID-related priorities or be left out of the discussion. As I pointed out, only about 10 percent—10 percent—of that ''COVID bill'' was actually COVID related.

It was a deeply disappointing start to the Biden Presidency and a betrayal of the unity that President Biden had pledged himself to in his inauguration address.

Unfortunately, the Biden Presidency has mostly continued along in the same partisan fashion. The President promised to be a President for the whole people yet seems more focused on making sure that he is the President for the far left. You don't have to take my word for it. One of the leading voices of the far left in this Congress recently stated that President Biden had exceeded—not met; exceeded—progressives' expectations.

Between Democrats and the White House, the first 3 months of the Biden Presidency have been a long stream of policies and proposals that seem to have come right from the progressives' playbook—proposals for tax hikes and more tax hikes and still more tax hikes to pay for new government programs like the President's Green New Dealesque Civilian Climate Corps; a sharp retreat from border security, with a huge crisis going on at the border as a result; a bill that would place unprecedented restrictions on the free exercise of religion in the name of equality; legislation to dramatically revise our electoral system to ensure Democrats' hold on power. The list goes on.

Once an ardent defender of America's core institutions, the President recently established a commission to explore the idea of court-packing—perhaps the most outrageously partisan and political proposal we have seen in this century.

From the way Democrats are behaving, you would think that the American people had elected overwhelming Democratic majorities and a President with a reputation as a strong leftist. Of course, that isn't close to being the case. We all know that. Democrats have a razor-thin majority in the Senate and an almost equally thin majority in the House of Representatives, where they lost a substantial number of seats. 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. That is right. Even among primary Democratic voters, the Democrats' far-left liberal candidates did not fare so well.

If there was any mandate in the election, it was a mandate for moderation, for compromise. Yet the President and Democrats are behaving as if they had been delivered a mandate for a partisan revolution.

There has been one encouraging thing lately, and that is the fact that President Biden seems to actually be considering pursuing bipartisanship on an infrastructure package. He has had multiple meetings on infrastructure with Republican Members of Congress, and while I am still waiting to see just how committed the Democrats are to achieving a bipartisan result, I am encouraged that the President is at least talking to the Republican Members.

A bipartisan infrastructure proposal should be a slam dunk. Congress has a history of bipartisan collaboration on infrastructure legislation. In fact, our last major infrastructure bill, the FAST Act, received strong support from both Democrats and Republicans and was a remarkably successful bill.

As chairman of the Commerce Committee, I helped to spearhead a bipartisan reauthorization of the FAA, including of critical programs to improve airport infrastructure, and last Congress, the Environment and Public Works Committee developed major bipartisan infrastructure legislation.

There is no good reason that we shouldn't reach bipartisan agreement on another substantial infrastructure bill, but it will require a commitment from the Democrats and the President to real bipartisan work and a recognition that bipartisanship involves compromise and that no one side is going to get everything its Members want.

Bipartisanship is not the Democrats inviting the Republicans to support the Democrats' ideal bill. Bipartisanship is sitting down at the table, identifying what we agree on, and then working out a solution to our differences that involves both sides accepting compromises.

I hope that, tonight, the President will go beyond empty talk about bipartisanship and make an actual, concrete commitment to achieve bipartisan results, starting with infrastructure legislation. I hope, although I do not really expect, that he will move away from the policies and partisan priorities of the far left and toward a more moderate vision, more in keeping with the bringing together of Americans that he spoke of in his inaugural address.

Ultimately, what matters the most is not what the President will say tonight

but what he will do in the days and weeks to come. Will he finally deliver on that promise of unity that he spoke of in his inaugural address or will he continue to pursue the partisan path that progressives have laid out for him? For the sake of our country, I hope he chooses bipartisanship.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S.J. RES. 14

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the resolution of disapproval on the Trump EPA's methane policy rule.

This resolution we have in front of us today is nothing more than political posturing, I believe. Ironically, the Democrats are targeting natural gas for blame when methane emissions have actually fallen. According to EPA data, natural gas systems in the United States reduced their overall methane emissions by nearly 16 percent between 1990 and 2019. It is widely recognized that the shale gas boom led to significant greenhouse gas emissions reductions across our power sector.

Some climate change advocates, including those in Washington, want to ban oil and gas production and use, and they oppose the maintenance and expansion of our pipelines in this country. The CRA is part of that effort, I believe.

The CRA is part of a plan to double down on an industry that the Biden administration—obviously, from the day the President took office—does not support. Just yesterday, the Biden administration's Office of Management and Budget issued a Statement of Administration Policy on the resolution we are considering today. The statement does not hide the disdain that the administration has toward the oil and gas sector. The statement presents a laundry list of alleged harms to Americans from the oil and gas industry and none of the benefits. It doesn't mention that, as our natural gas production and use have gone up, our country's overall greenhouse gas emissions have gone down. It does not talk about the wage gap between natural gas sector jobs and so-called green jobs.

As POLITICO reported this week, ''The median wage for solar workers is $24.48 an hour compared with $30.33 for those employed by the natural gas sector, which amounts to a roughly $12,000 annual wage gap.''

In yesterday's statement, the administration showed its cards for its next step. The passage of this resolution would lay the groundwork for a planned regulatory war on oil and gas.

According to the administration, today's resolution ''clear[s] the pathway for EPA to evaluate opportunities to promulgate even stronger standards under section 111 of the Clean Air Act to address dangerous methane and other pollution from both new and existing sources across the oil and gas sector.''

That is right. They want to come forward with even stronger clean air regulations on the sector than the Obama administration did. But before even starting a rulemaking to ask for public comments, the Biden administration has made up its mind to regulate much more aggressively. I guess I am not really surprised. Now it is time; it is just waiting to identify the best opportunities to do so.

We shouldn't demonize an industry that is part of the lifeblood of our economy. We should celebrate the emission-reduction accomplishments and look for ways to further incentivize those. Let's focus on solutions that address our climate challenges without destroying the economic engines of growth, solutions that don't pick winners and losers.

The market is pushing industry to lower its methane emissions. And for those still flaring gas, one way to reduce flaring is to build out our pipeline infrastructure so they can get the gas—the very commodity they are trying to produce and sell—to the market.

So let's come up with solutions that actually help protect our planet and don't overregulate industry for political points, solutions like improving the environmental review and permitting processes so that we can complete these pipeline projects more efficiently and cleaner.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution, and I urge my colleagues to focus on real, unifying solutions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

WORKERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today is Workers Memorial Day, when we remember all of the workers in our Nation who have been killed, who have been injured, or who became sick on the job. On this day, we reflect upon the losses these workers and their families have suffered, and we also—and I believe we must—recommit ourselves to ensuring that every worker in America is safe on the job.

On a day like today, I am remembering Pennsylvania workers—not only the workers of today and the challenges they face in the workplace and the challenges their families still face, especially in the grip of and, we hope, ultimately in the aftermath of a terrible pandemic, but we are also, of course, remembering those who came before them, generations of workers in a State like Pennsylvania, folks who built this country, made this country run, and helped us win World War II, not to mention other battles, economic and otherwise.

So we are remembering those stories. I am also remembering, of course, on a day like today a lot of stories from my home area. I live in northeastern Pennsylvania. I live in Scranton, PA, which at one time was the anthracite coal capital of the world, that region was. Every family, every community seemed to have a story about one of their loved ones—sometimes a grandfather or a great grandfather or an uncle or a grandmother or some relative—and how they struggled in those days.

One story is not, unfortunately, atypical. This is a story about an 11-year-old boy working in the anthracite coal mines.

In those days, in order to pull the coal out of the coal mine, you had to fill a coal car with coal, but it had to be pulled out of the mines by a mule. I am talking about the early 1900s.

In this case, this 11-year-old boy—and, of course, it was permissible in those days to allow someone that young to work in a coal mine—this young kid reached down to get the straps that connected the mule to the coal car, and then, when he was bending down to pick up one of those leather straps, the rear hooves of the mule kicked him square in the face.

Here is the description of what happened after that mule kicked the 11-year-old, and I am reading from an account:

> [The] kick hurled him over a loaded five-foot-high coal car and into the wall of the mine—the ''face'' of the mine, as the miners would say.

The 11-year-old had his nose smashed.

> He had an open wound from his forehead across his eyebrow, down his nose, through his lip, and into his chin.
>
> No ambulance was called. No paramedics came to save him. Work didn't even stop.

Then the account goes on to talk about how the mine boss had another young kid walk this 11-year-old out of the mine, taking the child home—a long, perilous journey home.

> Once he finally made it home, [the 11 year old's] mother called a doctor and they laid him on the dining room table, where the doctor sewed the long gouge in his face back together. There were no benefits—no worker's compensation, no safety net in place to take care of the adult worker, much less an injured child.

That is, unfortunately, an account that was all too common in those days. Much has changed, fortunately, but, candidly, not enough.

We mark today the 50th anniversary of the Occupational Safety and Health Act going into effect. It just happens to be today. This is a landmark achievement in the fight to guarantee every worker a safe workplace. It was passed because of the tireless efforts of workers and unions that stood up for their fellow working men and women and demanded government action that led to the so-called OSHA Act. There remains, of course, much work to be done to protect our workers.

Let's turn to the pandemic and our workers.

The COVID–19 pandemic has made clearer than ever the need for action to

strengthen workplace protections, ensure workers can stand up and advocate for safe workplaces.

The virus has touched every workplace in the country, presenting a new threat to workers' health on the job unlike any we have seen in our lifetimes.

Throughout the pandemic, millions of workers have been at risk—at risk of contracting the virus as they did their work, having to worry every day when they headed home about their health and, of course, the health of their families.

The death toll from this virus, this pandemic, is staggering. More than 570,000 Americans are dead; more than 26,000 in Pennsylvania. These, of course, were mothers and fathers and grandmothers and grandfathers, sisters and brothers, neighbors and friends.

The disproportionate effect on people of color is also staggering—those who are widely represented in the essential workforces that have continued to go to work every day throughout the pandemic. This disproportionate impact on people of color has been especially disturbing and devastating.

The toll never should have been this high, and workers never should have had to face the risk they faced every day during the pandemic.

To honor all of these workers and their families, we must continue to take action to protect them on the job and ensure that workers are never left as vulnerable as they were in the pandemic.

Now, we have made some steps—taken some steps recently. The American Rescue Plan, passed by Congress and signed into law by President Biden, has already been critical to helping protect workers from COVID–19. The rescue plan provided billions to help get Americans the vaccines they need and to ensure that frontline workers receive the supplies and personal protective equipment they need to stay safe on the job. It also included $100 million for OSHA to protect workers on the job. So we can celebrate that on this celebration of Workers Memorial Day. This $100 million in funding is essential to help defeat the pandemic but also, in the process, to keep workers safe.

We must ensure that policies are in place to strengthen our workplace safety laws and also to strengthen enforcement.

We must ensure that the highest standards—the highest standards—which are informed by recent science, exist to protect workers from all threats to their health, whether it is exposure to COVID–19 in a grocery store or silica dust in a coal mine.

We must strengthen workers' ability, of course, to organize and bargain collectively by passing the PRO Act, the Protecting the Right to Organize Act. The PRO Act would ensure workers have a voice on the job and are able to advocate for safe working conditions.

We must ensure that OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and its sister Agency, MSHA, the Mine Safety and Health Administration, have the authority, the resources, and the personnel they need to protect workers every day of every year.

Our Nation's workforce has done heroic work throughout this pandemic. One part of that workforce that has done both essential and heroic work over the past year is our Nation's home- and community-based services workforce, often not talked about in the debates here in Congress.

These workers are the backbone of our caregiving infrastructure, and we know that as part of the rescue plan, President Biden—I am sorry—as part of the American Jobs Plan the President has proposed and we have not yet passed, but we are working on it, President Biden has called for a $400 billion investment to be directed to invest in seniors and people with disabilities and to support this vital and undervalued workforce.

This great American idea to develop the best caregiving workforce in the world—not one of the best, not second or third, the best workforce in the world—to care for and to provide support and services to people with disabilities and seniors—this great American idea is an idea that is focused on that workforce, which is a workforce primarily of women of color making only $12 an hour.

We can't say that we have the best caregiving workforce in the world if we are not going to invest in that workforce and lift them up. The American people want this to happen. This is overwhelmingly popular. More than 70 percent of the American people want us to make this investment in home- and community-based services, thereby lifting up that workforce so that we can provide better care for people with disabilities and seniors so they can not only survive but also thrive.

Making this investment is a vital part of raising standards and working conditions for this essential workforce and for all workers.

Let me conclude with this, the story of the 11-year-old boy kicked in the face in the anthracite coal mines of northeastern Pennsylvania. That 11-year-old was my grandfather. His name was Alphonsus Liguori Casey, and he, like a lot of young kids, started in the coal mines at that age, at the age of 11, between—worked in the mines between 1905 and 1910. Of course, when he worked in the mines, there were no protections—virtually none, even for a child. Thank goodness we have made a lot of progress since then, but we still have a long way to go to make sure that all workers in all workforces are protected in their workplace.

We also have to make sure we are making the appropriate investments in them to call ourselves the greatest country in the world. We can't say we are the greatest country in the world if we are paying people $11 or $12 an hour to do the important work they have to do every day and want to do. It is a high calling to care for people with disabilities and seniors.

So just like that 11-year-old boy and so many like him in those days, we have to make sure that today's workforce is the subject of our protection, is the subject of our attention, and is the subject of our investment. Let's lift them up so that we have the best workforce in the world and the safest workplaces, not only on Workers Memorial Day but every day.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S.J. RES. 14

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to speak on the upcoming methane Congressional Review Act matter and speak in support of overturning the Trump misrule regarding the problem of methane emissions.

Let's just start by setting the stage that about one-quarter of the global warming that we have experienced has been due to methane and about one-third of that is due to the activities of the oil and gas industry. So this is a very significant part of our climate problem—I should say our climate and oceans problem—and we don't actually know how bad it is.

The Environmental Defense Fund has recently estimated that methane emissions from oil and natural gas operations could be as much as 60 percent higher than previous estimates. So it is a significant part of the problem.

One of the reasons we don't know how bad the problem is, is because of the way the oil and gas industry has behaved about reporting its methane problem. Now, just to understand, what the natural gas industry would like to tell you is that natural gas is a far cleaner fuel, far safer from a climate perspective, than coal or than oil—bunker oil or whatever else you want to burn. And it is true that once natural gas has been burned at the burner tip, it is less harmful. But what the natural gas industry wants you to forget is everything between the well and the burner tip because through that enormous web of piping occurs so much leakage that satellites flying overhead can pick up the pools of methane floating in our atmosphere from the leakage. The natural gas industry doesn't want to talk about that.

One of the things that they did is they got the Trump administration to, early on, withdraw EPA's request that in the previous administration the industries more or less agreed to that would have required oil and gas companies to report on their methane emissions. When the fossil fuel apparatchiks occupied in the Trump

administration the offices at EPA, Energy, and Interior, and other places important to the industry, they did what the industry wanted, and the very first thing, March 2, 2017, was to withdraw the request that would have had oil and gas companies report how bad their methane leakage actually was.

It didn't take long to follow that up on March 28, with an Executive order from Trump directing EPA to suspend or rescind existing methane regulations for the oil and gas industry.

But that wasn't enough for the oil and gas industry. On April 19, they got EPA to postpone implementation of a rule that would have required them to equip new wells with equipment to prevent methane leaks. You wouldn't think that would be asking too much, particularly from an industry that wants to tell everybody that it is better for the climate and the environment than the rest of the fossil fuel industry. But no, they asked EPA to undo that requirement so they could more readily leak methane from new wells.

Even that wasn't enough. In May of 2017, they got the Department of the Interior to suspend a rule that would have required oil and gas companies to curb the flaring of methane from their oil and gas wells on public lands.

And then again, September 11, 2018, they got EPA to propose a rule to weaken the methane leak detection and repair requirements for their new wells—weaken the detection and repair requirements for methane leakage from their own wells.

Then they proposed a second rule to eliminate EPA's regulatory authority over methane emissions from oil and gas facilities. That is getting a little bit out there because methane is a greenhouse gas regulable as a pollutant by the EPA, and it also has a whole lot of unfortunate characteristics for people who have to breathe it in entirely apart from the climate harm and damage it does. But that is what the oil and gas industry wanted the EPA to do, to eliminate its regulatory authority over methane emissions.

Then, more recently, on August 13, 2020, they got EPA to promulgate a rule to eliminate that rule—to eliminate that regulatory authority over methane emissions from oil and gas facilities.

This is dirty conduct by an industry, to take advantage of its ability to plant industry operatives in positions of public responsibility in order to leak more methane, put less equipment in place to protect against methane leakage, and reduce its requirements even to report on the methane leakage that is going on. That is not responsible corporate conduct. These rules are a disgrace. The CRA should pass, and we should get on to taking on this problem of methane.

I will close by pointing out that I have a bill that would do quite a lot to solve this problem. One of the problems in this whole enterprise of pollution is that, when it is free to pollute, people will pollute. If corporations view themselves as having only an obligation to their shareholders and only an obligation to their shareholders that is denominated in dollars, why would they ever spend any money at all to protect against pollution, unless they were required to or unless it had a cost?

We know it actually has a cost. People suffer from pollution; that is a cost. Our oceans are acidifying because of carbon dioxide pollution; that is a cost. People lose their homes in wildfires that didn't used to happen; that is a cost. My State has to plan to lose its current map to sea level rise and to lose precious shorefront land; that is a cost. These are real costs. The industry just doesn't want to pay them. They want a free ride on everybody else's suffering, and one way to solve that is to put a price on the pollution.

And, by the way, this is not a liberal, Democratic environmental agenda. This is economics 101. Milton Friedman, for Pete's sake, said that if you want to have an economic system that works, you have to put what he called ''negative externalities,'' the bad things that happen that hurt other people. You have to put the cost of that into the product. Otherwise, you don't have a market system. You have a subsidy system. You are picking winners and losers.

As much as my colleagues on the other side like to say that they don't like subsidies and they don't want to see government picking winners and losers, when it is the fossil fuel industry that gets subsidized, when it is the fossil fuel industry that is the winner, they can't line up fast enough to subsidize and pick winners and losers.

So we are going to have to work pretty hard to solve this problem because we have some real hazards in front of us. What my bill would do is to measure the thing that they didn't want to do—measure methane emissions from oil and gas production. As I said, new developments in satellite technology means that we don't have to depend on them any longer. We can actually do a lot of this measuring. We can check their measuring. We can, to use Reagan's phrase, ''trust but verify'' what they are reporting with a whole lot of other data that we can pull together.

So get the data. How much are they leaking? Figure it out basin by basin because that is where it really happens. It happens in these pools that emerge from the basins from all of the leakage. And then put a price on it.

It is not hard to do. There is a social cost of carbon that President Obama proposed. President Biden has put it back in at the previous level, while they get to work on figuring out what updates there should be to it. We have a social cost of carbon. You can quantify the methane harm and compare it to the carbon harm. You can make an equivalency between those two and you can determine what the social cost of methane leakage should be. It is really not all that complicated.

We would start it in 2023, so that the industry, which has been so reprehensible in its leakage, in its influence over EPA, and in its influence in the Trump administration—we are actually giving them a chance to clean up their act and do what they should have done all along. So it would begin in 2023, and it would cost them $1,800 per ton of leaked methane.

You leak it; you pay for it. It is not that complicated. When I was growing up, we had a pretty simple rule in my family: You spill it; you clean it up. I don't know why that is suddenly not an appropriate rule when the company and the industry gets big enough and has enough political power and dark money to be pulling strings around here. That ought to be the rule. You spill it; you clean it up. You leak the methane; you pay for it.

So I hope that we can get that methane factor passed into law, as well, because we know perfectly well that this is not an industry that is going to pursue the public interest if it is not required to. We saw that in the Trump administration. We saw it on March 2, 2017. We saw it on March 28, 2017. We saw it on April 19, 2017. We saw it on May 10, 2017. We saw it on September 11, 2018, on August 28, 2019, and on August 13, 2020. Over and over and over again, they hurt the public by using their clout over the regulatory Agency of this country to their own benefit.

You can't count on them to take care of this on their own. They just won't. They have proven that. That is not a contested fact any longer. We gave them the chance to clean up their act without this kind of requirement, and they totally failed. In fact, they spent all their energy trying to degrade the regulatory authority that kept them trying to clean up methane.

Let's solve this problem. Methane is a real problem. There is a lot of it changing our climate. The climate situation has become an emergency. Methane is easily preventable from leaking. And, by the way, here is the added bonus: It gives a lot of people jobs. There is a lot of work that we can do to reclaim the damage that the fossil fuel industry has caused. Cleaning up the wells, cleaning up the mines, cleaning up the piping—those are all real jobs.

So let's get after it. Let's start with the CRA. Let's go on to a proper methane fee to put the leaking out of business and on from there.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

S.J. RES. 14

Mr. KING. Mr. President, later today we will have one of the most consequential votes we have had in this

body in years, perhaps the most consequential vote in terms of our climate and the risk that climate change imposes on all of us here in America and across the world. It is a pretty straightforward vote, although it is an interesting procedural problem.

The vote is a Congressional Review Act vote to repeal the repeal of the regulation on the release of methane from oil and gas, both drilling and transportation. A repeal of a repeal is the legislative equivalent of a double negative, and, of course, we all know a double negative produces a positive, and that is exactly what will happen in this case.

Some years ago, regulations were imposed upon the oil and gas industry to control the escape of methane from drilling operations. This isn't about natural gas or oil; this is about fugitive gases that escape into the atmosphere as part of the drilling process or the transportation process.

The problem is that methane is the nuclear weapon of climate change. Methane is 80 times as dangerous as CO_2 in the atmosphere, in terms of capturing heat and contributing to climate change—80 times; not 80 percent more, not 8 times more, 80 times more.

Now, the good news is methane only persists in the atmosphere for about 20 years; CO_2, unfortunately, over 100 years. So because of its short residence time and its high potency, removing it now will have immediate and substantial effects on the overall amount of greenhouse gas that is in our atmosphere.

There is nothing we can do in the short run to deal with climate change that is more significant than the vote that will take place on this floor in a few hours. This is probably, as I said at the beginning, one of the most important votes that we will have in this Chamber in order to forestall and slow the climate catastrophe that everyone acknowledges is headed toward us—whether it is wildfires, whether it is changes in ocean temperature that affect sea life, whether it is hurricanes, whether it is pure temperature.

Let me talk a bit about climate change as a national security issue. I serve on the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees. It is a national security issue for a number of reasons. One is sort of dollars and cents. It affects our military facilities around the world that are going to be affected by rising sea levels. We are going to have to spend billions of dollars in order to shore up those facilities. So that is just kind of nuts and bolts, dollars and cents.

But the part that really worries me is migration. We all know about the migrants from Syria, from the Syrian civil war. I don't know the exact number—maybe 4 or 5 million. But those migrants upset the political system of all of Europe and created a major political crisis.

The estimate for climate migrants because of the inhospitality of the climate in the band around the central part of the Earth is in the hundreds of millions—between 100 and 200 million climate migrants who are escaping a place that they can't live in anymore because of drought, because of famine, because of a lack of drinking water, or just because of high temperatures.

Humans aren't evolved to live in places that are at 130 degrees of heat. So people are going to be on the move. Think of the disruption caused by the immigration or the migration from Syria and multiply that by 10, 20, 30, 40 times. That is what we are talking about, and that kind of pressure and famine and drought and all of those things throughout history are what have caused wars.

It is a threat multiplier. It is a threat creator. It is, in fact, a national security issue. This isn't about just being concerned about whether we will have more warm days in April. This is a national security issue, and it is of worldwide import.

Now, why is this vote today important if it is a worldwide issue? I have had people say to me: Angus, why are we going through all this? Why are we going to cost ourselves any money when it is just as big a problem coming from China or India?

We can shut down all of our businesses in Maine, and we are still not going to be able to solve this problem, nor could we if we did it in the United States. Molecules of methane or CO_2 don't care about borders. They go around the world, and they are causing this problem to happen around the world.

But, yes, this vote today is important because it is a signal to the rest of the world that we are serious about this problem. A negative vote today is a signal to the rest of the world that we don't care, and the rest of the world is going to be paying attention.

This is a global problem. It is going to take solutions from every country and particularly from the larger emitting countries, like the United States, like China, like India. But we have to show that we are willing to do it here, if we are going to ask other people to make these kinds of steps in their country. And that is why I think this vote has international implications as well as national.

Now, what about the cost? Are we imposing some enormous cost, or are we talking about new technology? No, this is a relatively cheap way to get a major improvement in the emission of greenhouse gases.

We are not talking about carbon capture, which is very important, but we are a ways away from cost-effective carbon capture technology, and the costs are still very high. This is of relatively low cost.

> Regulating methane emissions from oil and gas production is the right thing to do for our climate and the air quality of communities across the country.

I couldn't have said it better myself, but I am reading someone else's words.

> It's widely acknowledged that methane is a highly potent greenhouse gas with a global warming potential 80 times greater than CO_2. Beyond the long-term impacts related to climate change, methane emissions also have implications for local air quality. We owe it to the communities where we live and work to reduce these emissions.

Who said that? ANGUS KING didn't say that. Shell Oil said that. Many, if not most, of the major producers of oil and gas in this country are supporting this vote today. This is not a vote where fossil fuel is on one side and the environmental community is on the other. No, this is a broad coalition of people worried about health, of people worried about the environment, of people worried about climate change, and also people in the industry who are worried about the effects of this on their industry if we don't take care of this.

And here is very interesting data. We all know that different technologies have different impacts on the environment, and these bars are the emission levels per unit of energy produced of various alternatives: air pumps, wood pellets, natural gas, propane, heating oil, coal. These are all in use in the United States.

We have substantially lowered our emission of greenhouse gases because of the conversion from coal and oil to natural gas, and that hasn't been caused by regulation or by the dead hand of government. That is because of the market, because of the enormous production of natural gas in this country.

Now, here is the problem—and I have always thought of natural gas as a transition fuel. Sixty percent of our electricity in New England comes from natural gas, and, indeed, our CO_2 is down because of that. But here is the problem. See this little black line here? That is the actual emission from natural gas if you count methane.

So the environmental, the climate advantage of natural gas disappears if you count the methane that is released in the production of natural gas. But it is controllable. It is not inevitable. It is not something that is impossible.

There are now technologies to survey pipelines to detect leaks and to prevent them. It is really pretty straightforward. If you have a pipeline that is leaking and is putting methane in the atmosphere that is 80 times as bad as CO_2, let's fix it. And that is all we are talking about today.

We are talking about restoring commonsense regulations on the release of dangerous climate-change-inducing gases, principally, methane. Some of the other things that are released are also dangerous for people living in the area of the well or the pipeline leak.

I am not opposed to the use. I mean, right now, as I say, natural gas is the preferred alternative—and you can see why—except for the methane problem. So let's eliminate that. Let's make the chart look like this. Then, natural gas works. But we have to deal with methane.

This is the low-hanging fruit of climate action. This is an opportunity for this country to make a statement internationally, to make a statement to our people, and to do something about the most serious environmental problem we face.

Every day that goes by, it gets more expensive to deal with. Every day that goes by, it is going to be more difficult for our people, the impacts are going to be more catastrophic, and the impacts are going to be more difficult in terms of what we have to spend to deal with it.

So let's spend relatively little now to eliminate one of the most serious risks. It is not minor. It is a very significant part of the climate issue, and it is one that we can do at a relatively low price, with not a heavy hand of regulation but commonsense regulation. And we can do something important for the American people and, indeed, for the people of the entire world.

This is an important vote this afternoon. I hope it is a resounding vote. It should be. It should be a resounding vote to say to the world and to say to the people of this country: We are on your side. We understand there is a problem heading for us, and we are going to act to deal with it.

This is our responsibility. It is why we are here, and we have the capability to do this starting today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I think I will get done before, but, in case, I ask unanimous consent to be able to finish my statement before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the nomination of Ambassador Samantha Power to be our next Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Ambassador Power's qualifications for this position are beyond dispute. Her lifelong commitment to protecting human rights and preventing global atrocities, combined with the foreign policy experience she gained during the Obama administration, make her impeccably qualified for this role.

I want to highlight, in particular, her leadership on the international effort to end genocide. Our struggle against these horrific crimes is ongoing and unrelenting. Like Ambassador Power, I was proud to see the Biden administration formally recognize the Armenian genocide, a recognition by the U.S. Government that was long overdue.

Ambassador Power's intellect, energy, and focus will be an enormous asset to USAID in the Administration's efforts to end poverty around the world, help victims of conflict, improve food security, and build the kind of resilience that ultimately benefits the security and prosperity of the American people.

This work is not easy, but it is exactly the sort of work that President Biden described in his inaugural address when he spoke of the United States as ''a strong and trusted partner for peace, progress, and security.''

It is also the work we must do to confront the immense crises we face around the world. Many of the conflicts Ambassador Power contended with during her time at the United Nations continue today. New conflicts, as we know, are brewing in Ethiopia, Haiti, and Burma, and creating hundreds of thousands of innocent victims and refugees.

Climate change is increasing food insecurity, intensifying natural resource scarcity, and beginning to drive mass migration.

And, of course, the COVID–19 pandemic is an ever-evolving threat, and its proliferation around the world will continue to endanger our public health here at home. As long as there is a COVID–19 virus anywhere, it can be everywhere. We cannot hermetically seal off our Nation. That is why this particular role of USAID is going to be increasingly important.

As we reengage with our partners in the world to meet these challenges, Ambassador Power will play a critical role. I am confident her experience, tenacity, and drive to build a better, more prosperous, peaceful world are exactly what USAID and our country need at this moment.

I urge all of my colleagues to support Ambassador Power's successful confirmation.

With that, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 61, Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Charles E. Schumer, Mazie K. Hirono, Ron Wyden, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Michael F. Bennet, Tim Kaine, Christopher Murphy, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Cory A. Booker, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Chris Van Hollen, Sherrod Brown, Edward J. Markey, Bernard Sanders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it sense of the Senate that Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 67, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Risch
Blumenthal	Hirono	Romney
Blunt	Johnson	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Sasse
Burr	King	Schatz
Capito	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Luján	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cornyn	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Crapo	Moran	Warnock
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Fischer	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young
Graham	Peters	
Hassan	Portman	

NAYS—28

Barrasso	Hagerty	Rubio
Blackburn	Hawley	Scott (FL)
Boozman	Hoeven	Scott (SC)
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sullivan
Cassidy	Inhofe	Thune
Cotton	Kennedy	Tillis
Cruz	Lankford	Toomey
Daines	Lee	Tuberville
Ernst	Lummis	
Grassley	Marshall	

NOT VOTING—5

Cantwell	Paul	Shelby
Cramer	Rounds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 67, the nays are 28.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

postcloture time on the Power nomination expire at 3:30 p.m. today, and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that following disposition of the nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and vote on the passage of calendar No. 48, S.J. Res. 14, and that if passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, at 3:30 p.m., the Senate will vote on confirmation of Samantha Power to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and on passage of the joint resolution of disapproval regarding the methane rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as I have said many times in the past, Presidents should be given a good deal of discretion when choosing their political appointees, and so long as their nominees are qualified and do not obstruct the advice and consent process, the Senate should not stand in the way of their confirmation.

After all, Presidents are ultimately responsible for the actions of their administration. And if the buck truly stops at the Resolute Desk, they need to be able to trust their subordinates to get the job done.

That being said, I now come to the point of my coming to the floor; that I must vote no on the nomination of Samantha Power to be Director of USAID.

On February 18, I sent a letter to Ms. Power asking questions regarding emails that came out of her office during her time serving as U.N. Ambassador.

Heavily redacted versions of those emails obtained by my office appear to suggest that Ms. Power's staff may have been working behind the scenes to remove the Islamic Relief Agency from the U.S. Treasury Department's sanctions list.

That organization was placed on the sanctions list for what? Funneling money to terrorist groups, and, thus, removing it would allow that organization to receive private donations as well as taxpayer funds.

In her letter responding to my questions, Ms. Power claimed that she was not working to take the Islamic Relief Agency off the sanctions list. She further claimed that the emails in question were part of an effort to challenge false claims made by the Islamic Relief Agency at the U.N. denying their involvement in terrorist financing.

In order to verify her claims, I have requested, on multiple occasions, that she provide unredacted copies of the emails and complete answers to the questions that I posed in my original letter.

But after 3 months, all I have received is a collection of public press releases. I have not received the emails I requested. I have not received answers to my questions.

Normally, political appointees and nominees wait until after they are confirmed to start ignoring congressional inquiries, but in this case, it seems the Executive branch has decided advice and consent is going to be a mere formality, and there is no need to wait. This seems to be a pattern.

For instance, I asked the Secretary of HHS a number of specific questions for the record as part of the Finance Committee vetting process. I received responses that didn't even try to answer the substance of my questions.

I also asked Interior Secretary Deb Haaland to reconcile some conflicting information on her House financial disclosures and responses to questions for the record for the Energy Committee about her taxes. They weren't gotcha questions either. In fact, it was probably innocent mistakes on her part, if anything, but Secretary Haaland declined to respond at all.

Maybe the White House figures simply that they don't need Republican votes so they don't need to answer even routine vetting questions from Republicans, but then the White House can't blame Republicans for voting no on their nominees when they ignore our oversight questions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

S.J. RES. 14

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, the methane problem is not a new one. It has quickly and drastically warmed our planet since the Industrial Revolution, and today it accounts for one-quarter of global warming.

We have no time to lose. In the short term, methane is more than 80 times more powerful and damaging than its better known cousin named CO_2.

And while we have made more progress reducing our carbon dioxide levels, methane pollution has continued to surge in the background. Even last year, with more cars off the road and many stuck in their homes, methane pollution levels just kept rising.

And it rose in record amounts. In 2020, we saw the largest ever annual increase in methane emissions. If we continue to fail to act, methane pollution from the oil and gas industry is projected to cause as much near-term global warming as 260 coal-fired powerplants every year by 2025.

This is a crisis brought on by humanity, but, thankfully, it is one that we can solve as well by humanity. We have the technology and we understand the science and we need now to summon the political will and the regulatory leadership in order to solve this methane problem.

Last week, I sent a letter to President Biden asking him to lead the world in developing a bold domestic methane strategy, and although the administration's economy-wide goals for greenhouse gas emissions are a good baseline start, we need robust and specific targets for methane.

By voting today to rescind the Trump-era attacks on methane regulations, we can protect the Clean Air Act instead of undermining it. By reinstating strong standards, we can protect public health and create new jobs in detecting and repairing leaks. By taking a stand today for environmental progress and good governance, we can begin to repair the immense damage done by Donald Trump. He was an enemy of science, a roadblock to progress, and a willing saboteur of American jobs and health as long as he could pursue his anti-environmental agenda.

Today, we have an opportunity to recommit to climate action and to environmental justice. The COVID–19 pandemic has helped expose the deep, systemic, and historic injustices our communities of color and low-income neighborhoods continue to face, communities like those in Chelsea, MA, which has been affected by both poor air quality and some of the highest COVID–19 infection rates in the State and the Nation, or Weymouth, MA, which grapples daily with the public health and public safety threat of a natural gas compressor station.

Big oil and big gas corporations have used places like Weymouth as a way station for pollution, without fear of reprisal for emissions of methane and toxic compounds. This week, we can stand up for justice for these communities instead of idly standing by.

By passing this resolution on the floor this afternoon, we can make real progress for the climate, for our global community, and for all Americans who breathe different air because of their race, their ZIP Code, or their income level.

In Massachusetts, Ralph Waldo Emerson said that health is the first wealth. Today's vote is a decisive victory for our families. It will give the Biden administration the tools it needs to shut in this methane for a very inexpensive cost to the oil and gas industry, providing real benefits to the health of our planet and the health of families in our country. As a result, I urge an ''aye'' vote on that CRA.

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER

Mr. President, I would like to speak on behalf of the nominee of the Biden administration to become the Administrator for the U.S. Agency for International Development or USAID.

He has a great nominee, Samantha Power, for this job. As noted in a New Yorker profile of her, Samantha's last name, Power, comes from the Irish ''de Paor'' meaning ''of the poor.'' Fittingly, she has dedicated her entire life in service of others, using her razor-sharp intelligence and fierce advocacy as a journalist, activist, and diplomat to stand with the world's voiceless masses, all while simultaneously advancing U.S. interests by building bonds in every corner of the world.

Ambassador Power has been known to be ferocious in the pursuit of justice, human rights, and democracy, always taking time to listen to other points of view with great humility.

While she disagrees with Henry Kissinger on everything from politics to the no-brainer debate of the Red Sox versus the Yankees, Henry Kissinger said that Samantha ''has an excellent analytical mind, and even on matters where I might have come to different conclusions, I respected her analysis''—perhaps the highest praise ever given by a Yankees fan to a member of Red Sox Nation, of which she is proudly a member.

As an immigrant from Ireland, Samantha's personal background gives her a unique and deep respect for this country and all that it stands for. Spending time between Pittsburgh, Atlanta, Dublin, and Boston, she received her bachelor's degree at Yale University and went on to obtain her law degree at Harvard University. She served in several key positions during the Obama administration, including as the Special Assistant to the President, the National Security Council Senior Director for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights, and, notably, as the youngest ever U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Prior to entering government service, she began her career as a war correspondent, reporting from the siege of Sarajevo, became a Pulitzer Prize-winning author, and served as the founding executive director of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at Harvard University.

As she takes on the important work of leading USAID, the challenges Samantha Power will face are daunting: recovering from a global pandemic, revamping the state of global democracy, tackling the climate crisis, and extending lifesaving assistance to the nearly 1 billion people around the world who go to bed hungry every single night. I know of no person more qualified to take on this task. She embodies that bold red, white, and blue USAID logo, which states ''From the American People.''

In 2015, Samantha Power invited me to be her guest to attend His Holiness Pope Francis's address before the United Nations General Assembly. For two Irish Catholics from Massachusetts, it was the experience of a lifetime. On that day, Pope Francis spoke of the need for compassion, inclusivity, and action to tackle the world's shared challenges. Samantha's career personifies each of these qualities, and I know she will take her compassion, inclusivity, and unwavering desire for action and achieve great things for the people of the United States and for the world at USAID.

There is no one better qualified, ever, to serve as the head of this Agency, and I would, with the greatest of enthusiasm, recommend an ''aye'' vote from every Member of the Senate on her confirmation as our Administrator of this great group who serves in every country around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this body does not have to automatically raise taxes to pay for infrastructure. Now, I know some of my colleagues would disagree with me. Some want to raise the gasoline tax. The President—well, I think he wants to raise every tax known to man and beast to spend on infrastructure and other things. And that is—he is the President. He is an American. He is entitled to his own opinion.

But I don't think we spent nearly enough time looking at our current spending and asking ourselves if we could reprioritize some of the ways that we are spending taxpayer money.

Let me put it another way. No person with even a casual relationship with the Federal budget and/or an IQ above a root vegetable believes that every single penny being spent today in the U.S. Government's budget is being spent efficiently. I mean, it is just not, Mr. President. You know that. You have run a State before. You have put together a budget before. It is not. For example, we waste $144 billion a year, every year, on improper payments. We send checks to people who are not entitled to receive them—for the earned income tax credit, for example. We spend money on people who don't exist or aren't qualified to receive Medicaid. We even send money to dead people, and they cash the checks—or at least their relatives do.

Now, I am not naive. I know that we will never ever—an organization as large as the Federal Government will never be able to avoid a percentage of improper payments. I understand that. But we ought to at least try, particularly on sending the checks to dead people. Even if we could reduce that $144 billion by 10 percent or 20 percent or 25 percent, we are talking about a very large amount of recurring revenue.

A very simple solution—I suggested this to the White House, which hasn't responded—we have passed legislation in this body, as you know, to try to stop sending checks to dead people. There is just one problem: It was made effective 3 years from now. I had to agree to it in conference to get the bill passed. There is no good reason for it other than some lobbyists insisted on it.

President Biden right now, I think, could pick up at least $10 billion, maybe more—we are not sure how much—by just saying: Effective immediately, my administration is no longer going to send checks to dead people. I mean, who is going to get mad? Who supports sending money to dead people? The American people don't.

No. 2, we could repurpose the money—a lot of the money that we have already appropriated. I have lost count on how much money we have appropriated for coronavirus—not just on public health but also for our economy. Look, I voted for many of the bills. I didn't vote for the last one because I felt the last one was unnecessary, it was too expensive, and it really wasn't about the coronavirus.

But I think all fairminded people can agree right now on two things: No. 1, a lot of the money we appropriated in the last coronavirus bill has not been spent, and No. 2, we are no longer in an economic crisis. The main crisis we have right now is that our small business women and small business men can't find workers.

So we are currently not in an economic crisis, and I think we can go back and take some of that money—and my State, Louisiana is going to take—some aspects of my State government—it will take them 10 years to spend all the money we sent to them in the last bill. I can tell you, given the option in my State, they are going to choose to spend that money on infrastructure and not on what Congress sent them the money to spend it on.

No. 3, there is a very interesting study by the CBO taking the years—I think it was 2013 to 2017. The CBO took the entire Federal nonmilitary workforce, on which we spend $220 billion a year because we have to have workers, and they took every job in the Federal Government and compared it to every equivalent job in the private sector. It was a massive study. So it is apples to apples. The CBO found that the Federal Government, on average, pays a Federal worker 17 percent more annually than we pay the same worker in the private sector.

Now, I won't begrudge anybody a living, but what if we could reduce that to 15 percent or 12 percent? What if we could just not automatically fill every vacancy? What if we actually stopped and asked ourselves, if this position has been vacant for 8 months, maybe we don't need it. I think there are enormous savings to be had.

The final thing I will point out: Doing is better than having. Doing is better than having. You are happier when you have earned something than when somebody has just given it to you.

We are the most generous Nation in all of human history. The American people spend about $1 trillion a year helping our neighbors and some folks who are not our neighbors but are less fortunate than we are. But we spend about $76 billion a year on Medicaid and on food stamps for adults who are able-bodied, who are 55 years of age and younger, and who don't have children. Many of them could work. Now, I know there are obstacles to them being able to work. Maybe they need help looking for a job. Maybe they need employment counseling. Maybe they need help with transportation. But we could save enormous amounts of money, and our citizens, our people, and our neighbors, who are receiving this money, would be better off if they had a job.

We don't have to reinvent the wheel. All we have to do is look to Denmark. Denmark does an extraordinary job. They are very generous in Denmark with their payments for unemployment, but they also have an infrastructure set up in government, which we could do, which works with people to get them a job and to get them off welfare. And Denmark has saved an enormous amount of money. Let me say it again. Doing is better than having.

Am I saying we could save 100 percent of that $75 billion? No. I don't know how much we could save. Nobody else does either because we have never tried.

Now, in about—I don't know—7 minutes, I have just given you four or five ideas. I am not suggesting that this is anything. I am not pretending that I just discovered gravity or something. This isn't Earth-shaking. I mean, you can find this with just a cursory amount of research. Just call the folks over at the Congressional Budget Office and ask them: What are some ways we can save money in our Federal budget?

I just think we would all feel so much better. I know the American taxpayer would feel a lot better, if just for a little while, as we talk about the importance of infrastructure, true infrastructure—roads, bridges, broadband—if we just spent a little while, as we talk about infrastructure, on how to pay for it without putting our hand even further, deeper, and more frequently in the taxpayers' pockets, because it can be done. I watched the Presiding Officer do it in Colorado. I have seen too many public officials do it. I think we need to at least try.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S.J. RES. 14

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of S.J. Res. 14, which we will vote on later today. I want to thank Senator HEINRICH, Senator MARKEY, and Senator KING for their leadership on this resolution. And I might be mistaken here, but I understand that when the Presiding Officer was Governor of Colorado, the Presiding Officer might have set the precedent for the creation of this point of view that is expressed in the resolution before us. So the Navy salutes Colorado.

The American people rely on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that our Nation has clean air, clean water, a clean environment, and a safe climate. Unfortunately, in 2020, under the previous administration, the EPA strayed from its mission any number of times.

One of those missteps was that Agency's methane rescission rule, which deregulated methane emissions from the oil and gas industry—our Nation's largest industrial source of this dangerous greenhouse gas. By passing this resolution, Congress, today, will reject and nullify this dangerous rule and restore clean air and climate protections from our Nation's largest sources of methane pollution.

Let me explain what methane is and why it is so harmful to our climate and to our health.

Methane is a super pollutant that damages our lungs and our planet. Compared to carbon dioxide, methane is a small part of our overall greenhouse gas emissions. Having said that, though, scientists tell us that methane is responsible for roughly—get this—one-quarter of the manmade global warming that we are witnessing today. Let me say that again: Methane is responsible for roughly one-quarter of the manmade global warming that we are experiencing and witnessing today.

Over a 20-year period, methane is 84 times more harmful to our climate than carbon dioxide—84 times. For a small molecule, methane punches above its weight when it comes to its contributions to climate change.

The oil and gas industry is our Nation's largest source of methane, responsible for nearly 30 percent of total methane emissions. For comparison, this amount of methane pollution has the same climate effect as the emissions from our Nation's entire fleet of passenger vehicles in a year.

In addition to damaging our climate, methane emissions also contribute to ground-level ozone, known as smog. Breathing in smog harms our lungs, and it aggravates lung diseases like bronchitis and asthma. Exposure to smog has been linked to premature death, and children and the elderly are particularly vulnerable to these health risks. If we want to meaningfully tackle the danger to our health and our climate, we need to reduce methane emissions from the entire oil and gas sector.

In 2016, as I was alluding to earlier, the EPA acted to do just that. Building on State actions, such as in Colorado, whose former chief executive is presiding at this moment, the EPA put into place commonsense Clean Air Act regulations that required the oil and gas industry to update its equipment. The rule also required the industry to inspect frequently in order to find and repair leaks and malfunctions that are such a big source of our methane problem.

Based on feedback from the oil and gas industry meeting, these new emission requirements did not place an undue burden on companies or raise costs for consumers. In fact, many oil and gas companies and industry groups supported the measures, and they still do. That is why it was so surprising when, in September of 2020, the EPA issued the final methane rescission rule to roll back what so many believed to be commonsense approaches for reducing methane risks.

While the Trump administration moved forward with this damaging policy, the consequences of climate change were roiling—roiling—our Nation. California, for example, experienced its worst wildfire season on record, with historic forest fires covering an area about the size of the State of Rhode Island. Other Western States—including Oregon, Montana, and Colorado—were ablaze with unprecedented damaging wildfires.

At the same time, other parts of our country were being battered by violent, extreme weather. The people of Iowa experienced one of the most costly thunderstorms in history, with hurricane force winds, causing $7.5 billion in economic damage. It flattened, I am told, over half of that State's corn and soybean crops in one day.

Coastal towns in Southern States like Florida, like Louisiana, and like South Carolina were battered by hurricane after hurricane after hurricane. In the summer of 2020, last summer, we saw the most hurricanes in the Atlantic Ocean in recorded history.

Despite all of this, the Trump administration took a step to undo one of the key tools available to us to combat methane emissions that contribute greatly to climate change. The methane rescission rule was a stark departure from the widely accepted, science-based, and commonsense view that we should protect people and our planet from the dangers of methane.

In promulgating the methane rescission rule, the Trump administration ignored the global scientific community, including EPA's own Agency scientists, who warned that the extreme weather events of 2020 were just the tip of the iceberg of consequences we can expect if we don't keep global warming below an increase of 1.5 degrees Celsius between now and 2040.

The bottom line is that the Trump methane rescission rule would allow more methane pollution, increase public health dangers, and bring us ever closer to the brink of irreversible climate catastrophe. It is this Trump EPA action that my colleagues and I reject today through the resolution before us.

The methane rescission rule stated that methane couldn't be regulated under the Clean Air Act. We reject that. The methane rescission rule stated that EPA couldn't regulate the entire oil and gas sector from wellhead to storage. We reject that. The methane rescission rule stated that greenhouse gasses couldn't be regulated. We reject that. The methane rescission rule also reversed EPA's longstanding position on what is required to regulate a pollutant, making it harder for EPA to implement clean air and climate protections. We reject that as well.

With approval of this resolution, though, EPA can and should still move forward to strengthen methane standards for the oil and gas sector in the future. This effort is also very timely, coming on the heels of President

Biden's climate commitment for our Nation to reduce emissions by 50 percent from 2005 levels by the end of this decade—by 2030.

Passing this resolution will be good for our health. Passing this resolution will be good for our planet. And passing this resolution will be good for America's economy. That is why so many States, so many environmental groups, and even a number of significant oil and gas companies support this resolution.

Joining over 60 environmental groups, as well as 20 State attorneys general, seven major oil and gas companies support today's resolution to reinstate requirements to control methane emissions. From the Environmental Defense Fund to Shell, from the League of Conservation Voters to BP, from the Natural Resources Defense Council to Equinor, there is a broad consensus among stakeholders with different interests—different interests—that Congress should reject and nullify the methane rescission rule.

So why do a number of oil and gas companies want Congress to reject the Trump rule, restore existing regulations, and pursue further regulations? They know the best way to boost growth in their sector and across the economy is to keep methane and other climate pollution in check. With unchecked methane releases in its operations, natural gas production and use become part of the climate problem, not a part of the solution as we endeavor to drive toward lower carbon fuels.

Companies know where the global market is heading. They know regulations will support innovation and technology deployment in their industry, bringing down emission reduction costs for everyone.

I sometimes like to quote Albert Einstein, who said, among other things: ''In adversity lies opportunity.'' Think about that: ''In adversity lies opportunity.'' We can see that in the issue of methane pollution and in climate change. It presents plenty of challenges. Yes, that is true. But it also presents a remarkable opportunity. It is an opportunity for us to protect our planet, improve the air that we breathe, and strengthen our economy.

At the same time, the product that the oil and gas industry is capturing can be sold to fuel more homes and businesses across the country. I want to say that again, too. At the same time, the product that the oil and gas industry is capturing can be sold to fuel more homes and businesses across the country. That is why today I will gladly vote for this resolution, which reaffirms that the Clean Air Act requires EPA to take action to protect Americans from dangerous pollution like methane.

In passing this resolution today, Congress is rejecting the Trump rule's baseless interpretation of the Clean Air Act and, in its place, reinstating commonsense methane public health and climate protections across the entire oil and gas sector. We are also clearing a path for additional protections from methane and other hazardous climate pollutants.

As a Senate, we are making our intent clear: The Clean Air Act gives EPA the authority and the mandate to establish methane emissions standards, even stronger than the ones we reinstate with this resolution. This includes all facets of the oil and gas industry now and moving forward, from production to processing and from transmission to storage.

We are saying to EPA loud and clear: It is your mission to protect the environment, to protect human health and public welfare from the dangers of climate pollutants like methane. And there is a lot of work still to do before that mission can be achieved. It is time that we get to that work. We don't have a lot of time to waste.

I have a couple of unanimous consent requests I would like to offer. One is to place supportive materials into the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD several of my materials in support of S.J. Res. 14 that is before us today; first, the Biden administration's Statement of Administration Policy supporting passage of the resolution; second, two letters of support for passing this joint resolution—one from the 57 leading environmental and advocacy groups and another, the Shell Oil Company.

These letters demonstrate the breadth of support for regulating this harmful pollutant and rejecting the methane rescission rule.

I ask unanimous consent for these to be inserted into the RECORD as appropriate.

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

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

S.J. RES. 14—A JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO ''OIL AND NATURAL GAS SECTOR: EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW, RECONSTRUCTED, AND MODIFIED SOURCES REVIEW''

(Sen. Heinrich, D–NM, and 23 cosponsors)

The Administration supports passage of S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the rule ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review,'' published at 85 Fed. Reg. 57018 (September 14, 2020). This action would ensure that this rule, which eliminated pollution standards for methane emissions from the oil and gas sector and eliminated all emission standards for the transmission and storage segments of that sector, will have no force or effect and reinstate the pollution reduction requirements established under the Clean Air Act in 2012 and 2016.

Addressing methane leaks through detection and repair by using already cost-effective technologies can spur the creation of good-paying jobs fixing leaking equipment and pipelines—all while minimizing waste and reducing this powerful source of pollution. Today, the oil and gas sector is the largest industrial source of methane emissions—a potent climate-disrupting greenhouse gas that is responsible for approximately one-third of the global warming and the resulting climate disruption we are already experiencing from climate change. In order to effectively mitigate climate change, addressing methane pollution from this and other sectors is an urgent and essential step.

Every American has a fundamental right to breathe clean air and drink clean water. These methane emissions—leaking during oil and gas production, transmission, and distribution activities—also contribute to the formation of smog, or ground-level ozone, which is harmful to both human health and agriculture. Oil and gas production is also a significant emitter of carcinogenic and smog-forming volatile organic compounds into frontline communities. These communities, as well as children, the elderly, outdoor workers, and individuals with respiratory conditions, are at higher risk of experiencing harmful health outcomes due to exposure to such pollution. Oil and gas pollution can also be carried by the wind and intensify air pollution problems in communities along that path, including across state boundaries.

The Clean Air Act authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to protect Americans from dangerous air pollution, including methane and volatile organic compounds. Nonetheless, the rule that this resolution disapproves of took four harmful actions that increased the amount of harmful pollution to which Americans are exposed: (1) the elimination of pollution standards for methane emissions from the oil and gas sector; (2) the elimination of all air pollution standards for the transmission and storage segments of the oil and gas sector; (3) removal of the predicate that establishes EPA's obligation to address the extensive methane pollution emitted by existing sources; and (4) establishment of a new, nonstatutory requirement that EPA make an additional, pollutant-specific finding of significant contribution to endangerment before addressing harmful air pollution from a sector already regulated under the Clean Air Act. All four of these actions would be reversed by the passage and signature of the resolution.

S.J. Res. 14 will restore robust Clean Air Act pollution standards for this sector, protecting American communities. The resolution will also clear the pathway for EPA to evaluate opportunities to promulgate even stronger standards under section 111 of the Clean Air Act to address dangerous methane and other pollution from both new and existing sources across the oil and gas sector. The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to restore these critically important pollution standards.

APRIL 26, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington. DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, MAJORITY LEADER SCHUMER, MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of our collective millions of members and supporters, we write to express our full support of Senate Joint Resolution (S.J. Res.) 14 and House Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 34), providing for congressional disapproval of recent executive action to roll back the 2016 methane and volatile organic compound

standards. We urge Congress to swiftly vote to pass this resolution, an action which would allow the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to accelerate strengthening safeguards against methane and other pollution.

As you know, methane is a potent pollutant that is responsible for around 25 percent of the impacts of climate change we are experiencing today. In 2016, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) established regulations to tackle methane and other dangerous emissions from new and modified sources within the oil and gas sector, which is the largest industrial source of methane pollution. This action took concrete steps to implement science-based standards to combat previously unchecked emissions. The oil and gas sector is likewise a significant source of smog-forming volatile organic compounds and hazardous air pollutants in communities across the nation.

In the waning days of the previous administration, EPA finalized a rule that eliminated safeguards that protect our climate and communities from oil and gas pollution and attempted to erect barriers to the promulgation of future standards. Many oil and gas operators, natural gas users like utilities, states, and environmental and health groups support federal standards to regulate methane emissions. Many environmental and health groups, state and local governments, utilities and other gas purchasers, oil and gas operators, and even the American Petroleum Institute (API), have expressed support for federal rules to curb the oil and gas industry's wasteful methane releases—wasted gas worth $2.4 billion, which could be used to heat approximately 12.5 million homes in a year. Adopting S.J. Res. 14 and H.J. Res. 34 will reinstate pollution protections and clear the path for EPA to move forward with widely-supported, sensible safeguards for methane and other pollution from oil and gas production.

We must take early action to reduce harmful methane emissions as a necessary step to combating the climate crisis. Regulation of dangerous methane emissions is critical to lowering the magnitude of warming we will experience around 2050. We need leaders who will fight for a healthier future and seek ambitious next-generation standards for new and existing oil and gas facilities. S.J. Res. 14 provides the EPA with a clean slate to get back to a regulatory process that makes scientific sense and gets our goal of ambitious methane emissions reductions back on track, while advancing our collective climate and environmental justice goals.

Sincerely,

Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Brighter Green, Center for Civic Policy, Center for Human Rights and Environment, Chapel Hill Organization for Clean Energy, Citizens Caring for the Future, Citizens' Environmental Coalition, Clean Air Council, Clean Air Task Force, Clean Water Action, Climate Advocates Voces Unidas, Climate Law & Policy Project, Conservation Colorado, Conservation Voters New Mexico, Dakota Resource Council.

Defend Our Future, Earth Action, Inc., Earthjustice, Earthworks, Empire State Consumer Project, Environmental Defense Fund, Fort Berthold POWER, Franciscan Action Network, Grand Canyon Trust, GreenLatinos, Health Action New Mexico, Hispanic Access Foundation, Interfaith Power & Light, League of Conservation Voters, League of Oil and Gas Impacted Coloradans, Moms Clean Air Force, National Organization for Women, National Parks Conservation Association.

Natural Resources Defense Council, New Mexico Interfaith Power and Light, New Mexico Sportsmen, Partnership for Responsible Business, Powder River Basin Resource Council, ProgressNow Colorado, Project CoffeeHouse, Protect All Children's Environment, Public Citizen, Rachel Carson Council, Responsible Drilling Alliance, Rio Grande Indivisible.

Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, Santa Fe Green Chamber of Commerce, Sciencecorps, Sierra Club, The Evangelical Environmental Network, The Greater Prince William Climate Action Network, The Ohio Environmental Council, The Wilderness Society, Waterkeeper Alliance, Western Colorado Alliance, Western Organization of Resource Councils, Young Evangelicals for Climate Action.

SHELL OIL COMPANY,
Houston, TX, April 22, 2021.

Hon. TOM CARPER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington, DC.

Hon. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Chairman, House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

Hon. CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CARPER, RANKING MEMBER CAPITO, CHAIRMAN PALLONE, AND RANKING MEMBER RODGERS: Shell supports passage of a proposed joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to rescind the 2020 rule ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed and Modified Sources Review'' and reinstate the direct regulation of methane emissions from new and modified sources established by the Environmental Protection Agency in 2016.

Beginning in 2015, Shell worked with EPA and industry peers to develop a workable approach to regulating methane from onshore oil and gas sources. Shell was the first oil major to signal support for the rule. Beginning in 2017, Shell urged the Trump Administration to make desired refinements to the regulation, but to maintain the direct regulation of methane from onshore sources established by the previous Administration.

The efficient regulation of methane from onshore oil and gas production makes good business sense, as methane captured is methane sold, advances the energy transition and expands the role of natural gas as a transition fuel. The 2016 rule sparked innovation, contributing to the development of more efficient and affordable pneumatics, better cameras and new airborne imagery, tools that help us better understand and control methane leaks from our assets.

I have appreciated the leadership of those in Congress working to advance this joint resolution. I have attached an oped in support of the resolution published last week in the Houston Chronicle.

Sincerely,

GRETCHEN WATKINS,
President.

Mr. CARPER. Now, Mr. President, I will yield the floor, but before I do, I want to salute you for your role in an earlier day, in an earlier place, your State of Colorado, for helping get this started. We are in your debt. Good work. God bless.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Iowa.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, it has been nearly 100 days since President Biden delivered his inaugural address, promising our Nation ''unity, not division.'' He called on all of us to ''listen to one another,'' noting that unity ''requires more than words.''

I was there, and I was listening. I was hopeful that he actually meant what he said. But that very same day, as soon as he reached the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, President Biden seemed to forget his own words as he began signing a record number of Executive orders.

With the stroke of a pen, he unilaterally created a new migrant crisis by reversing the previous administration's successful policies and ceasing construction of the wall.

He also killed thousands of jobs for American workers by canceling the XL Pipeline. And that was just his first day on the job.

Since then, the President and his Democratic allies in Congress have used a partisan process to fast-track trillions of dollars of new spending for their pricey pet projects.

Despite the President's call for us to listen to one another, the Democrats are planning to, once again, fast-track another $2.2 trillion package being sold as an ''infrastructure'' bill, even though it spends less on roads and bridges than it does on parts of the Socialist Green New Deal and other progressive priorities.

And then right after that, they want to ram through another $1 trillion for so-called human infrastructure.

The Democrats are threatening to end the right of Senators to debate by abolishing the filibuster so they can shove through their extreme agenda. This would fundamentally change the Senate, which has long been known as the world's—not just America's but the world's greatest deliberative body, in which every State has equal representation and every Senator is given a voice in our national conversations.

It is an interesting twist for the party that just a year ago proudly resisted nearly every effort put forth to address the problems facing our Nation.

For purely partisan political reasons, Democrats even filibustered—yes, they filibustered—the JUSTICE Act that would have provided police reform following the deaths of George Floyd and others.

This week, the Nation will have the opportunity to hear from the author of that bill, my dear friend Senator TIM SCOTT of South Carolina, who is delivering the Republican response to the President's address this evening. No one better represents the type of positive leadership we need to unify our Nation than TIM. He truly is the perfect voice for the American dream.

Growing up in a poor, single-parent household, TIM's mother worked hard

to make ends meet. Despite some early challenges and setbacks, TIM successfully started his own business and was chosen, time and again, to serve in public office.

As a Senator, TIM is focused on creating opportunities for others by tapping into the potential of individuals and communities. TIM listens, and he works hard to bring people together.

Folks, that is what President Biden promised to do, but he is not living up to that promise. Frankly, the President only seems to be listening to the far-left progressives within the Democratic Party who live on their own liberal ''Fantasy Island.''

He and his liberal allies on the left are pushing tax hikes on working Americans, while giving tax breaks to wealthy coastal elites. They are bringing back corrupt and costly earmarks.

Democrats want to defund our police and abolish ICE. They want to remake nearly every aspect of our economy with their radical Green New Deal. The Democrats are plotting to pack the Supreme Court with ultraliberal Justices and destroy that institution. And to pad their numbers in Congress, Democrats are attempting to make Washington, DC, a State.

Does that sound like the unity and bipartisanship we were promised on day one? It sure doesn't, folks.

If President Biden actually listened to the voices of Americans who live outside of the DC swamp, he wouldn't be hearing a demand for any of those radical proposals.

The Senate is split 50–50, while Democrats hold a razor-slim majority in the House of Representatives. And according to a recent Gallup poll, an overwhelming two-thirds of Americans say they are dissatisfied with the way things are going in the United States. Based upon those responses, it sounds like the Democrats' radical agenda is dividing, not unifying, our country.

Iowans want Democrats and Republicans to set aside partisan differences and work together on our national interests. They want students to be able to safely return to their classroom and for folks to go back to work.

Iowans want us to fix our roads and bridges and expand broadband to rural areas. They worry about the growing global influence of Communist China and the humanitarian and national security crisis on our southern border. They want us to protect the American dream for future generations.

Folks, we can do this.

President Biden, if you are listening, please hear me out. Giving into the deafening demands of the loudest on the left and attempting to silence half of the country will not solve our problems. It will only divide us more.

To succeed, we need to consider the voices of all Americans and speak to what unites us so we can overcome our challenges. And we can overcome these challenges together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. First, Madam President, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Iowa, who did a magnificent job of pointing out what we are facing as a nation. And I admire her fortitude, her hard work, and her dedication as the vice chairman of the Republican conference.

Madam President, 99 days ago, Joe Biden took office. He took the oath of office. We were there. He gave an inaugural address. He said that ''with unity, we can do great things.'' He said that ''unity is the path forward.'' Well, that was the last example of unity and bipartisanship that we have seen from President Biden. He has lost all credibility when it comes to bipartisanship or unity.

In just 99 days, President Biden has already shown himself to be one of the most radical Presidents in American history.

When I am in Wyoming, as I am every weekend and have been over Easter, as well, traveling the State and talking to people, they ask about two specific issues; one is energy, and the second is the southern border. On these two specific issues, President Biden has already done tremendous damage—damage to our country, damage to our people, damage to our economy.

Right after his inaugural address about unity, President Biden drove to the White House, sat there, went in, and threw the unity speech out the window, and he drew a big target on the back of American energy, and he pulled the trigger. He shut down the Keystone XL Pipeline; he ended new fossil fuel projects on Federal lands; and he cut off traditional energy loans to developing nations that need our help and look to us for help.

Well, these steps aren't going to reduce carbon emission, but they will most certainly reduce jobs and wages for American energy workers.

Also, on his first day, President Biden flipped on the big green light switch on our southern border. He sent out the word, laid out the welcome mat, and people from around the world came illegally to the United States. He stopped construction on the border wall, and he ended a policy that was successful. The policy was that known as the ''Remain in Mexico'' policy.

Now, the result wasn't just one crisis; it was two. It was a humanitarian crisis, and it was also a national security crisis.

It is a national security crisis because two-thirds of the Border Patrol agents—and I went to the border and went with a number of Republican Senators and went on a midnight patrol with our border agents, and they told us that two-thirds of the Border Patrol agents are unable to do their jobs and keep us safe, unable to be there to enforce the law. And they said that, so far, people have come into the country illegally from 56 different nations.

The whole world knows the border is open. Our friends know it; our enemies know it; and this will make us less safe as a nation.

There is also a humanitarian crisis at the border caused by President Biden. Just a month ago, a 9-year-old from Mexico died trying to cross the Rio Grande River. It is heartbreaking. That is what happens, though. This is what happens when more and more people try to come illegally to cross our border.

Children who cross the border unaccompanied are sent to a facility that is prepared and appropriate for about 250 children. The day we were there, there were 7,000 crammed in like sardines. That is Joe Biden's plan for immigration.

Ten percent of these children are testing positive for coronavirus. And we saw the testing process. We know that every child there was exposed to coronavirus based on the high percentage of those who were testing positive.

Now, as these young people are released, those who have tested negative but who have just been exposed in the days before, they are being sent all across America, and they are spreading the virus and unknown variants of the virus to this country.

Joe Biden is the superspreader of coronavirus today. Democrats think this is just fine.

The Vice President of the United States is going to be up here tonight on Capitol Hill. She says: ''We're making progress.''

NANCY PELOSI says: ''We're on a good path on the border.''

Homeland Security Secretary Mayorkas says: ''The border is secure and closed,'' even though he has also said this is the worst case in 20 years for young people and we are on a path for up to 2 million illegal immigrants coming across the border this year.

The White House refuses to use the word ''crisis.'' In fact, when the President and his Press Secretary have accidentally called it a crisis—and they both have done that—the White House issued a correction. They said: No, no, not a crisis; only a challenge.

Who do they think they are fooling? Two million illegal immigrants this year is not a challenge. It is a crisis. It is chaos at the border. It is catastrophic.

Ninety-nine days ago, none of this was happening. For 99 days, Republicans in the U.S. Senate have repeatedly looked for common ground with President Biden and the Democrats. We have stood for American energy. We worked to secure the border. Yet for 99 days those efforts have been blocked by President Biden and a Democratic majority—which is hardly a big majority when it is 50–50, which you would think would be a mandate to move to the middle.

Well, President Biden still has a thousand days or so left in his term. Tonight's speech might sound a lot like his inaugural address with lots of promises. The American people know talk is cheap. It is time for President

Biden to start to practice what he is preaching.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I would like to start by thanking my colleague from Wyoming and my colleague from Iowa for their comments about where we are as a country 100 days into the Biden administration.

It has been discouraging that we haven't seen more bipartisan work and with regard to the border, having been down there a couple of weeks ago, particularly discouraging that we can't come up with a bipartisan solution that deals with the obvious crisis on the border.

Of course it is a crisis. Everybody knows that, including the Biden administration. The question is, What are we going to do about it? Some of us have laid out some proposals that we think would be very sensible, that could be done on a bipartisan basis. Yet we are not getting the kind of cooperation from the White House or the other side of the aisle, frankly, with regard to dealing with a clear crisis.

In my time here in Congress, I have tried to work to bring Republicans and Democrats together on issues. I think that is the best thing for our country. I think you get, actually, better legislation if you have input from both sides, and I think you also have more sustainable legislation.

If you don't work in a bipartisan way, what happens when there is a 50–50 Senate, as there is now, and where the Vice President can supply the tie-breaking vote, and if you do things on the basis of reconciliation or getting rid of the filibuster, which is what the Democratic majority currently would like to do, you end up lurching back and forth, don't you? So you pass Democratic legislation and then, when Republicans take over, Republican legislation.

We should be focusing on American legislation. In my office, we have had some success with this bipartisan approach. Sixty-eight of my bills were signed into law by President Obama, and 82 of my bills were signed into law by President Trump—on important issues like the eviction crisis, job creation, and natural resource protection. So it can be done, and President Biden knows that. He served here in the Senate. In fact, he took pride in coming together with Republicans and Democrats to actually have agreements on some of these tough issues.

Although I didn't vote for him because I thought that President Trump had better policy ideas, coming into this new administration, I was hopeful that President Biden would govern as he had campaigned. He promised, you remember, in his campaign to reach out to Republicans and Democrats alike. He talked about the need for unity. In fact, he gave that same speech in the primary and in the general election, which I thought took some courage, frankly, to do so in the primary because most of his opponents did not take that position. Yet, now having gotten elected, he seems to have forgotten the pledges that he made.

I listened to his inaugural address intently, as I hope a lot of Americans did—and certainly my colleagues did—and he talked again about reaching out, going back to the days when we could work together, and he focused on unity. I was very hopeful with the tone he set that day, and I said so at the time. Yet that rhetoric has not been matched by action. It hasn't been matched by action when it comes to key policy initiatives they have already put forward, including the latest COVID–19 spending bill that passed in March.

Remember, despite a 50–50 Senate and very tight majority in the House of Representatives, there was no outreach to Republicans for the COVID–19 legislation. Not a single Republican was consulted before unveiling the plan, and once it was out there, Democrats chose to work only among themselves and do it under what is called reconciliation, where they don't need a single Republican vote—this despite some of us having an alternative, which we actually presented to the White House. The next day, we were told: Thank you, but we are going to take the reconciliation approach, and we don't need any Republican input.

That is too bad because the COVID–19 issue, obviously, is one where there has been not just bipartisanship but nonpartisanship. Five times last year, we passed major COVID–19 legislative initiatives with huge majorities. In one case, the biggest bill, the CARES package, passed with a 97-to-0 vote here. So this is one where we had always been able to work together.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration chose the partisan path. Right now, the Biden administration is repeating this same mistake, as far as I can tell, because they have introduced their $2.3 trillion infrastructure package without consulting, again, any Republicans.

We now hear that the White House and some Democratic leaders may want to pass this latest partisan proposal by reconciliation as well. I hope that is not true because, again, this is an area—infrastructure—where we have been able to work together on a bipartisan basis and get things done. In fact, typically that is how it happens with infrastructure.

Last Congress, we passed a bill out of committee on highways and bridges with a unanimous vote—not just a majority vote, a unanimous vote—by Republicans and Democrats. But the proposal they put forward, first, is not really about infrastructure because it dramatically expands the definition of ''infrastructure'' so that it is not at all what traditionally you would think or I would think of as the kind of hard assets—roads, bridges, ports, airports, transit, even broadband.

Even the most generous description of ''infrastructure'' applied to this bill means that less than 20 percent of it, 20 percent of $2.3 trillion, is about infrastructure. It is about other things. And we can have a debate on those other things, whether it is nursing home subsidies or whether it is subsidies to electric car companies or whether it is more childcare. Those are all issues we can discuss, but they are not, obviously, infrastructure issues.

Proposing to pay for this huge plan with taxes on American workers makes it even worse. So the $2.3 trillion plan is not mostly infrastructure—80 percent is not—but then the taxes that would apply to America and to American workers would be devastating, making us noncompetitive in the global economy again after finally we were getting our act together.

In 2018 and 2019, we saw a big increase in our economy, large increases in terms of employment. Also, wages were going up. We had the lowest poverty rate in the history of our country, going back to the 1950s, partly because we were putting in place policies that made sense in terms of tax reform to create more incentives to invest and bring jobs here to this country. That would all be changed under these tax increases that are being proposed to pay for this big, new Biden infrastructure package.

Making us less competitive in global markets and putting American workers at a disadvantage again is not the right way to go. The American people don't want that. The American people think we should be doing all we can to get businesses back on their feet right now so that people can get employment and so we can ensure that the economy continues to improve as we come out of the coronavirus pandemic.

Infrastructure, again, has always been so bipartisan. Why would, in this case, we want to take it down the partisan road?

Past Presidents, by the way, have shown that they can get big things done early in their administration. So during this first hundred days, there was an opportunity to reach out. I hope in the second hundred days, it will be different.

Let me give a couple of examples. When President Bill Clinton got elected, he worked with Republicans and Democrats to pass what was called the North American Free Trade Agreement. He got a lot of support from the Republican side of the aisle—in fact, even more than he got from the Democratic side of the aisle—and he pushed that through. Ronald Reagan's economic reforms of 1981 passed the Senate with an overwhelming margin of 89 to 11.

Last night, C–SPAN allowed us to look back in history at some of the speeches Presidents gave after their first hundred days. One was Ronald Reagan's speech to the joint session that I saw last night. It was amazing. Republicans and Democrats alike were

standing because President Reagan said: ''I want to work with all of you.'' And he showed he would work with all of them by passing those economic reforms in 1981.

We should all want the Biden administration to succeed in putting in place bipartisan policies that help our constituents and help our country, but that can only happen if they agree to reverse course and engage with Republicans in a genuine way. That is clearly what the American people want. In a recent poll, a Washington Post and ABC poll, 60 percent of respondents, including two-thirds of Independents, said they wanted the Biden administration to work with Republicans to make these proposals bipartisan—twice the number that wanted him to pursue the partisan path chosen so far.

I suggest to my constituents in Ohio and all Americans who will be listening tonight: Don't just listen to the rhetoric; look at the action because the rhetoric thus far has not been matched by actions.

We were promised bipartisanship as a path toward unity. For the sake of our country, it is time to keep that promise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I rise today to talk about how Congress can work together in a bipartisan way to pass infrastructure legislation, following my colleagues from Ohio, from Wyoming, from Iowa—and my colleague from North Carolina is here as well—with a real desire to come up with an infrastructure package, but we want it to be bipartisan.

Republicans and Democrats agree that investing in our national infrastructure is necessary to increase economic growth, ensure global competitiveness of American businesses, and create new, high-paying jobs. In fact, just last Congress, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee unanimously approved a 5-year surface transportation reauthorization bill, which included about $300 billion for roads and bridges. That actually represents a 27-percent increase over the FAST Act. We really feel that bill, with its bipartisan support, creates a starting point—a starting point on a bipartisan basis—for the negotiations that we should have in developing the infrastructure package.

Tonight we expect the President will outline his American Jobs Plan, but unfortunately it is not focused on infrastructure. It is a massive, $2.25 trillion tax-and-spend bill that dedicates less than one-third, just over $600 billion, toward actual traditional infrastructure.

The administration's plan would increase the corporate tax from 21 percent to 28 percent, resulting in reduced wages, increased costs for consumers, and a reduction in economic growth.

The Biden plan would revert the U.S. tax system to a worldwide tax system, increasing taxes on U.S. multinational corporations, reducing the competitiveness of American businesses, and driving U.S. jobs and profits to other countries. The 2017 tax bill brought the United States into a territorial tax system for the taxation of multinational companies. It has worked. From 1985 to 2017, 85 U.S.-based multinational corporations took advantage of corporate inversions, resulting in a $19.5 billion tax revenue loss to the U.S. Government. Since the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, there have been no corporate inversions. The Biden plan would abandon this successful approach.

Further, the administration has proposed a $35 billion tax increase on U.S. energy producers, endangering U.S. energy independence, costing U.S. jobs, and empowering foreign energy production. A recent study from the National Association of Manufacturers shows that nearly 1 million jobs would be lost in the first 2 years alone if this tax increase goes through.

Tonight we expect to hear from President Biden on additional proposals to increase taxes on American workers as well as increase our debt and deficit. For instance, we have seen reports today that the President is going to seek to repeal stepped-up basis. Now, while the administration indicates there may be some exceptions, repealing stepped-up basis would place a significant and complex tax burden on small businesses and particularly family farms and ranches, not only in my State of North Dakota but across the country.

Right now, the average age of our farmers in America is about 60 years old, and we need to get the next generation into farming, but they can't do it if they have to sell the farm to pay the tax.

A repeal of stepped-up basis would increase the cost of capital, discourage investment, reduce the wages of workers, and stunt economic growth in both the immediate and long term. A recent analysis from Ernst & Young shows that eliminating stepped-up basis will result in the loss of 80,000 jobs a year for the next 10 years and a loss of nearly $10 billion in GDP growth per year.

While we continue to emerge from the COVID–19 pandemic, we should not be constraining economic growth by increasing taxes and regulation. Instead, we should maintain the pro-growth, low-tax regime put in place in 2017 by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and make targeted investments in traditional infrastructure, while reducing regulatory barriers to provide long-term certainty to Americans.

Last week, I met with President Biden at the White House to share this very message—that Republicans stand ready to work with the administration and our Democrat colleagues on the infrastructure package, in a bipartisan and targeted manner, focusing on updating our roads, bridges, railways, airports, broadband, and other traditional infrastructure.

We also support investing in energy infrastructure, including enhancing the 45Q tax credit to accelerate the deployment of carbon capture and sequestration technology, as well as pipelines to provide the safe and efficient transportation of our natural resources.

We should be working together for the American people to enact policies that will improve our national infrastructure. To this end, I want to highlight a number of bipartisan proposals that I have been working on with my colleagues across the aisle.

I have introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator SMITH, Senator CAPITO, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and others to enhance the 45Q tax credit for carbon capture and sequestration.

Also, Senator SMITH and I have legislation that would empower rural electric and telecom cooperatives to refinance existing debt, reinvest in improved energy efficiency, and expand broadband delivery to more of their rural customers.

Likewise, Senate Finance Committee Chairman WYDEN and I have introduced a bill that would encourage private investment in infrastructure by expanding private activity bonds and creating a new infrastructure tax credit.

Additionally, I have introduced legislation with Senator BENNET that ensures that our farmers, ranchers, and producers have the regulatory flexibility needed to safely and efficiently move their products—livestock, in particular—to market while ensuring the safety of all road users.

We don't need to burden hard-working Americans with increased taxes in order to pay for this. There are a number of potential options to provide the necessary revenue for a targeted infrastructure package. For example, we can make modest changes to our user-fee-based highway trust fund system, ensuring that electric vehicles pay into the fund. We can repurpose unused Federal spending, including using funds from the recent American Rescue Plan Act. We could also use revenue generated from energy production on Federal lands. These are just a few of the ideas we put forward.

Last week, Ranking Member CAPITO of the Environment and Public Works Committee, along with the ranking members of the Banking, Commerce, Energy, and Finance Committees, unveiled the framework of an almost $600 billion infrastructure package, which focuses investment in traditional infrastructure.

We should use this framework and begin working through regular order in a committee-driven process to produce a bipartisan, targeted infrastructure bill that does not increase taxes on American workers. That way, we truly upgrade our infrastructure, create jobs, and keep our economy growing.

That is the right approach. We need to work in a bipartisan manner to get it done.

And with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I want to thank my colleagues from North Dakota, Ohio, Wyoming, and Iowa, who have spoken before me, and my colleague from Kansas, after me.

I think Senator PORTMAN ended his statement by saying that we have heard the rhetoric, but we haven't seen the actions. Well, in North Carolina, our State motto, in Latin, is ''Esse quam videri.'' It means: To be, rather than to seem.

I think our State motto does a good job of summarizing the first 100 days of the Biden administration. As a Presidential candidate, Joe Biden made it seem that he would govern as a moderate, pragmatic deal maker, and he set the bar high in his inaugural address. He said:

> My whole soul is in this: bringing America together, uniting our people, [and] uniting our nation. I ask every American to join me in this cause.

I was actually inspired by that statement, and I am one of the Americans who was willing to work for him on that cause. In fact, I was 1 of the 10 Republicans who had the first official meeting with the President to see if we could come to common ground on the COVID relief package, after having successfully passed five bipartisan COVID relief packages in the last Congress.

Unfortunately, the President's actions have not corresponded with his promises to date. Instead of leading on his instincts to bring America together, President Biden has followed his advisers' recommendations to go it alone. He has pushed a highly partisan, ideologically driven agenda.

And you don't need to take my word for it. New York Representative ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ recently declared that President Biden has exceeded the expectations of progressives.

Indeed, there has been a lot in Biden's agenda for the left to like. It is an agenda designed to pass with no need for moderation and not a single Republican vote—no consensus whatsoever—proposing tax hikes on American families and businesses at a time that they are trying to rebound from the pandemic.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are in the middle of a national emergency. We are in the middle of a pandemic. We have spent and appropriated billions of dollars to healthcare, to businesses to recover. And now, long before the national emergency has been declared done, we are talking about taking those same dollars away.

Offering mixed messaging and failed policies that have caused a humanitarian and security crisis at the southern border is another issue. When I went down to the border about a month ago, the Press Secretary said: It is not a crisis; it is a situation. Now, a month later, the Press Secretary and the administration say it is a crisis, but now it is a catastrophe.

I saw a dead body floating in the Rio Grande River. Other people died. We heard the report of a 9-year-old. That doesn't even count the number of people who died along the way.

It also doesn't count the 300 or 400 people who are called the ''got-aways''—not the thousands who are coming in and going to the border agents but the hundreds every night who are crossing. They are bad actors. Many of them are gang members or they are smuggling drugs or are human traffickers, who are evading arrest. It is creating a dangerous situation. It is a catastrophe. The President hasn't spoken on it. To my knowledge, the Vice President has never gone down there to get a bird's eye view.

The President has embraced the Green New Deal policies, like canceling the Keystone Pipeline. That one stroke of a pen ended thousands of labor union jobs, good-paying jobs. But even more heartbreaking are the communities that would have benefited from all of that commerce occurring in some of the most rural areas and most economically challenged areas in our country.

They rammed through an entirely partisan $2 trillion spending package. They called it COVID relief. But only about 9 percent of it actually had anything to do with continuing to recover from the damage that COVID has caused this country.

I am sure the President will talk about it tonight, a $2.3 trillion—air quotes—infrastructure bill that isn't actually an infrastructure bill. In fact, they have been a little bit more intellectually honest. Now they are calling it human infrastructure.

I think most Americans, when you think about infrastructure, you think about roads, you think about bridges, you think about broadband. You don't think about human infrastructure. But that is what is being pitched today, and it is being pitched on a partisan basis, without even attempting to get a single Republican vote.

Americans did not elect President Biden to enact any of these partisan policies. They trusted him to come in and make deals—to settle for something less than 100 percent but something that was going to be embraced by more of the American people versus half, which is about where the President is today.

And he has pursued this for 100 days. I hope he changes his mind, but here is one reason why I am not optimistic. His most audacious action, in my opinion, is placating the far left and entertaining the idea of nuking the Senate legislative filibuster. In this very Chamber, 21 years ago, then-Senator Biden declared that defending the filibuster was about defending compromise and moderation. The promises he made on the campaign trail, the promise he made on the day of his inauguration—he noted that his speech was one of the most important he would ever give as a Senator, defending the filibuster. It is a shame that President Biden isn't demonstrating the same political courage that Senator Biden did two decades earlier—the kind of courage that we are seeing today demonstrated by Senator MANCHIN and Senator SINEMA. Instead, the President has entertained the far left's push to eliminate the filibuster and destroy this institution, to end bipartisanship and compromise—they really are no longer a necessity—so that any piece of fringe legislation can pass with a simple majority.

The President, a 30-plus year defender of the filibuster, should know better than anyone. He knows that the left is demanding a Faustian bargain—trading 2 years for the far left to have free reign in exchange for permanent destabilization of our Republic, emboldening future demagogues on both ends of the spectrum.

Our country doesn't need more partisan pandering or political brinksmanship from this administration or from either party. That is why I stood against nuking the filibuster about 3 years ago, and I will as long as I am a U.S. Senator.

There are plenty of Republicans like me who are willing to work with President Biden and even put some of our supporters out of their comfort zone for the good of this Nation.

In fact, when I was sworn in, I said I would work to find common ground in areas where we may agree, and I would vigorously oppose policies where we do not. Unfortunately, to this point, I have only had the opportunity to do the latter.

The willingness to negotiate has only been a one-way street on the part of Republicans. I went to the White House to try to find common ground on another bipartisan COVID package, but it is ultimately up to the President whether he leads on bipartisanship instincts or follows his advisers who are pushing him to keep governing from the left.

Quite frankly, it doesn't matter what the President says about bipartisanship and uniting the country; it is what he does. And, tonight, I hope we will see it for the good of our great Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, on January 20, President Joe Biden gave his inaugural address to the American people, saying that in order to overcome the challenges we face as a nation and ''to restore the soul and [to] secure the future of America requires more than words; it requires that most elusive of things in a democracy: unity. Unity.''

I end the quote.

And he says for a second time: ''Unity.'' In fact, he mentioned the word ''unity'' nine separate times throughout his inaugural remarks. Unfortunately, that ''unity'' President Biden preached about is nowhere to be found.

One hundred days in office, and there has been zero bipartisanship from the

White House on any major issue. We have seen zero effort by the White House to take any Republican idea or concept seriously. In fact, they have done very little to reach across the aisle, engage Republicans, or have a serious conversation with us.

They have shown that they are not interested in bipartisanship, as they continue to jam through their radical agenda and seek power grab after power grab.

We have seen a record number of Executive orders, the first partisan COVID relief bill, steps to grant DC statehood to tip the powers of scale, a directive that threatens private property rights—the cornerstone of our democracy—an attempt to federalize elections and destroy election integrity with H.R. 1, threats to eliminate the filibuster, increased gas prices for Americans at the pump, efforts to pack the Supreme Court, disguised measures to pass the Green New Deal, calls to defund police, mandates to allow biological boys to compete in girls' sports, and tax increases on all Americans, and much, much more.

Things are changing in DC. History will record President Biden as having spent more money than any other President in U.S. history in his first 100 days. I am warning everyone: Grab your wallets. History will record President Biden's misguided policies as making our Nation less safe, having created a health crisis, a national security crisis, and a humanitarian crisis at the southern border.

What I hope to hear from President Biden this evening is not likely to be covered in a speech. He is going to try to explain to us—even though our economy is recovering and we just borrowed and spent $2 trillion from our grandchildren—why we now need to spend another $2 trillion and why he needs to raise your taxes to do it. He is going to try to describe the legislation he wants passed as a so-called infrastructure bill, when less than 5 percent of it is going toward roads and bridges.

He is going to try to convince Americans of something that is a misnomer and not a truth. What he won't tell you is this is a recipe to kill Kansas jobs and an economic catastrophe for this Nation.

Last week, President Biden signed into law a bipartisan bill I introduced, alongside Senators BILL CASSIDY and TINA SMITH, to lower prescription drug prices for the American people. Additionally, we unanimously passed a bill out of the Ag Committee regarding carbon markets. These are both great examples of the unity the President spoke of in his inaugural address—Democrats and Republicans coming together to deliver solutions for the American people.

These are good first steps, and in case there is more opportunity for bipartisanship, let me tell you where we can and should start. We can start with an infrastructure package that actually rebuilds our aging roads, bridges, and waterways; invest in future generations and ensure high-speed internet for all Americans and incentivize innovation. We can start with staying the course laid out by Operation Warp Speed and get more shots in people's arms so we can reach herd immunity sooner rather than later. We can start with people getting back to work and finally unleash our economy to prepandemic levels, and we can start getting all our kids back in school.

As President Biden said in his inaugural address, ''This is our historic moment of crisis and challenge, and unity is the path forward.''

If he truly puts unity above all else, we can accomplish great things for the American people, for it is unity that will see this country come roaring back, not President Biden's radical, partisan ways that have further divided this Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1410

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, sadly, the United States is in the midst of the deadliest drug epidemic in our Nation's history, caused by some of the deadliest drugs ever created.

It appears that more than 80,000 Americans died from drug overdose last year. By far, the biggest killers were lab-made opioids, such as fentanyl, which are cheap to produce and easy to mix with other street drugs such as heroin. These lethal cocktails have devastated countless communities and families across our Nation. Too many parents have come home to a dead child who mistakenly took a prescription pill or a so-called party drug laced with this deadly fentanyl.

Illicit fentanyl, the kind created in underground Chinese drug labs or smuggled across our porous southern border by Mexican cartels, is made only to addict and kill. For those dark, terrible purposes, fentanyl is unsurpassed in the tragic history of addiction. It is 50 to 100 times stronger than morphine. Just 2 milligrams of fentanyl, an amount equivalent to a few grains of salt, is enough to kill a grown man.

Just last December, police arrested a man in Arkansas carrying 7 pounds of fentanyl. Depending on the purity of that fentanyl, that would have been enough to deliver a fatal dose to up to 1.5 million Americans. That is far from the biggest fentanyl bust that police have ever made.

That means that every time our Border Patrol stops a drug mule coming across our southern border, every time the Coast Guard intercepts a drug runners' vessel in our waters, and every time a SWAT team raids a drug dealer's stash house, they could be averting what is, in effect, a mass casualty attack on our country.

Unfortunately, these Mexican drug cartels and Chinese superlabs are diabolically creative in waging this new kind of opium war against the United States. When American law enforcement started cracking down on fentanyl a few years ago, the cartels started producing so-called analogs or look-alike drugs that are chemically distinct from fentanyl, yet have no legitimate medical uses but will kill you just as quickly. Some of these analogs are even more powerful than fentanyl—up to 150 times more potent of a drug that I would remind you, once again, is, itself, 50 to 100 times more potent than morphine. Because these drugs are chemically distinct from fentanyl, prosecuting and shutting down their creators is often prohibitively expensive, requiring law enforcement to hire expert witnesses to testify the analog is, in fact, a deadly drug.

In 2018, the Drug Enforcement Administration took the necessary and prudent step listing the entire class of fentanyl analogs as schedule I prohibited substances. This decision closed a deadly loophole that drug dealers were using to escape punishment from poisoning our citizens, while still allowing legitimate researchers to apply for and obtain approval to research these analogs for potential medical or scientific breakthroughs.

The evidence suggests that this law enforcement action has been getting results. Since the classwide scheduling went into effect in early 2018, law enforcement encounters with uncontrolled fentanyl analogs plummeted by almost 90 percent.

Of course, our work to solve the opioid epidemic is far from finished. We still have much to do to dismantle the cartels and drug trafficking networks that spread fentanyl and analogs and mix it with other drugs. But the DEA's efforts to control fentanyl analogs were a step in the right direction.

Last year, the Senate voted unanimously to extend the DEA's emergency scheduling of fentanyl, but that extension is now set to expire. We have the opportunity—in fact, I would say we have the responsibility to permanently control these deadly fentanyl analogs so law enforcement has the legal backup it needs to take these dangerous drugs off the streets.

If Congress doesn't act, this emergency scheduling order is set to expire next week. The authority of our Border Patrol to seize these drugs as they cross the border will be dramatically reduced. Cartels will, once again, be able to exploit loopholes to evade prosecution, and Chinese superlabs will get right back to work inventing new and creative ways to repackage fentanyl and to kill even more Americans. We cannot let that happen.

I introduced a bill to solve this problem once and for all by merely eliminating the expiration date on the law that protects us against these fentanyl analogs. I am asking my colleagues to approve it just like we did last year—unanimously.

I would also like to urge my Democratic colleagues to disregard the liberal activist groups that are lobbying

against controlling these deadly fentanyl analogs because they hope to use it as a bargaining chip to reduce criminal penalties for the most serious drug traffickers. Think about that. More Americans died of a drug overdose last year than in any other year in our history. Yet these liberal activists are trying to help the drug traffickers who spread these very poisons. If they succeed, drug dealers will have an easier time killing Americans for profit, and prosecutors will have to waste valuable resources proving that each new form of fentanyl they encounter is, in fact, a deadly drug.

We cannot play politics with this bill, trading the lives of innocent Americans for more lenient treatment of cartels and superlabs. Protecting Americans from deadly fentanyl should not be treated as a bargaining piece or poker chip. I ask my colleagues to think of the victims and think of the urgency of this measure. I am offering this bill on behalf of tens of thousands of Americans who were with us just last year but are not today because of these deadly synthetic drugs. I am offering this on behalf of the countless Americans who can still be saved if we act.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure and, therefore, Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to immediate consideration of S. 1410, introduced earlier today; further, I ask unanimous consent 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?

Mr. BOOKER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I am deeply grateful to my colleague and friend, the Senator from Arkansas, for bringing this to the floor of the U.S. Senate.

There is an urgency he described that I agree with. One hundred Senators here, and not one State has not been touched, devastatingly, by the fentanyl epidemic. These analogs present a crisis to our country. Lives are at stake so I share his sense of urgency.

I am hoping we can work together to find a way to stop, as he put it, these cartels and these drug labs from wreaking such havoc on our country. I believe that together we can find a solution. In fact, there has been constructive talk across the Capitol—bipartisan talk about finding a way to come to some kind of accord.

In addition to that, I am hopeful that there are other bills out there that have the same ambition, the same goal, the same sense of urgency that I believe should be part of the discussion; for example, policies like the ones in the STOP Fentanyl Act, which I understand Senator MARKEY will be introducing in the Senate very soon. I believe we should have time in the Judiciary Committee to work on a longer term solution that cannot just deal with the international cartels, not just deal with these horrific drug labs but also empower people who are addicted to begin not to be punished simply with the criminal justice system but to find ways to provide treatment and support to people who are struggling with addictions to this horrific drug.

So with that, I would like to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Objection is heard.

The junior Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. I thank my colleague from New Jersey for these remarks.

Time is not on our side. This emergency scheduling order expires next week. The Senate is not in session next week.

I know that we want to empower addicts, as the Senator from New Jersey said; that we want to help give them the treatment they need to get back on their feet. That is a goal I share.

We are talking, though, about drug dealers, drug traffickers, cartels, Chinese superlabs. If we do not pass an extension—in my bill, a permanent extension of this emergency scheduling order—it is the addicts who will be hurt because the drug dealers and these cartels and superlabs will simply begin to flood our streets, once again, with the synthetic fentanyl analogs, which I remind you, again, can be 150 times more potent than fentanyl itself, which is 50 to 100 times more potent than morphine.

I hope my Democratic friends will reconsider in the short time we have this week, and we will be able to pass a permanent extension of this scheduling order.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I want to say, in conclusion, before I switch to another topic, that I appreciate the willingness of the Senator from Arkansas to look not just at his bill but a powerful potential bipartisan extension however we can deal with this. The urgency does exist. We are in a crisis.

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER

Madam President, I rise today to speak in support of Ambassador Power's nomination to serve as Administrator for the U.S. Agency for International Development or USAID.

The mission of USAID is to advance the values of democracy throughout the world on behalf of the American people, and this mission has never been more critical than today.

If confirmed, Ambassador Power will lead an Agency tasked with responding not only to the global crisis of COVID–19 and its devastating impact on vulnerable people across the world but with responding to some of the most pressing challenges facing the United States and the international community: global democratic backsliding, human suffering caused by sexual- and gender-based violence, climate change, and violent conflict around the world.

Now, Ambassador Power is an extraordinary public servant. She has distinguished herself in her career and is more than capable of leading USAID's efforts in addressing these global urgencies. She is clear-eyed and sober about the international challenges that she and USAID will face.

Over the past 4 years, experts and career professionals within the USAID were, unfortunately, silenced. Decisions were politicized, and recruitment and retention were inadequate. Ambassador Power will be the kind of leader this Agency now needs to restore integrity, transparency, and to rebuild the morale among the dedicated professionals who drive USAID's critical mission.

Ambassador Power also understands that the United States will remain a global leader—really, must remain a global leader—who will be able to counter the influence of China's aggressive diplomatic and development agenda. If the USAID is seen, once again, by our international partners as a competent and trustworthy partner, this mission of countering China will be stronger. If the USAID is a competent and trustworthy partner, we will build on our coalitions to counter China's aggressive actions.

President Biden could not have nominated someone more ready or more capable than Ambassador Power. She has had an impressive career from her work as a Pulitzer Prize-writing journalist to spending 8 years in the Obama administration on the National Security Council, and then as the Ambassador to the United Nations, where she championed the rights of women, atrocity prevention, and LGBTQ rights, reaching consensus with other countries on vital U.S. interests while going toe to toe with our adversaries.

This is one of our more experienced international diplomats from America whom we have today, and by elevating Ambassador Power to the National Security Council, President Biden has made it clear that development and humanitarian assistance will be an integral component to meeting our foreign policy objectives. It is important that we understand that development and humanitarian assistance are a critical part of our foreign policy.

Finally, I just want to end with something that Ambassador Power shared in her most recent book. It is something that, I think, speaks so well to her humility, to her willingness to learn, and to why she will be the leader of the USAID—and, I say, of our entire Nation—and is what the world needs right now. Ambassador Power wrote about a meeting she had with the Ambassador from the Central African Republic, Charles Doubane, who described to her the horrific violence taking place in his country.

She wrote that, during that meeting, she told him she didn't have an agenda. She just wanted to learn from him

about what was happening in his country. She then writes that he starts speaking and then stops and gets very emotional. She assumes he is getting emotional about the horrific violence in his country, but he says to her, ''No, it's not that, Ambassador. What is happening in my country is terrible—more terrible than anything that has ever happened to us before. But I am emotional because you are here. The United States of America is the greatest country in the world, and you, America, are here.''

That is the vision of America that has defined Ambassador Power's career, that has guided her in the awesome responsibility of representing this Nation and her values—rooted in the ideals of humility, grace, compassion, and thoughtful leadership.

I have known Ambassador Power since she and I were very young. It has been decades now of friendship and connection. You can say many things about her, but her core is decency and honor. She will represent the best of us. She is exactly the leader we need right now as we navigate the increasing and pressing challenges facing the world and our country.

I am thankful. It would be enough for Ambassador Power to retire. It would be enough for her to say, ''I have served my country'' and, like Cincinnatus, will return to her plow, but, clearly, her calling has not yet fully been answered. She will continue, should this body believe it and endorse it, to serve this country. She will continue to honor the United States of America. She will continue to be a credit to our Nation and the world. That is why I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

FENTANYL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I am 5 minutes late in coming to the Senate floor. I was supposed to be here on the fentanyl issue to support Senator COTTON. I know that an objection has been raised, but I want people to know how important I think this issue is.

Today, we were considering—hopefully, by unanimous consent—passing a bill to permanently schedule fentanyl substances. Proactively scheduling fentanyl-related substances ought to be a big priority because too many Americans' lives have been lost to reject this critical measure.

Some wrongly assert that controlling fentanyl analogs is partisan and unnecessary. That is simply untrue. Legislation to schedule fentanyl analogs is a bipartisan issue. Just last year, this body passed a bipartisan, 15-month extension bill unanimously. Also, such authority is necessary. The CDC estimates that fentanyl analogs have killed 50,000 Americans in the last 12 months. We must prevent overdose deaths. Prevention is possible when we use our laws to force China to stop the flow of fentanyl analogs.

Opponents of permanent scheduling assert that the authority is broad and could result in too many arrests, but since the Drug Enforcement Administration placed fentanyl analogs in schedule I, the Justice Department has convicted only 80 people under that authority. So too many people being arrested as an argument against their permanent extension is hogwash. This authority hasn't resulted in vast and wide prosecutions; rather, this authority has been targeted and deliberate, and, of course, that is the way it should be.

So if controlling fentanyl analogs is, in fact, bipartisan and necessary, why isn't supporting legislation then a no-brainer? Perhaps because of heightened partisanship, the Democrats can't vote for legislation that helps law enforcement, or maybe they can't be seen as supporting any drug control law even if it could save thousands of lives. This position goes against the unfortunate truth that 50,000 Americans have died from these deadly fentanyl analogs. Politics has no place above human life.

As frustrated as I am by this, it is not my nature to throw in the towel. I will always work hard to find middle ground. That is why I am asking every Senator to support Senator COTTON's permanent extension or, at a minimum, my bill, the Temporary Extension of Fentanyl Scheduling Act. This bipartisan measure extends the authority to schedule fentanyl analogs for 14 months. It keeps fentanyl analogs in schedule I until July 2022, which is long enough for the administration to come to a permanent scheduling solution and allow for a deliberate and transparent dialogue with Congress.

Simply put, we need to give ourselves enough time to find a solution to this major problem causing 50,000 lives to be lost every year. As history shows us, lengthy fentanyl scheduling legislation is not controversial. I am simply asking for a similar, bipartisan approach now. My bill is the only bipartisan temporary extension bill on the table.

I am grateful for Senators HASSAN and SHAHEEN for teaming up with me and Senator CORNYN.

We can't limit ourselves in the fight against fentanyl. It is with this in mind that I urge all of my colleagues to support either a permanent extension or my bipartisan bill and to extend the authority to schedule fentanyl analogs for 14 months.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 185

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, Americans are worried about inflation. New polling shows that 87 percent of Americans are concerned about the rising costs of household items, like diapers and gas and groceries. That is up from 77 percent just last month. They have good reason to feel that way. Right now, reports show that a third of American households making less than $50,000 in annual income are buying less because of increasing prices, and more than one-quarter of all households report that rising prices on goods are causing them to purchase less.

Just this month, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that, over the last 12 months, food prices have gone up, and gas prices have risen 23 percent. That means, since Biden was elected, gas prices have increased about 70 cents per gallon across the Nation. Year over year, consumer prices increased 2.6 percent in March. That is up from an annual 1.7 percent increase in February. This is all in addition to statements from some of America's largest corporations, like Procter & Gamble and Kimberly-Clark, which recently announced that they are increasing prices on a number of their products. That includes essential household goods, like toilet paper and diapers.

The evidence of inflation is right in front of us. Just look at these numbers that show the percentage change in average unit prices versus last year: groceries up 2.6 percent; household goods up 5.2 percent; baby care up 7 percent; general merchandise up 7.1 percent. Wages never go up this fast. So who does it hurt? It hurts the poorest and those on fixed incomes.

Businesses are also expecting price increases to continue.

According to data from FactSet, 47 S&P companies have mentioned inflation on their earnings calls for Q1 2021. That is more than during any other quarter in the last 10 years.

On its most recent earnings call, Procter & Gamble's chief financial officer, Andre Schulten, said:

> The commodity cost challenges we face this year will, obviously, be larger next fiscal year.

Who gets hurt the most when inflation rises? Not the rich. It is working families, especially those on low and fixed incomes.

I grew up poor and watched my parents struggle to put food on the table. I know just how much a slight rise in prices can hurt a family, because I saw it while I was growing up, and that is what is happening right now across our Nation.

We know that those in the Biden administration are worried about this. They know that rising costs caused by their massive spending are bad for Americans, but they won't say it. While they are reportedly worrying in private about the effects of their spending plans, they have had a different message in public.

On April 13, the New York Times reported that officials and aides at the White House and the Department of the Treasury have been holding private meetings for months to discuss inflation and have conducted indepth internal analyses for senior officials and President Biden.

The article goes on to read:

Mr. Biden's aides are sufficiently worried about the risk of that spending fueling inflation that they shaped his infrastructure proposal, which has yet to be taken up by Congress, to funnel out $2.3 trillion over eight years, which is slower than traditional stimulus.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this New York Times article, dated April 13, 2021.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 13, 2021]

THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION IS QUIETLY OBSESSING OVER INFLATION

(By Jim Tankersley)

WASHINGTON.—Even before President Biden took office, some of his closest aides were focused on a question that risked derailing his economic agenda: Would his plans for a $1.9 trillion economic rescue package and additional government spending overheat the economy and fuel runaway inflation?

To find the answer, a close circle of advisers now working at the White House and the Treasury Department projected the behaviors of shoppers, employers, stock traders and others if Mr. Biden's plans succeeded. Officials as senior as Janet L. Yellen, the Treasury secretary, pored over the analyses in video calls and in-person meetings, looking for any hint that Mr. Biden's plans could generate sustained price increases that could hamstring family budgets. It never appeared.

Those efforts convinced Mr. Biden's team that there is little risk of inflation spiraling out of the Federal Reserve's control—an outcome that Wall Street analysts, a few prominent Republicans and even liberal economists like Lawrence H. Summers, the former Treasury secretary, have said could flow from the trillions being pumped into the economy.

Traditional readings of price increases are beginning to turn upward as the recovery accelerates. On Tuesday, the Consumer Price Index rose 0.6 percent, its fastest monthly increase in more than a decade, while a less volatile index excluding food and energy rose a more muted 0.3 percent.

But Mr. Biden's advisers believe any price spike is likely to be temporary and not harmful, essentially a one-time event stemming from the unique nature of a pandemic recession that ruptured supply chains and continues to depress activity in key economic sectors like restaurant dining and tourism.

The administration's view mirrors the posture of top officials at the Fed, including its chairman, Jerome H. Powell, whose mandate includes maintaining price stability in the economy. Mr. Powell has said that the Fed expects any short-term price pops to be temporary, not sustained, and not the type of uptick that would prompt the central bank to raise interest rates rapidly—or anytime soon.

''What we see is relatively modest increases in inflation,'' Mr. Powell said in March. ''But those are not permanent things.''

Armed with their internal data and conclusions, administration officials have begun to push back on warnings that a stimulus-fueled surge in consumer spending could revive a 1970s-style escalation in wages and prices that could cripple the economy in the years to come.

Yet they remain wary of the inflation threat and have devised the next wave of Mr. Biden's spending plans, a $2.3 trillion infrastructure package, to dispense money gradually enough not to stoke further price increases right away. Administration officials also continue to check on real-time measures of prices across the economy, multiple times a day.

''We think the likeliest outlook over the next several months is for inflation to rise modestly,'' two officials at Mr. Biden's Council of Economic Advisers, Jared Bernstein and Ernie Tedeschi, wrote on Monda in a blog post outlining some of the administration's thinking. ''We will, however, carefully monitor both actual price changes and inflation expectations for any signs of unexpected price pressures that might arise as America leaves the pandemic behind and enters the next economic expansion.''

Some Republicans call that posture dangerous. Senator Rick Scott of Florida, the chairman of his party's campaign arm for the 2022 midterm elections, has called on Mr. Biden and Mr. Powell to present plans to fight inflation now.

''The president's refusal to address this critical issue has a direct negative effect on Floridians and families across our nation, and hurts low- and fixed-income Americans the most,'' Mr. Scott said in a news release last week. ''It's time for Biden to wake up from his liberal dream and realize that reckless spending has consequences, inflation is real and America's debt crisis is growing. Inflation is rising and Americans deserve answers from Biden now.''

Economic teams in recent administrations spent little time worrying about inflation, because inflationary pressures have been tame for decades. It has fallen short of the Fed's average target of 2 percent for 10 of the last 12 years, topping out at 2.5 percent in the midst of the longest economic expansion in history.

Shortly before the pandemic recession hit the United States in 2020, President Donald J. Trump's economic team wrote that ''price inflation remains low and stable'' even with unemployment below 4 percent. As the economy struggled to climb out from the 2008 financial crisis under President Barack Obama, White House aides feared that prices might fall, instead of rise.

''Given the economic crisis, we worried about preventing deflation rather than inflation,'' said Austan Goolsbee, a chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers during Mr. Obama's first term.

The conversation has changed given the large amounts of money that the federal government is channeling into the economy, first under Mr. Trump and now under Mr. Biden. Since the pandemic took hold, Congress has approved more than $5 trillion in spending, including direct checks to individuals.

Mr. Biden's aides are sufficiently worried about the risk of that spending fueling inflation that they shaped his infrastructure proposal, which has yet to be taken up by Congress, to funnel out $2.3 trillion over the course of eight years, which is slower than traditional stimulus.

Even before Mr. Summers and others raised economic concerns about Mr. Biden's $1.9 trillion relief bill, officials were wrestling with their own worries about its inflation risks. They had internally concluded, with direction from Mr. Biden, that the biggest risk to the economy was going ''too small'' on the aid package—not spending enough to help vulnerable Americans survive continued stints of joblessness or lost income. But they wanted to know the risks of going ''too big.''

They tested whether an uptick in inflation might cause people and financial markets to expect rapid price increases in the years to come, upending decades of what economists call ''well-anchored'' expectations for prices and potentially creating a situation where higher expectations led to higher inflation. They estimated the odds that the Fed would react to such moves by quickly and steeply raising interest rates, potentially slamming the brakes on growth and causing another recession.

The informal group that initially gathered to research those questions included Mr. Bernstein, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers; David Kamin, a deputy director of the National Economic Council; Michael Pyle, Vice President Kamala Harris's chief economic adviser; and two Treasury officials, Nellie Liang and Ben Harris. More members have joined over time, including Mr. Tedeschi.

The group reports regularly to Ms. Yellen and other senior officials including Brian Deese, who heads the N.E.C., and Cecilia Rouse, who leads the C.E.A. Its work has informed economic briefings of Mr. Biden and Ms. Harris.

''The president and the vice president, their job is to deliver good economic outcomes for the American people,'' Mr. Pyle said in an interview. ''Part of what delivering strong economic outcomes to the American people means is ensuring that their team is fully on top of both the tailwinds to the U.S. economy but also the risks that are out there. And this is one of them.''

Mr. Pyle and his colleagues looked at financial market measures of inflation expectations, including one called the five-year, five-year forward, which currently shows investors expecting lower inflation levels over the next several years than they expected in 2018.

At the same time, officials at the Treasury's Office of Economic Policy conducted a series of modeling exercises to ''stress test'' the virus relief package and how it might change those price and expectation measures if put in place. They considered scenarios where consumers quickly spent their aid money, which included $1,400 checks, or where they did not spend much of it at all right away. They talked with large banks about trends in customers' cash balances and how quickly people were returning to the work force. Ms. Yellen, a former Fed chair, helped adjust the models herself.

The exercises produced a wide range of possibilities for inflation. But they never suggested it would rise so rapidly that the Fed could not easily handle it by adjusting interest rates or other monetary policy tools. They saw no risk of a sharp return to recession—and no reason to pull back from spending proposals that administration officials believe will help the economy heal faster and help historically disadvantaged groups, like Black and Hispanic workers, regain jobs and income.

''We're going to see some heat in this economy,'' Mr. Pyle said. ''That heat is going to be good and redound to the benefit of wages and labor market conditions overall and particularly for a number of communities that have been at the margins of the labor market for too long.''

If the data proves that forecast wrong, officials say privately, they will be quick to adapt. But they will not say how. If inflation were to accelerate in a sustained and surprising way, some officials suggest, the administration would trust the Fed to step in to contain it.

There is no plan, as of yet, for Mr. Biden to consider inflation-fighting actions of his own.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. The content and conclusions of these meetings and working groups have not been disclosed or been made available to the public.

While privately worrying about the same issue I have been sounding the

alarm on for months, the Biden administration continues to mislead the American public and ignore the threat of inflation.

Over the last 2 months, I have asked the National Economic Council about its plans to fight inflation and protect American families.

I have written a Federal Reserve member, asked him what can be done to help families who are seeing skyrocketing gas prices and increasing mortgage rates.

I have called on President Biden and Federal Reserve Chair Powell to lay out their clear plan to address inflation and rising prices that threaten American families. I have yet to get a straightforward or acceptable response. I have yet to hear them acknowledge this very real threat or propose a solution to protect families.

So today Senator BRAUN and I are making a simple request that the Biden administration share with the Senate all of its notes, memos, and reports regarding their discussions and plans to mitigate and prevent growing inflation.

Inflation is a very real threat to the well-being of already struggling families, and the last thing American families need is to be misled by this administration.

Right now, Democrats in Washington are living in a fantasyland where debt doesn't matter, spending has no consequences, inflation is impossible.

But the reality is that inflation does have consequences, and it is the duty of everyone here, especially the President of the United States, to be open and transparent with the American people about what is happening with inflation.

There is no reason the Biden administration should be hiding this information. Americans deserve to know the consequences of massive government spending, and they deserve leadership that will show some fiscal responsibility when it comes to their taxpayer dollars.

I look forward to all my colleagues supporting this effort to increase transparency.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 185, submitted earlier today. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, no serious economists across the ideological spectrum are concerned about inflation right now. No one is hiding information at the White House.

I am in meetings all the time with White House officials talking about this package. No one believes—first of all, no one is hiding information. No one believes what the Senator, the junior Senator from Florida, is saying about this.

Perhaps some millionaire Senators want to make this into an issue, and I hear that over and over and over, but I talk to people like Jay Powell, Chair of the Federal Reserve, nominated by President Trump for that position. He, of course, keeps his eye on these kinds of things, but he has expressed no strong concern about inflation.

And we even know that when some experts have been concerned, they have been wrong. We saw what happened in 2008 after too many elites worried about inflation. What we really needed was to increase wages and get people back to work. The result from 2008 was a recovery that was too slow for most people, while so many of these big costs continued to rise.

Our economy looks a whole lot better today than it did last year, but we can't compare where we are today with where we were last year. We were on the brink of a once-in-a-generation health and economic crisis at this time last year. Millions of people, mostly low-wage workers, lost their jobs. Our economy ground to a halt as we tried to stop the spread of the virus.

This year, we have made good progress with the American Rescue Plan, as the Presiding Officer from Wisconsin knows, getting shots in arms and money in pockets and kids back in school, people back to work.

But our recovery is far from over. Just moments ago Fed Chair Powell said that we are seeing some temporary upticks because things were so dire last year, but we still have a long way to go.

The bigger risk to the economy is not doing enough to raise workers' wages and to invest in the infrastructure that allows our economy to grow.

We know corporate leaders, we know millionaire Senators, we know people at the top have done very—in many cases, have done very, very well through this, but we know millions of workers, many of them hourly workers, have lost jobs. We know millions of workers, so-called essential workers—one essential worker said to me, works in a grocery store: I don't feel essential. Frankly, I feel expendable because they don't pay me much; they don't protect me at work. Those are the people we should be looking after.

I want to raise wages. I want to bring down costs. That is exactly what the jobs plan and the family plan will do—bring down healthcare costs, make childcare more affordable, create more housing people can afford, bring down energy bills, make work—getting to work cheaper and easier with better transit. These are the costs that have been rising and eating away at family budgets for decades.

If my colleague from Florida is so concerned about the cost of living and raising a family, I hope he will join me to allow Medicare to negotiate directly with drug companies to bring down prices for seniors. I hope he will join us in investing in childcare to bring down the cost of childcare. I hope he will join us as we work to create more housing, bringing down housing costs. I hope he will join us to raise the minimum wage.

My first speech on this floor 14 years ago—14 years ago, my first speech on this floor was to raise the minimum wage, and we did, and it hasn't been raised since. That is what the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Indiana can help us with.

But we know most of the conservative elites in this country—most won't say out loud what this inflation alarmism is really about. They don't want to invest in the American people. They don't want to do anything to make Americans' hard work pay off. They would rather try to scare people: Can't spend this money because there might be inflation.

They don't want us to do what too many have failed to do: put money in people's pockets and raise wages and rebuild infrastructure.

I would ask my colleagues to listen to the words of a worker from West Virginia, Pamela Garrison. She testified at our first-ever work listening session, our ''Dignity of Work'' session in the Banking and Housing Committee yesterday. She said:

> We're seeing corporations make billions every quarter in profit, but then when we ask for a minimum wage raise, we're told that ''no that will raise the cost of stuff, oh that'll cost jobs.''

Funny, corporate executives never seem to say they will have to raise prices when they give themselves bonuses. It is just we will have to raise prices if we increase the minimum wage.

This same Ms. Garrison also said: You know, they call me part of the working poor. The words ''working'' and ''poor'' shouldn't be in the same sentence, and she is right about that.

Real expenses for most families have gone up for decades, along with corporate profits and the stock market. Executive compensation has exploded upward, and workers' wages haven't kept up.

Executive compensation—productivity is up. Executive compensation is up. Profits are up. Workers' wages are flat. That is the problem. That is what we should be working on.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, the decision by my colleague to block this resolution is clearly disappointing.

Let's remember what this was about. This was about transparency. They just blocked the Senate from requesting basic information that is going to help all Americans.

And just look at these numbers again. Just in the last 4 months, grocery prices are up 2.6 percent; household care is up 5.2 percent; baby care is

up 7 percent; general merchandise up 7.1 percent. We are clearly seeing inflation.

Senate Democrats just objected to transparency. That means they are against getting the facts, against ensuring accountability, and against getting the American people the information they need to make smart decisions as prices keep rising.

Eighty-seven percent of Americans are worried about the rising costs of goods. Apparently, so is the White House. So don't the American people deserve the same information about what is happening with the economy?

Floridians deserve to know the truth about inflation and so do the people of Ohio. Why does my colleague want to keep them in the dark?

This administration is telling the American people one thing but saying something else behind closed doors. That is wrong.

The American people deserve the truth. Inflation is real. It is happening. It is hurting American families. It is time President Biden does something about it, and I am extremely disappointed my colleague is actually today helping the President mislead the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 10 minutes.

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

WORKERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, today we mark Workers Memorial Day, when we honor and remember workers who have laid down their lives on the job.

I have worn on my lapel since I was in the House, a pin depicting a canary in a bird cage given to me at a Workers Memorial Day rally in Lorain, OH, in the late 1990s.

This pin depicts a canary going down in the mine. It suggests the mine worker taking a canary down in the mines. If the canary died from lack of oxygen or from toxic gas, the mine worker got out of the mines. He had no union strong enough to protect him and no government that cared enough to protect him in those days.

To me, this pin represents the role of government to support the middle class and those who aspire to the middle class. It represents the progress we have made and the society we continue to fight for every day here.

We know the story. Coal miners took the canary down into the mines. Throughout the 20th century, we have worked to change that. We passed workers safety laws and overtime pay. We banned child labor. We passed clean air and safe drinking water laws. We enacted Social Security and Medicare and workers' rights and women's rights and civil rights.

But despite that progress over the last year, too many workers have felt a whole lot like those miners. They have felt like they are on their own.

A moment ago, I mentioned a grocery store worker in Cincinnati, who said: ''They tell me I am essential, but I feel expendable.''

That grocery store worker and thousands of others have been on the frontlines of this pandemic, risking their lives so Americans could keep food on their table and get their packages delivered. They were changing linens in hospitals and driving buses and stocking shelves in supermarkets.

Then workers go home at night and are anxious that they might spread the virus and infect their family.

We know that hundreds of thousands of workers have been exposed to the virus on the job. Thousands have died. It is hard to get an exact count of how many because the previous administration didn't bother to keep track.

We know that food and commercial workers reported last summer that more than 16,000 grocery store workers have been exposed, more than 100 have died. We know those numbers keep going up.

The National Nurses United has recorded at least 3,200 healthcare workers have died. In meatpacking plants, the toll has been horrific.

Last summer, 16,000 workers had been infected; the vast majority of them Black and Brown workers. More than 230 died.

And yet all of last year, the Trump administration and too many large corporations failed to protect their workers. The corporate lawyers that ran the Labor Department from the top down refused to issue workplace safety requirements.

Corporations ran a lot of feel-good TV ads saying thank you to essential workers, claiming these workers are the heart of their companies, but workers didn't ask for a PR campaign. They needed protections on the job.

This Workers Memorial Day, today—we celebrate it every year—we remember the American workers who have lost their lives on the job from this virus, sometimes from gun violence, sometimes from workplace accidents.

We honor them best by fighting to protect these workers and their fellow workers to make their hard work pay off.

Yesterday, in the Banking and Housing Committee, we held the committee's first-ever listening session. It was purely a listening session. No Senators got to ask questions. We just came to listen, with workers from Ohio and around the country, to hear how the financial system affects their jobs and their lives.

They shared powerful stories about their work, about how companies and economic policies prevent their hard work from paying off.

We heard from a distribution worker in Ashtabula County, OH. He told us:

> We rarely go a few weeks without an injury, largely because of the insane pace we work at. We have suggested that slowing the pace even just a little would improve safety and could save money, to which we were told, ''Injuries don't cost the company much money.''

We heard from a Wells Fargo call center worker who talked about how the bank misclassified her to avoid paying overtime. They put her on salary. They said she was management. They worked her more than 40 hours. They never paid her an overtime dollar.

We heard from a full-time gig worker who works for multiple corporations like Uber and Instacart. He works full time. He has zero benefits because these companies claim he is an independent contractor.

We heard from a Michigan worker who lost her job when a private equity firm bought out her company. They laid off 3,100 workers in the Detroit area, and they pocketed the money.

We heard from a worker in West Virginia who talked about working her whole life and never seeing that hard work pay off. She said the term ''working poor'' should not be two words that go together.

If you work hard, you should be able to get ahead in this country. If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work.

If even the global pandemic, where America's workers have been on the frontlines—if even that won't get corporations to rethink their business model that treats workers as expendable, it is time to stop letting them run the economy. That is what the new Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee is all about. Wall Street had its chance. They failed. If corporate America won't deliver for its workers, then we have to create a better system centered on the dignity of work. That means safe workplaces.

The Biden administration is taking steps toward finally issuing an OSHA emergency temporary standard. We went a whole year in the pandemic where the President of the United States simply refused and the corporate lawyer who ran the Department of Labor simply refused to issue any standards on workplace safety. Think about that. Now it means laws and policies will reward work, like the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit—the junior Senator from New Hampshire is here and has been supportive of that; a strong overtime rule; ending misclassification that robs workers of their wages and their rights. It means a strong labor movement. Unions give people power on the job. People ought to have the option, if they choose, of joining a union, allowing them to join together to make their workplace safer.

It is workers who make our economy successful. It is workers who allow corporations and Wall Street investors to rake in record profits. It is time for that hard work to pay off for all workers, no matter if you punch a clock or work for salary or work for tips or take care of your parents or take care of

your children. Work should be rewarded in this country. When you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work on Workers Memorial Day and the other 364 days of the year.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise to voice my strong support for the confirmation of Ambassador Samantha Power to be the next Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development. I am confident that she brings the talent, skill, and experience required of this office and is the right person to lead this pivotal agency at a critical point in America's return to global leadership.

Ambassador Power has worn many different hats throughout her sterling career—advocate, academic, advisor, and diplomat. But that trajectory has been propelled in large part by her time as a journalist, where she saw the day-to-day experiences of those living in places struggling against the tides of war, famine, genocide, and disease. She witnessed, first-hand, the tireless efforts of USAID Foreign Service officers working in partnership with local stakeholders to uplift and empower communities around the world. And those early experiences seeing the work of USAID and the challenges the agency faces continue to guide her path.

Like Ambassador Power, I spent the early part of my career seeing global conflict up close. As a staffer working on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1988, I travelled to Iraq after Saddam Hussein used poison gas against the Kurdish people. It's a trip that Ambassador Power recounts in her first book, A Problem from Hell, which won her the Pulitzer Prize in 2003—and it's a trip that animates so much of the work I do in the United States Senate.

The world witnessed the horrific chemical weapons attacks on the Kurdish people in Halabja in March 1988 and later that year, together with my colleague, Peter Galbraith, I interviewed Kurdish survivors of other chemical attacks that followed. It was a heart-rending journey that stays with me to this day. But that experience, like Ambassador Power's experiences in Bosnia, East Timor, Darfur, West Africa, and elsewhere, instilled in me a sense of moral urgency that hasn't tired in the three decades since—and I know hasn't tired in Ambassador Power either.

I'm confident that she'll employ that sense of urgency in her new role as the Administrator of USAID, which bolsters peace and prosperity both in developing nations and here at home. The biggest threats that we face are interconnected and global—from climate change to cybersecurity to pandemics. As we've seen throughout the past year, viruses know no borders, and our ability to defeat COVID–19 depends upon our willingness to partner with other nations to stop the spread and mount a successful recovery. And as we reassert American values at the core of our foreign policy, we will also need to combat the Chinese government's efforts to export its model of authoritarianism to governments in developing countries. USAID will be at forefront of these missions and others. In Ambassador Power's own words, ''Development is critical to America's ability to tackle the toughest problems of our time—economic, humanitarian, and geopolitical.''

Madam President, there is no doubt in my mind that Ambassador Samantha Power will serve our country well as the next Administrator of USAID. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of her confirmation.

VOTE ON THE POWER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Are there any Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote or change his or her vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Baldwin	Heinrich	Portman
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Risch
Blunt	Inhofe	Romney
Booker	Johnson	Rosen
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Burr	Kelly	Sasse
Capito	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Luján	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cornyn	McConnell	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Crapo	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warnock
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Fischer	Murray	Wicker
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wyden
Graham	Padilla	Young
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—26

Barrasso	Boozman	Cassidy
Blackburn	Braun	Cotton
Cruz	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Daines	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Ernst	Lankford	Sullivan
Grassley	Lee	Thune
Hagerty	Lummis	Tillis
Hawley	Marshall	Tuberville
Hoeven	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—6

Cantwell	Paul	Shelby
Cramer	Rounds	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO ''OIL AND NATURAL GAS SECTOR: EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW, RECONSTRUCTED, AND MODIFIED SOURCES REVIEW''—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume legislative session.

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

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

S.J. RES. 14

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, Leader CHUCK SCHUMER, Chairman TOM CARPER of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, Senator ANGUS KING, Senator EDWARD MARKEY and I are leading supporters and sponsors of S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review, 85 Fed. Reg. 57,018, Sept. 14, 2020, also known as methane rescission rule. We submit these comments to provide the Senate with addit{onal information regarding the intent in adopting this resolution.

The atmospheric buildup of greenhouse gases, such as methane, is changing the climate at a pace and in a way that endangers human health, society, our economy, and the natural environment. Specific public health impacts of anthropogenic climate change include respiratory harms associated with smoke inhalation from unprecedented climate-driven forest fires, heat stroke, and other health effects of increasingly frequent heat waves, and more widespread vector borne diseases. Other public welfare impacts include displacing U.S. communities by retreating snow and ice and rising sea levels, droughts that impact agricultural production and farming communities, and

changes in the frequency and intensity of heat waves, precipitation, and extreme weather events that have a disproportionate impact on our Nation most vulnerable.

A key chemical constituent of natural gas, methane is a leading contributing cause of climate change. It is 28 to 36 times more powerful than carbon dioxide in raising the Earth's surface temperature when measured over a 100–year time scale and about 84 times more powerful when measured over a 20–year timeframe.

Industrial sources emit greenhouse gases in great quantities, and methane emissions from all segments of the oil and gas industry are especially significant in their contribution to overall emissions levels and surface temperature rise.

It is not possible to address the problem of rising global atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations tEy achieving U.S. net greenhouse gas neutrality. The United States cannot become greenhouse gas neutral without reducing greenhouse gas emissions from all industrial sources, regardless of the relative size of any one emission source or the disparate locations of the points of emission.

Within this context, the methane rescission rule should be disapproved by Congress. The rule finalized regulatory actions and introduced legal interpretations that contravene the Clean Air Act and congressional intent for EPA to take strong action to regulate and abate greenhouse gas emissions, such as methane, from all sources.

S.J. Res. 14 renders the methane rescission rule's effect void and demonstrates Congress's disapproval of the new findings of fact and interpretations of law upon which this rule was based.

By adopting this resolution of disapproval, it is our view that Congress reaffirms that the Clean Air Act requires EPA to act to protect Americans from sources of climate pollution like methane, which endangers the public's health and welfare.

In rejecting the methane rescission rule's misguided legal interpretations, the resolution clarifies our intent that EPA should regulate methane and other pollution emissions from all oil and gas sources, including production, processing, transmission, and storage segments under the authority of section 111 of the Clean Air Act.

In addition, we intend that section 111 of the Clean Air Act obligates and provides EPA with the legal authority to regulate existing sources of methane emissions in all of these segments.

In addition, we do not intend that section 111 of Clean Air Act requires EPA to make a pollutant-specific significant contribution finding before regulating emissions of a new pollutant from a listed source category, although EPA could make such a finding if it chooses to do so on a case-by-case basis.

Disapproval of the methane rescission rule does not preclude future regulation under section 111 of the Clean Air Act of methane, VOCs or other pollution from the oil and gas industry. This resolution nullifies a rule that strips away public health and welfare protections and deregulates the oil and gas industry. Any future rule that imposes regulatory requirements on the oil and gas industry, provides additional public health and welfare protections, or establishes or strengthens standards on sources of methane and other pollutant emissions would have the opposite intent and effect of the methane rescission rule and therefore cannot be construed as ''substantially the same'' as the methane rescission rule.

In fact, with the congressional adoption of this resolution, we encourage EPA to strengthen the standards we reinstate and aggressively regulate methane and other pollution emissions from new, modified, and existing sources throughout the production, processing, transmission, and storage segments of the oil and gas industry under section 111 of the Clean Air Act.

The welfare of our planet and of our communities depend on it.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today in support of the joint resolution of disapproval, which would reinstate critical regulations on methane emissions from the oil and gas industry.

Last summer, the Trump administration finalized a midnight rule that weakened and in some cases altogether eliminated requirements that oil and natural gas companies limit methane and volatile organic compound emissions from their operations. This action was taken despite methane's proven harmful impacts on air quality, health, and climate change.

Methane leaks from oil and gas wells are often accompanied by leaks of harmful carcinogens like benzene, resulting in health effects for the most vulnerable, including children and seniors. My home State of California is still dealing with the fallout of the Aliso Canyon gas leak—the worst gas leak in U.S. history-during which more than 100,000 metric tons of methane was emitted into the air. Many nearby residents reported having headaches, bloody noses, nausea, and rashes.

Methane also has more than 80 times the global warming potential of carbon dioxide and accounts for 10 percent of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. According to one study, the Trump aministration action will result in methane leaks equivalent to up to 592 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. This will have irreversible effects on our climate.

In California, we are already experiencing the destructive effects of climate change. California has seen recordbreaking and devastating droughts, floods, and wildfires. These disasters cannot be separated from global warming and the emissions of greenhouse gasses that cause it.

I am glad to see Congress taking action to reinstate necessary regulations on methane emissions, and I look forward to taking additional action, along with my conngressional colleagues, to combat climate change and ensure clean air for all Americans.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, as we approach the 100-day mark of this new Congress, the Senate is about to take its first major step in fighting climate change. In a moment, the Senate will vote on reinstating commonsense rules to reduce methane emissions. It will be the first time the Senate Democratic majority has used the Congressional Review Act, and it is no mistake that we have chosen to use the law first and foremost on the subject of climate change.

Under this Democratic majority, the Senate will be a place where we take decisive, ambitious, and effective action against climate change. Of course, reducing methane emissions is not the only thing we need to do to fight climate change, but it is a very significant and large first step.

Methane accounts for roughly a quarter of all the human-caused global warming that has transpired since the Industrial Revolution. Restoring these methane-reducing rules will be one of the most significant climate actions that the Senate has taken in more than a decade.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes and commend Senators HEINRICH, KING, and MARKEY for their great work on this issue.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 175 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Brown
Bennet	Booker	Cardin

Carper	King	Sanders
Casey	Klobuchar	Schatz
Collins	Leahy	Schumer
Coons	Luján	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Sinema
Duckworth	Markey	Smith
Durbin	Menendez	Stabenow
Feinstein	Merkley	Tester
Gillibrand	Murphy	Van Hollen
Graham	Murray	Warner
Hassan	Ossoff	Warnock
Heinrich	Padilla	Warren
Hickenlooper	Peters	Whitehouse
Hirono	Portman	Wyden
Kaine	Reed	
Kelly	Rosen	

NAYS—42

Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Blackburn	Grassley	Murkowski
Blunt	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Lummis	Tuberville
Daines	Marshall	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	Young

NOT VOTING—6

Cantwell	Paul	Shelby
Cramer	Rounds	Toomey

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 14) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES 14

Resolved the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review'' (85 Fed. Reg. 57018 (September 14, 2020)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The Senator from Delaware.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

DRINKING WATER AND WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2021

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Prescient, this week, the Senate has the opportunity to take a major step on an issue that affects all Americans: infrastructure.

Senator DUCKWORTH, my friend and fellow Illinois Senator, is leading a bipartisan effort to finance critical water infrastructure improvements across the country.

The Drinking Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Act authorizes $35 billion in funding to improve access to safe drinking water, fortify our water infrastructure against extreme weather, lower the cost of utility bills, and rebuild aging water systems across America.

More than 40 percent of authorized funds will go to small, rural, and disadvantaged communities, many of which have not seen water infrastructure improvements in decades. And believe me, our water infrastructure is in desperate need of improvement.

My home State of Illinois has the most lead service lines of any State. Recent reports indicate that 8 in 10 Illinoisans live in a community where lead has been found in the drinking water in the last 6 years. Chicago alone has more than 380,000 lead service lines, the most of any city in the country. My hometown of Springfield has more than 10,000 lead service lines. These numbers are tragic and unacceptable. Every day, millions of my constituents risk exposure to lead, which can impair brain development in children and harm pregnant mothers. The people of Illinois, like many others across the country, sorely need these pipes replaced.

Thankfully, this bipartisan bill would begin to tackle the epidemic of lead in our Nation's drinking water. It would authorize $100 million per year for lead service line removal and a further $40 million per year for lead testing in schools. Just imagine what that kind of funding could do to protect vulnerable people and children in Chicago, Springfield, and across our country.

But unfortunately, lead is not the only water infrastructure problem facing our communities. A few weeks ago, I visited a small, rural town in Illinois called Centreville. Near my birthplace of East St. Louis, I have known this community all my life. Centreville's population is mostly elderly, Black, lifelong residents. They have faced chronic wastewater and storm water issues for decades. Ordinary rainfall can overflow the town's broken sewer systems and flood residents' basements and lawns with raw sewage. No one risks taking a sip of water from the tap.

I have heard from residents about the horror of stepping out of their front door in the morning to discover pools of sewage seeping up through the grass in their front yards. This is a tragic and dangerous situation and one that deserves significant Federal attention. And yet the problem has persisted for decades. Why?

Centreville is one of the poorest towns in Illinois and has struggled to attract financial help. The town cannot meet the cost-share requirements of grant programs or qualify for the loans it so desperately needs.

Well, the residents of Centreville have spoken up, they are fed up with officials looking the other way. They have every right to feel frustrated. They have every right to demand more of us. For decades our water policy has overlooked their needs and left them to fend for themselves. This cannot continue.

That is why I am glad this bill offers towns like Centreville a chance to fix their broken pumps, shore up their drainage ditches, and begin addressing water issues that have been overlooked for far too long. The bill would waive many of the cost-share requirements for small, rural towns like Centreville, giving them a path to the funding they deserve. It also would give on-the-ground technical assistance to disadvantaged communities struggling with their water systems, and provide grants for repairing broken and outdated water infrastructure.

To help ensure that this expertise reaches places like Centreville, I offered an amendment to the bill to focus it even further. I want to thank the EPW Committee for including my amendment to require the EPA to prioritize distressed communities like Centreville, that have struggled to attract funds and face the cumulative burden of wastewater and storm water issues. Flooding, lead, drinking water access—none of these problems are new.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have spent years decrying the state of American infrastructure, and our water is no exception. Despite all the complaining, we have struggled to sit down together and actually address these issues. But for the first time in many years, we not only have a President willing to pursue bold and necessary infrastructure policy, but a majority in the Senate willing to work with him to get it done.

While President Biden's American Jobs Plan includes billions more in funding to replace the Nation's lead pipes, this bill is a good-faith, down payment on the President's plan, and importantly, it has bipartisan support. The Drinking Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Act is the first step towards new, meaningful infrastructure policy.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill, so we can put a bipartisan down payment on the infrastructure every American needs.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY HAMBY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, our country recently took a long-overdue step toward honoring the courageous Americans who served in the First World War. Earlier this month and more than a century after the formal end of the war, the United States raised the flag over the newly constructed National World War I Memorial. I am immensely proud of this tribute in our Nation's Capital to the 4.7 million Americans who sacrificed to preserve our way of life. Today, I would like give special thanks to a remarkable Kentuckian who became a driving force bringing this memorial into existence. My longtime friend Terry Hamby, from Cadiz, is the chair of the World War I Centennial Commission. He deserves our sincere gratitude for his leadership and perseverance in giving every American the opportunity to honor our heroes.

Through the generations, the Hamby family has proudly answered the Nation's call to military service. The noble tradition dates back to the Civil War and Terry's great-grandfather's service in the Union Army. His grandfather and father each courageously defended our country in a global war. Next, it was Terry's turn to wear the uniform as part of a Naval Air Wing in Vietnam. He later joined the U.S. Army Reserves until he retired following 26 years of military service. Terry's son continued the family legacy by joining the Navy in the Persian Gulf. Service and sacrifice are personal to this family.

Even when Terry retired from the military, he continued working to support the world's greatest fighting force. His hometown in Christian County, KY, neighbors Fort Campbell, one of our country's premier military installations. Terry founded a contracting firm to provide services to the Defense Department and the men and women stationed at the base nearby, including the famed ''Screaming Eagles'' of the 101st Airborne Division.

To know Terry is to instantly like him. I have had the privilege to call him a friend for many years, and I have always been impressed by his love of our country and respect for the men and women who protect it. So when I had the chance through my leadership position to appoint a member of the World War I Centennial Commission, Terry was the clear choice. His family's tradition of service, as well as his civilian contributions to the military, gave him an important perspective for this project. I also knew the commission would benefit from Terry's business mindset as it raised funds to advance its mission. His colleagues on the commission quickly recognized his talents too. They elected Terry to chair the organization and this monumental effort to honor America's heroes.

The memorial found a fitting home only blocks from the White House in a park named for General John J. Pershing, the commander of the American Expeditionary Forces on the Western Front of World War I. After an international competition with more than 300 entries, the commission selected a design titled ''The Weight of Sacrifice.'' Terry and his wife, Carolyn, recently took Elaine and me on a tour of the memorial. One of its most striking features is an approximately 60 foot long depiction of ''A Soldier's Journey.'' Dozens of overlapping figures tell the stories of warriors leaving home for the battlefield before their ultimate triumph. It is emotional piece that shows these soldiers' toil and sacrifice to build a lasting peace.

Even now that the memorial is officially open to the public, Terry hasn't stopped working to honor the World War I generation. He has turned his attention to gathering support for recognition of female telephone operators called the ''Hello Girls.'' Other than nurses, these were the first women in uniform who played a consequential role in our country's wartime effort. With Terry working for their cause, I am confident these selfless women will receive the national attention and gratitude they deserve.

So I encourage my Senate colleagues and all Americans to plan a visit to the World War I Memorial. It is a striking commemoration of our brave men and women in uniform, those who supported them, and the Americans who never came home. Terry Hamby has earned our praise for his unyielding drive to build this tribute. Without him, the United States would still be waiting for a proper memorial to these heroes. Kentucky and our country are proud of the mark he has left on our Nation's Capital.

S.J. RES. 14

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from attorneys general of New York, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, and the District of Columbia, and the chief legal officers of Chicago and Denver on the importance of passing this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 26, 2021.

Re Senate Joint Resolution 14/House Joint Resolution 34—Disapproval of Environmental Protection Agency Rule Rescinding Methane Regulation.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SCHUMER, SENATOR MCCONNELL, SPEAKER PELOSI, AND REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTHY: The Attorneys General of New York, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, and the District of Columbia, and the chief legal officers of Chicago and Denver support using the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to invalidate a regulation of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that eliminated important limits on air pollution from oil and gas facilities, 85 Fed. Reg. 57,018 (Sept. 14, 2020) (Rescission Rule). Because that rule is legally flawed and would significantly increase pollution that harms our residents and natural resources, using the CRA to expeditiously nullify the rule is justified. Restoring the prior regulation will ensure that new oil and gas facilities apply common sense, cost-effective measures to control emissions of methane and volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and facilitate state efforts to limit pollution from existing oil and gas facilities.

METHANE AND VOCS EMITTED BY OIL AND GAS FACILITIES

Methane is a potent greenhouse gas that is responsible for about a quarter of the global warming we are experiencing today. Oil and natural gas facilities are the single largest industrial source of methane emissions. Methane emissions from oil and gas sources are harming the States and our residents by significantly contributing to climate change. Our States are experiencing substantial injuries from climate change, including property damage and hazards to human safety associated with sea level rise and increased severity of storms and flooding; increased deaths and illnesses due to intensified and prolonged heat waves; harms to lives and property caused by increased frequency and duration of wildfires; and damage to public health—particularly among our children, elderly, and those with lung ailments—due to local air pollution exacerbated by hotter temperatures. These injuries are often most severe in low-income communities and communities of color. Scientists have found that substantial reductions in global methane emissions this decade is critical if we are to have a realistic chance of avoiding catastrophic effects from climate change.

Oil and gas facilities are also a substantial source of VOCs, a primary component of ground-level ozone (smog). Several of our States experience persistent and widespread unhealthy levels of smog, which EPA has found results in numerous harms to public health, including triggering asthma attacks and even premature death. The States' smog problems are often substantially caused or exacerbated by the transport of smog precursors, such as VOCs, from emission sources located upwind. More than 9 million people live within a half mile of an existing oil or gas well, including approximately 600,000 children under the age of five and 1.4 million over 65, groups that are especially sensitive to the health risks posed by ozone and other local air pollution.

THE RESCISSION RULE

The Rescission Rule eliminated methane emission standards for new (including modified and reconstructed) oil and gas facilities1 that EPA issued four years earlier pursuant to section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act. See 40 C.F.R. part 60, subpart OOOOa, 81 Fed. Reg. 35,824 (June 3, 2016). Through common sense, cost-effective approaches such as more efficient technology and leak detection and repair, the 2016 rule secured important reductions of methane and VOC pollution. EPA sensibly required that the emission standards apply to similar equipment used in the production, processing, and transmission and storage segments, i.e., up to the point that natural gas is delivered for distribution to businesses and consumers. In sum, the 2016 rule helped to prevent and mitigate significant harms to public health and the environment while increasing the efficiency of natural gas operations.

Despite these substantial public health, environmental, and economic benefits, the Trump EPA nonetheless promulgated the Rescission Rule, which repealed the requirements that directly targeted methane emissions at new facilities. The Rescission Rule also eliminated pollution abatement requirements for methane and VOCs emitted by facilities engaged in the transmission and storage of natural gas, despite the fact that this segment uses some of the same equipment (e.g., compressors, pneumatic pumps) as production and processing facilities. EPA acknowledged that the Rescission Rule would result in increased pollution emissions from new facilities, including 448,000 more tons of

methane, 12,000 more tons of VOCs, and 400 more tons of hazardous air pollutants by 2030. 85 Fed. Reg. at 57,065.

EPA also included in the Rescission Rule a new hurdle for limiting pollution under section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act: to adopt emission limits on any additional pollutant for sources already regulated under section 111(b), EPA must make a pollutant-specific ''significant contribution'' finding. See 85 Fed. Reg. at 57,019. This new obstacle contravenes EPA's longstanding position that the agency may require emission limits for other pollutants from already-listed sources provided it demonstrates a rational basis for doing so, and creates an unjustified roadblock making it more difficult for EPA to carry out its mission to protect public health and the environment. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals recently vacated a related EPA rule that sought to implement EPA's new significant contribution finding requirement, further undermining this theory.

As noted above, the Rescission Rule would result in significant increases in emissions from new oil and gas facilities. These pollution increases are just part of the story, however, because the rule also blocks Clean Air Act regulation of existing oil and gas facilities—facilities that collectively emit substantial amounts of methane pollution. Under the Clean Air Act, there must be pollutant emission standards in effect for new facilities under section 111(b) of the Act to trigger the requirement under section 111(d) of the Act for EPA to promulgate emission guidelines that facilitate states' developing plans that limit emissions of the same pollutant from existing facilities.

EPA is required under its regulations to issue existing source emission guidelines ''upon or after promulgation'' of standards for new facilities, 40 C.F.R. 60.22a(a). Although EPA did not issue the guidelines in 2016 when it finalized the previous new source rule, it began work that year to ''swiftly'' develop guidelines to limit methane emissions from existing sources. That work ground to a halt shortly after the Trump Administration took office, leading a group of our States to sue EPA in on the grounds that it had unreasonably delayed issuance of the emission guidelines, New York v. EPA (D.D.C. No. 18–773). In that litigation, EPA contended that it could not be compelled to issue the guidelines because it was in the process of eliminating its statutory obligation to regulate methane from existing sources, a process that culminated in the Rescission Rule.

Significantly, the Rescission Rule was opposed by a wide range of stakeholders, from independent domestic companies such as Jonah Energy and Pioneer Natural Resources to the largest oil and gas companies such as BP, Shell, and ExxonMobil. These industry leaders support the direct regulation of methane from oil and natural gas facilities because it is the right thing to do for the environment, will lead to consistent regulation across the U.S., and can be cost-effectively achieved.

THE DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTIONS

Pursuant to the CRA, enacting the disapproval resolutions, once signed by the President, results in the subject rule ''being treated as though such rule had never taken effect.'' 5 U.S.C. 801(f). Here, by restoring the 2016 rule's emission standards for new facilities and paving the way for EPA to facilitate state regulation of methane from existing facilities, passing the disapproval resolutions under the CRA would result in substantial public health, environmental, and economic benefits. According to EPA, the 2016 rule was expected to reduce 510,000 tons of methane, 210,000 tons of VOCs, and 3,900 tons of hazardous air pollutants in 2025 alone. 81 Fed. Reg. at 35,827. Between the health benefits of the 2016 rule and the increased revenues that operators would realize from recovering natural gas that would otherwise be released, EPA determined that the 2016 rule would result in a net benefit of $170 million in 2025. Id. at 35,827–28.

Enacting the disapproval resolutions would also help EPA promptly fulfill its obligation to develop emission guidelines that states can use to craft plans to limit methane from existing sources. Had EPA continued on the path it began in 2016, those guidelines would have been issued some time ago and states would now be implementing them. Although Congress cannot turn back the clock, it can take action now that gives EPA clear direction to promptly discharge its overdue statutory duty to limit emissions from these existing, polluting facilities.

Finally, passing the disapproval resolutions would not risk invalidating any subsequent regulations pursuant to the CRA's ''substantially the same'' language. See 5 U.S.C. 801(b)(2) (prohibiting a ''new rule that is substantially the same as the [disapproved] rule'' unless specifically authorized by Congress). The Trump EPA acknowledged that the Rescission Rule is a ''deregulatory action.'' 85 Fed. Reg. at 57,067. As discussed above, it (1) eliminates direct regulation of methane from new facilities (removing the predicate for state regulation of existing facilities pursuant to section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act), (2) repeals methane and VOC limits on new facilities in the transmission and storage sector, and (3) creates a new legal requirement for EPA to regulate additional pollutants from already-listed source categories under section 111.

Disapproving the Rescission Rule thus would restore the provisions in the 2016 rule that directly regulated methane and VOCs from sources in the transmission and storage sector, and would reinstate EPA's legal interpretation permitting regulation of additional pollutants from already-listed sources. Accordingly, disapproval of the rule would not stand in the way of EPA using its statutory authority in the future to promulgate more protective standards for new facilities under section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act and more protective emission guidelines for existing facilities under its section 111(d). Indeed, it would be absurd to contend that a CRA resolution disapproving a purely ''deregulatory action'' would bar a protective future regulation under the statute's ''substantially the same'' language.

We urge the Senate and the House to promptly pass the CRA resolutions disapproving the Rescission Rule. Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

Letitia James, Attorney General of New York; Matthew Rodriquez, Acting Attorney General of California; Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General of Colorado; William Tong, Attorney General of Connecticut; Kathleen Jennings, Attorney General of Delaware; Kwame Raoul, Attorney General of Illinois; Tom Miller, Attorney General of Iowa; Aaron M. Frey, Attorney General of Maine; Brian E. Frosh, Attorney General of Maryland; Maura Healey, Attorney General of Massachusetts; Dana Nessel, Attorney General of Michigan; Keith Ellison, Attorney General of Minnesota; Gurbir S. Grewal, Attorney General of New Jersey.

Hector Balderas, Attorney General of New Mexico; Josh Stein, Attorney General of North Carolina; Ellen Rosenblum, Attorney General of Oregon; Josh Shapiro, Attorney General of Pennsylvania; Peter Neronha, Attorney General of Rhode Island; T.J. Donovan, Attorney General of Vermont; Bob Ferguson, Attorney General of Washington; Karl Racine, Attorney General for the District of Columbia; Celia Meza, Acting Corporation Counsel for the City of Chicago; Kristin M. Bronson, Attorney for the City and County of Denver.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DAVID SOULES

• Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, David Soules was one of the kindest people you could ever meet. His easy laugh and infectious enthusiasm was always such a welcome presence, especially on excursions onto his favorite southern New Mexico public lands. I will always treasure the way David could put his ''engineer's brain'' to work, diving into complex problems and looking for solutions, from public access and wildlife habitat restoration to the siting of transmission lines. He was also a real listener, with a rare appetite to always learn something new. David always had time to sneak away to a quiet corner to compare notes, share thoughts, and strategize about how to make something better.

The decade-plus-long, community-driven effort to establish the Organ Mountains Desert Peaks National Monument was successful because of so many different people. But it is truly impossible to imagine it happening without David Soules. David knew every inch of the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks, and his methodical documentation of historical places, artifacts, and unique Chihuahuan desert ecosystems was instrumental in qualifying the area for monument designation. The National Monument and the 10 new Wilderness Areas that are now protected forever within it will endure as an everlasting gift from David to all of us.

David held a doctorate in mechanical engineering and became nationally recognized expert in the field of imaging through turbulence during his career spanning over 37 years at White Sands Missile Range. During that same time, David became a lifelong sportsman and champion for wildlife, serving on the New Mexico Game and Fish Commission, coauthoring the ''Exploring Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument'' guidebook, serving as a member and supporter of numerous nongovernmental sportsmen's and conservation organizations, including on the boards of New Mexico Wild and the White Sands Missile Range Historical Foundation.

David Soules was a dear friend and an incredible mentor to my boys. I am thinking of his wife, Nancy, their two sons, Kevin and Keith, their grandchildren, and all those who knew, loved, and will forever miss David. Whenever I am hunting mule deer or javelina in southern New Mexico, I will remember David and all he did to protect the wildlife and wild places that I hold dear.•

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN CUCCIAS

• Mr. WICKER. Madam President, today I honor a visionary leader whose years at the helm of Ingalls Shipbuilding have left a profound impact on the State of Mississippi and on the national security posture of the United States. I have had the pleasure of associating with Mr. Brian Cuccias both personally and professionally over many years.

As president of Ingalls Shipbuilding, Mr. Cuccias led the largest manufacturing employer in Mississippi. Located near Brian's hometown of Biloxi, the Pascagoula shipyard sits on 800 acres of land along the Pascagoula River. With 11,500 employees, Ingalls is the largest supplier of U.S. Navy surface combatants and has built nearly 70 percent of the current fleet of Navy warships.

Mr. Cuccias began his career at Ingalls in 1979. when he joined Litton Data Systems, which was then a major division of Litton Industries, then owner of what is today Ingalls Shipyard. He served as a financial analyst for several Navy programs, including amphibious assault ships and *Spruance* and *Kidd*-class destroyers. Since then, he has held a number of positions of increasing responsibility, including assistant to the group vice president of Avondale industries; sector vice president for material for Northrop Grumman Ship Systems; program manger and vice president for Northrop Grumman's DDG 1000 program; and vice president for surface combatants for Northrop Grumman Shipbuilding.

Mr. Cuccias left his mark on both the shipbuilding industry and Navy surface combatant programs. Universally recognized for his superb leadership, business acumen, and commitment to maritime security, his 2014 appointment as president of Ingalls Shipbuilding came as no surprise to those of us who knew him. During his tenure, Ingalls has continued to set the standard for shipbuilding excellence, delivering five national security cutters to the Coast Guard, along with two *America*-class amphibious assault ships and two *San Antonio*-class amphibious transport docks to the Navy. Additionally, Mr. Cuccias oversaw the reactivation of the *Arleigh Burke*-class production line, delivering four guided missile destroyers to the Navy after a 5-year hiatus. As he departs, he leaves the shipyard in perhaps its strongest position ever, with 13 ships in various stages of production.

Mr. Cuccias has left an indelible impact on the Ingalls workforce. He spearheaded numerous investments in the health and safety of shipyard employees and their families. In 2015, Ingalls dedicated a Family Health Center in Gautier, MS a full-service health care facility for employees, dependents, and retirees covered by the shipyard's health care plans. As part of a $600 million 4-year upgrade to build the Shipyard of the Future, he supervised the installation of covered, environmentally controlled facilities to protect workers from the elements—again prioritizing the health of the Ingalls workforce.

Always active in his community, Mr. Cuccias served on the executive committee and board of directors for the Mississippi Gulf Coast Business Council, as well as on the boards of directors for the Mississippi Economic Council, the Mississippi Partnership for Economic Development, the Jackson County Economic Development Foundation, and the Salvation Army of Mobile, AL. In 2018, he was honored as one of the Top CEOs in Mississippi by the Mississippi Business Journal.

I want to express my deep gratitude and appreciation to Brian Cuccias for his outstanding leadership in Mississippi and for his unwavering support for the missions of the U.S. Navy. As he departs Ingalls for retirement, I wish him and his family ''fair winds and following seas.''•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT DELIVERED TO A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS ON APRIL 28, 2021—PM 8

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which was which was ordered to lie on the table:

To the Congress of the United States:

Madam Speaker. Madam Vice President. No President has ever said those words from this podium, and it's about time. The First Lady. The Second Gentleman. Mr. Chief Justice. Members of the United States Congress and the Cabinet. My fellow Americans.

While the setting tonight is familiar, this gathering is very different—a reminder of the extraordinary times we are in.

Throughout our history, Presidents have come to this chamber to speak to the Congress, to the Nation, and to the world.

To declare war. To celebrate peace. To announce new plans and possibilities.

Tonight, I come to talk about crisis—and opportunity. About rebuilding our Nation—and revitalizing our democracy. And winning the future. For America.

As I stand here tonight—just one day shy of the 100th day of my Administration. 100 days since I took the oath of office—lifted my hand off our family Bible—and inherited a nation in crisis. The worst pandemic in a century. The worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. The worst attack on our democracy since the Civil War.

Now—after just 100 days I can report to the Nation: AMERICA IS ON THE MOVE AGAIN.

Turning peril into possibility. Crisis into opportunity. Setback into strength. Life can knock us down. But in America—we never stay down. In America—we always get up.

And today—that's what we're doing: America is rising anew.

Choosing hope over fear. Truth over lies. Light over darkness.

After 100 days of rescue and renewal, America is ready for takeoff.

We are working again. Dreaming again. Discovering again. Leading the world again.

We have shown each other—and the world: There is no quit in America.

100 days ago, America's house was on fire. We had to act.

And thanks to the extraordinary leadership of Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader SCHUMER—

And with the overwhelming support of the American people—Democrats, Independents, and Republicans—we did act.

Together—we passed the American Rescue Plan. One of the most consequential rescue packages in American history.

We're already seeing the results.

After I promised 100 million COVID–19 vaccine shots in 100 days—we will have provided over 220 million COVID shots in 100 days. We're marshalling every Federal resource. We've gotten the vaccine to nearly 40,000 pharmacies and over 700 community health centers.

We're setting up community vaccination sites and are deploying mobile units into hard-to-reach areas.

Today, 90% of Americans now live within 5 miles of a vaccination site.

Everyone—over the age of 16—everyone—is now eligible and can get vaccinated right away.

So, get vaccinated now.

When I was sworn in, less than 1% of seniors were fully vaccinated against COVID–19.

100 days later, nearly 70% of seniors are fully protected.

Senior deaths from COVID–19 are down 80% since January. Down 80%. And, more than half of all adults in America have gotten at least one shot.

At a mass vaccination center in Glendale, Arizona, I asked a nurse what it's like. She looked and said every shot feels like a dose of hope.

A dose of hope for the educator in Florida who has a child who suffers from an auto-immune disease. She

wrote to me that she was worried about bringing the virus home. When she got vaccinated, she sat in her car and just cried. Cried out of joy, Cried out of relief.

Parents are seeing smiles on their kids' faces—as they go back to school—because teachers and school bus drivers, cafeteria workers have been vaccinated.

Grandparents—hugging their children and grandchildren instead of pressing their hands against a window to say goodbye. It means everything to both of them.

There's still more work to do—to beat this virus. We can't let our guard down now.

But tonight—I can say because of you—the American people—our progress these past 100 days against one of the worst pandemics in history is one of the greatest logistical achievements our country has ever seen.

What else have we done these first 100 days?

We kept our commitment and we are sending $1,400 rescue checks to 85% of all American households.

We've already sent more than 160 million checks out the door.

It's making a difference.

For many people, it's making all the difference in the world.

A single mom in Texas wrote to me. She said when she couldn't work—this relief check put food on the table and saved her and her son from eviction.

A grandmother in Virginia told me she immediately took her granddaughter to the eye doctor—something she put off for months because she didn't have the money.

One of the defining images of this crisis—has been cars lined up for miles—waiting for a box of food to be put in the trunk.

Did you ever think you'd see that in America?

That's why the American Rescue Plan is delivering food and nutrition assistance to millions of Americans facing hunger—and hunger is down sharply already.

We're also providing: Rental assistance to keep people from being evicted from their homes.

Providing loans to keep small businesses open and their employees on the job.

During these 100 days an additional 800,000 Americans enrolled in the Affordable Care Act because I established a special sign up period to do that.

We're making one of the largest one-time investments EVER in improving health care for veterans.

Critical investments to address the opioid crisis.

And, maybe most importantly—thanks to the American Rescue Plan—we are on track to cut child poverty in America in half this year.

In the process the economy created more than 1.3 million new jobs in 100 days.

More new jobs in the first 100 days—than any President on record.

The International Monetary Fund is now estimating our economy will grow at a rate of more than 6% this year.

That will be the fastest pace of economic growth in this country in nearly four decades.

America is moving. Moving forward. And we can't stop now.

We're in a competition with China and other countries to win the 21st Century.

We have to do more than just build back. We have to build back better.

Throughout our history, public investments and infrastructure have transformed America.

The transcontinental railroad and interstate highways united two oceans and brought us into a totally new age of progress.

Universal public school and college aid opened wide the doors of opportunity.

Scientific breakthroughs took us to the Moon and now to Mars, discovered vaccines, and gave us the Internet and so much more.

These are the investments we make together, as one country, and that only government can make.

Time and again—they propel us into the future.

That's why I proposed the American Jobs Plan—a once-in-a-generation investment in America itself. The largest jobs plan since World War II.

It creates jobs to upgrade our transportation infrastructure. Jobs modernizing roads, bridges and highways. Jobs building ports and airports, rail corridors and transit lines.

It's clean water.

Today—up to 10 million homes—and more than 400,000 schools and child care centers—have pipes with lead in them, including for drinking water.

A clear and present danger to our children's health.

The American Jobs Plan creates jobs replacing 100% of the Nation's lead pipes and service lines—so every American—so every child—can turn on the faucet and be certain to drink clean water.

It creates jobs connecting every American with high-speed internet, including 35% of rural Americans who still don't have it.

This will help our kids and businesses succeed in a 21st Century economy. And I am asking the Vice President to help lead this effort.

It creates jobs by building a modern power grid. Our grids are vulnerable to storms, hacks, and catastrophic failures—with tragic results as we saw in Texas and elsewhere during winter storms.

The American Jobs Plan will create jobs to lay thousands of miles of transmission lines needed to build a resilient and fully clean grid.

The American Jobs Plan will help millions of people get back to their jobs and their careers.

2 million women have dropped out of the workforce during this pandemic—too often because they couldn't get the care they need for their family, their children.

800,000 families are on a Medicaid waiting list right now to get homecare for their aging parent or loved one with a disability.

This plan will help these families and create jobs for our caregivers with better wages and better benefits.

For too long, we have failed to use the most important word when it comes to meeting the climate crisis. Jobs. Jobs. For me, when I think about climate change, I think jobs.

The American Jobs Plan will put engineers and construction workers to work building more energy efficient buildings and homes.

Electrical workers—installing 500,000 charging stations along our highways.

Farmers planting cover crops, so they can reduce carbon dioxide in the air and get paid for doing it.

There's no reason the blades for wind turbines—can't be built in Pittsburgh instead of Beijing. No reason why American workers can't lead the world in the production of electric vehicles and batteries.

The American Jobs Plan will create millions of good paying jobs—jobs Americans can raise their families on.

And all the investments in the American Jobs Plan will be guided by one principle: ''Buy American.''

American tax dollars are going to be used to buy American products made in America that create American jobs. The way it should be.

Now, I know some of you at home are wondering whether these jobs are for you. You feel left behind and forgotten in an economy that's rapidly changing.

Let me speak directly to you.

Independent experts estimate the American Jobs Plan will add millions of jobs and trillions of dollars in economic growth for years to come. These are good-paying jobs that can't be outsourced.

Nearly 90% of the infrastructure jobs created in the American Jobs Plan do not require a college degree. 75% do not require an associate's degree.

The American Jobs Plan is a blue-collar blueprint to build America. And, it recognizes something I've always said. Wall Street didn't build this country. The middle class built this country. And unions build the middle class.

And that's why I'm calling on Congress to pass the Protecting the Right to Organize Act—the PRO Act—and send it to my desk to support the right to unionize.

By the way, let's also pass the $15 minimum wage. No one should work 40 hours a week and still live below the poverty line.

And we need to ensure greater equity and opportunity for women. Let's get the Paycheck Fairness Act to my desk for equal pay. It's long past time.

Finally, the American Jobs Plan will be the biggest increase in non-defense research and development on record.

We will see more technological change in the next 10 years than we saw in the last 50 years.

And we're falling behind in that competition.

Decades ago, we used to invest 2% of our GDP on research and development.

Today, we spend less than 1%. China and other countries are closing in fast.

We have to develop and dominate the products and technologies of the future—advanced batteries, biotechnology, computer chips, and clean energy. The Defense Department has an agency called DARPA—the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency—that's there to develop breakthroughs to enhance our national security—which led to the internet and GPS and so much more.

The National Institutes of Health, the NIH, should create a similar Advanced Research Projects Agency—for Health.

To develop breakthroughs to prevent, detect, and treat diseases like Alzheimer's, diabetes, and cancer.

This is personal to so many of us. I can think of no more worthy investment. And I know of nothing that is more bipartisan.

Let's end cancer as we know it. It's within our power.

Investments in jobs and infrastructure like the ones we're talking about have often had bipartisan support.

Vice President HARRIS and I meet regularly in the Oval Office with Democrats and Republicans to discuss the American Jobs Plan.

And I applaud a group of Republican Senators who just put forward their proposal.

So, let's get to work. We welcome ideas. But, the rest of the world isn't waiting for us. Doing nothing is not an option.

We can't be so busy competing with each other that we forget the competition is with the rest of the world to win the 21st Century.

To win that competition for the future, we also need to make a once-in-a-generation investment in our families—in our children.

That's why I'm introducing the American Families Plan tonight, which addresses four of the biggest challenges facing American families today.

First, access to a good education.

When this Nation made 12 years of public education universal in the last century, it made us the best-educated and best-prepared nation in the world.

But the world is catching up. They are not waiting.

12 years is no longer enough today to compete in the 21st Century.

That's why the American Families Plan guarantees four additional years of public education for every person in America—starting as early as we can.

We add two years of universal high-quality pre-school for every 3- and 4-year-old in America.

The research shows that when a young child goes to school—not day care—they are far more likely to graduate from high school and go on to college.

And then we add two years of free community college.

And we will increase Pell Grants and investment in Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges, and Minority-Serving Institutions.

Jill is a community college professor who teaches today as First Lady. She has long said any country that out-educates us is going to outcompete us—and she'll be leading this effort.

Second, the American Families plan will provide access to quality, affordable child care. We guarantee that low- to middle-income families will pay no more than 7% of their income for high-quality care for children up to the age of 5. The most hard-pressed working families won't have to spend a dime.

Third, the American Families Plan will finally provide up to 12 weeks of paid family and medical leave. No one should have to choose between a job and paycheck or taking care of themselves and a loved one—a parent, spouse, or child.

And fourth, the American Families Plan puts money directly into the pockets of millions of families. In March we expanded a tax credit for every child in a family. Up to a $3,000 Child Tax Credit for children over 6—and $3,600 for children under 6. With two parents, two kids, that's up to $7,200 in your pocket to help take care of your family. This will help more than 65 million children and help cut child poverty in half this year. Together, let's extend the Child Tax Credit at least through the end of 2025.

The American Rescue Plan lowered health care premiums for 9 million Americans who buy their coverage under the Affordable Care Act. Let's make that provision permanent so their premiums don't go back up.

In addition to my Families Plan, I will work with Congress to address—this year—other critical priorities for America's families.

The Affordable Care Act has been a lifeline for millions of Americans—protecting people with pre-existing conditions, protecting women's health. And the pandemic has demonstrated how badly it is needed. Let's lower deductibles for working families on the Affordable Care Act.

And let's lower prescription drug costs. We all know how outrageously expensive they are. In fact, we pay the highest prescription drug prices in the world right here in America—nearly three times as much as other countries. We can change that.

Let's do what we've always talked about. Let's give Medicare the power to save hundreds of billions of dollars by negotiating lower prices for prescription drugs. That won't just help people on Medicare—it will lower prescription drug costs for everyone. The money we save can go to strengthen the Affordable Care Act—expand Medicare coverage and benefits without costing taxpayers one additional penny. We've talked about it long enough—Democrats and Republicans. Let's get it done this year.

This is all about a simple premise: Health care should be a right, not a privilege in America.

So how do we pay for my Jobs and Family Plans? I've made clear that we can do it without increasing deficits. Let's start with what I will not do. I will not impose any tax increases on people making less than $400,000 a year.

It's time for corporate America and the wealthiest 1% of Americans to pay their fair share. Just pay their fair share.

A recent study shows that 55 of the nation's biggest corporations paid zero in Federal income tax last year. No Federal taxes on more than $40 billion in profits. A lot of companies evade taxes through tax havens from Switzerland to Bermuda to the Cayman Islands. And they benefit from tax loopholes and deductions that allow for offshoring jobs and shifting profits overseas. That's not right. We're going to reform corporate taxes so they pay their fair—share and help pay for the public investments their businesses will benefit from.

And, we're going to reward work, not wealth. We take the top tax bracket for the wealthiest 1% of Americans—those making $400,000 or more—back up to 39.6%. That's where it was when George W. Bush became President.

We're going to get rid of the loopholes that allow Americans who make more than $1 million a year pay a lower rate on their capital gains than working Americans pay on their work. This will only affect three tenths of 1% of all Americans.

And the IRS will crack down on millionaires and billionaires who cheat on their taxes. That's estimated to be billions of dollars.

Look, I'm not out to punish anyone. But I will NOT add to the tax burden of the middle class of this country. They're already paying enough. What I've proposed is fair. It's fiscally responsible. It raises the revenue to pay for the plans I've proposed that will create millions of jobs and grow the economy.

When you hear someone say that they don't want to raise taxes on the wealthiest 1% and on corporate America ask them: whose taxes are you going to raise instead, and whose are you going to cut?

Look at the big tax cut in 2017. It was supposed to pay for itself and generate vast economic growth. Instead it added $2 trillion to the deficit. It was a huge windfall for corporate America and those at the very top.

Instead of using the tax savings to raise wages and invest in research and development, it poured billions of dollars into the pockets of CEOs. In fact, the pay gap between CEOs and their workers is now among the largest in history.

According to one study, CEOs make 320 times what their average workers make. The pandemic has only made things worse. 20 million Americans lost their jobs in the pandemic—working and middle-class Americans.

At the same time, the roughly 650 billionaires in America saw their net

worth increase by more than $1 trillion.

Let me say that again.

Just 650 people increased their wealth by more than $1 trillion during this pandemic.

They are now worth more than $4 trillion.

My fellow Americans, trickle-down economics has never worked.

It's time to grow the economy from the bottom up and middle-out.

A broad consensus of economists—left, right, center—agree that what I'm proposing will help create millions of jobs and generate historic economic growth. These are among the highest value investments we can make as a nation.

I've often said that our greatest strength is the power of our example—not just the example of our power.

And in my conversations with world leaders—many I've known for a long time—the comment I hear most often is: we see that America is back—but for how long?

My fellow Americans, we have to show not just that we are back, but that we are here to stay.

And that we aren't going it alone—we're going to be leading with our allies.

No one nation can deal with all the crises of our time alone—from terrorism to nuclear proliferation to mass migration, cybersecurity, climate change and as we're experiencing now, pandemics.

There's no wall high enough to keep any virus away.

As our own vaccine supply grows to meet our needs—and we are meeting them—we will become an arsenal of vaccines for other countries—just as America was the arsenal of democracy in World War II.

The climate crisis is not our fight alone, either. It's a global fight.

The United States accounts for less than 15% of carbon emissi ons.

The rest of the world accounts for 85%.

That's why I kept my commitment to rejoin the Paris Climate Agreement on my first day in office.

And I kept my commitment to convene a climate summit right here in America, with all of the major economies of the world from——China and Russia to India and the European Union in my first 100 days.

I wanted the world to see that there is consensus that we are at an inflection point in history.

And the consensus is if we act, we can save the planet—and we can create millions of jobs and economic growth and opportunity to raise the standard of living for everyone in the world.

The investments I've proposed tonight also advance a foreign policy that benefits the middle class.

That means making sure every nation plays by the same rules in the global economy, including China.

In my discussion with President Xi, I told him that we welcome the competition and that we are not looking for conflict.

But I made absolutely clear that I will defend American interests across the board.

America will stand up to unfair trade practices that undercut American workers and industries, like subsidies for state-owned enterprises and the theft of American technologies and intellectual property.

I also told President Xi that we will maintain a strong military presence in the Indo-Pacific just as we do with NATO in Europe not to start conflict—but to prevent conflict.

And, I told him what I've said to many world leaders—that America won't back away from our commitment to human rights and fundamental freedoms.

No responsible American President can remain silent when basic human rights are violated.

A President has to represent the essence of our country.

America is an idea—unique in the world. We are all created equal. It's who we are. We cannot walk away from that principle.

With regard to Russia, I made very clear to President Putin that while we don't seek escalation, their actions have consequences.

I responded in a direct and proportionate way to Russia's interference in our elections and cyber-attacks on our government and businesses—and they did both of those things and I did respond.

But we can also cooperate when it's in our mutual interests.

As we did when we extended the New START Treaty on nuclear arms—and as we're working to do on the climate crisis.

On Iran and North Korea's nuclear programs that present a serious threat to America's security and world security—we will be working closely with our allies to address the threats posed by both of these countries through diplomacy and stern deterrence.

And American leadership means ending the forever war in Afghanistan.

We have the greatest fighting force in the history of the world.

And I'm the first President in 40 years who knows what it means to have had a child serving in a warzone.

Today we have service members serving in the same war as their parents once did.

We have service members in Afghanistan who were not yet born on 9/11. War in Afghanistan was never meant to be a multi-generational undertaking of nation-building. We went to Afghanistan to get the terrorists who attacked us on 9/11. We delivered justice to Osama Bin Laden and we degraded the terrorist threat of al Qaeda in Afghanistan.

After 20 years of American valor and sacrifice, it's time to bring our troops home.

Even as we do, we will maintain an over-the-horizon capability to suppress future threats to the homeland.

But make no mistake—the terrorist threat has evolved beyond Afghanistan since 2001 and we will remain vigilant against threats to the United States, wherever they come from.

Al Qaeda and ISIS are in Yemen, Syria, Somalia, and other places in Africa and the Middle East and beyond.

And, we won't ignore what our own intelligence agencies have determined—the most lethal terrorist threat to the homeland today is from white supremacist terrorism.

And my fellow Americans, we must come together to heal the soul of this Nation.

It was nearly a year ago before her father's funeral, when I spoke with Gianna Floyd, George Floyd's young daughter. As I knelt down to talk to her so we could talk eye-to-eye, she said to me, ''Daddy changed the world.''

After the conviction of George Floyd's murderer, we can see how right she was—if we have the courage to act.

We have all seen the knee of injustice on the neck of Black America.

Now is our opportunity to make real progress.

Most men and women in uniform wear their badge and serve their communities honorably.

I know them. I know they want to help meet this moment as well.

My fellow Americans, we have to come together. To rebuild trust between law enforcement and the people they serve. To root out systemic racism in our criminal justice system. And to enact police reform in George Floyd's name that passed the House already.

I know the Republicans have their own ideas and are engaged in productive discussions with Democrats. We need to work together to find a consensus. Let's get it done next month, by the first anniversary of George Floyd's death. The country supports this reform. Congress should act.

We have a giant opportunity to bend to the arc of the moral universe toward justice. Real justice.

And with the plans I outlined tonight, we have a real chance to root out systemic racism that plagues American life in many other ways. A chance to deliver real equity. Good jobs and good schools. Affordable housing. Clean air and clean water.

Being able to generate wealth and pass it down through generations. Real opportunities in the lives of more Americans—Black, white, Latino, Asian American, Native American.

I also want to thank the Senate for voting 94–1 to pass the COVID–19 Hate Crimes Act to protect Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders from the vicious hate crimes we've seen this past year—and for too long.

I urge the House to do the same and send that legislation to my desk as soon as possible.

I also hope Congress can get to my desk the Equality Act to protect the rights of LGBTQ Americans.

To all the transgender Americans watching at home—especially the young people who are so brave—I want you to know that your President has your back.

And another thing. Let's reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, which has been law in this country for 27 years since I first wrote it.

It will close the so-called ''boyfriend'' loophole to keep guns out of the hands of abusers. It's estimated that more than 50 women are shot and killed by an intimate partner—every month in America. Pass it and save lives.

And I need not tell anyone this, but gun violence is an epidemic in America.

Our flag at the White House was still flying at half-staff for the 8 victims of the mass shooting in Georgia, when 10 more lives were taken in a mass shooting in Colorado.

In the week between those mass shootings, more than 250 other Americans were shot dead. 250 shot dead.

I know how hard it is to make progress on this issue.

In the 1990s, we passed universal background checks and a ban on assault weapons and high-capacity magazines that hold 100 rounds that can be fired in seconds.

We beat the NRA. Mass shootings and gun violence declined.

But in the early 2000s, that law expired and we've seen the daily bloodshed since.

More than two weeks ago in the Rose Garden, surrounded by some of the bravest people I know—the survivors and families who lost loved ones to gun violence—I laid out several steps the Department of Justice is taking to end this epidemic.

One of them is banning so-called ''ghost guns.'' They are homemade guns built from a kit that includes the directions on how to finish the firearm. The parts have no serial numbers, so when they show up at a crime scene, they can't be traced.

The buyers of ghost gun kits aren't required to pass a background check. Anyone from a criminal to a terrorist could buy this kit and, in as little as 30 minutes, put together a lethal weapon.

But not anymore.

I will do everything in my power to protect the American people from this epidemic of gun violence.

But it's time for Congress to act as well.

We need more Senate Republicans to join with the overwhelming majority of their Democratic colleagues, and close loopholes and require background checks to purchase a gun.

And we need a ban on assault weapons and high-capacity magazines again.

Don't tell me it can't be done. We've done it before . . . and it worked.

Talk to most responsible gun owners, most hunters—they'll tell you there's no possible justification for having 100 rounds—100 bullets—in a weapon.

They will tell you that there are too many people today who are able to buy a gun, but who shouldn't be able to.

These kinds of reasonable reforms have the overwhelming support of the American people—including many gun owners.

The country supports reform, and the Congress should act.

This shouldn't be a Red vs. Blue issue. It's an American issue.

And here's what else we can do.

Immigration has always been essential to America. Let's end our exhausting war over immigration. For more than 30 years, politicians have talked about immigration reform and done nothing about it. It's time to fix it.

On day one of my Presidency, I kept my commitment and I sent a comprehensive immigration bill to Congress.

If you believe we need a secure border—pass it.

If you believe in a pathway to citizenship—pass it.

If you actually want to solve the problem—I have sent you a bill, now pass it.

We also have to get at the root of the problem of why people are fleeing to our southern border from Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador. The violence. The corruption. The gangs. The political instability. Hunger. Hurricanes. Earthquakes.

When I was Vice President, I focused on providing the help needed to address these root causes of migration. It helped keep people in their own countries instead of being forced to leave. Our plan worked. But the last administration shut it down.

I'm restoring the program and asked Vice President HARRIS to lead our diplomatic efforts. I have absolute confidence she will get the job done.

Now, if Congress won't pass my plan—let's at least pass what we agree on.

Congress needs to pass legislation this year to finally secure protection for the Dreamers—the young people who have only known America as their home.

And, permanent protections for immigrants on temporary protected status who come from countries beset by man-made and natural made violence and disaster.

As well as a pathway to citizenship for farmworkers who put food on our tables.

Immigrants have done so much for America during the pandemic—as they have throughout our history. The country supports immigration reform. Congress should act.

And if we are to truly restore the soul of America—we need to protect the sacred right to vote.

More people voted in the last Presidential election than ever before in our history—in the middle of one of the worst pandemics ever. That should be celebrated.

Instead it's being attacked. Congress should pass H.R. 1 and the John Lewis Voting Rights Act and send them to my desk right away. The country supports it. Congress should act.

As we gather here tonight, the images of a violent mob assaulting this Capitol—desecrating our democracy—remain vivid in our minds.

Lives were put at risk. Lives were lost. Extraordinary courage was summoned.

The insurrection was an existential crisis—a test of whether our democracy could survive.

It did.

But the struggle is far from over. The question of whether our democracy will long endure is both ancient and urgent.

As old as our Republic. Still vital today. Can our democracy deliver on its promise that all of us—created equal in the image of God—have a chance to lead lives of dignity, respect, and possibility?

Can our democracy deliver on the most pressing needs of our people?

Can our democracy overcome the lies, anger, hate and fears that have pulled us apart?

America's adversaries—the autocrats of the world—are betting it can't.

They believe we are too full of anger and division and rage.

They look at the images of the mob that assaulted this Capitol as proof that the sun is setting on American democracy.

They are wrong.

And we have to prove them wrong.

We have to prove democracy still works. That our government still works—and can deliver for the people.

In our first 100 days together, we have acted to restore the people's faith in our democracy to deliver.

We're vaccinating the Nation. We're creating hundreds of thousands of jobs. We're delivering real results people can see and feel in their own lives. Opening the doors of opportunity. Guaranteeing fairness and justice. That's the essence of America. That's democracy in action.

Our Constitution opens with the words, ''We the People''.

It's time we remembered that We the People are the government. You and I. Not some force in a distant capital. Not some powerful force we have no control over. It's us. It's ''We the People.''

In another era when our democracy was tested, Franklin Roosevelt reminded us—in America: we do our part.

That's all I'm asking. That we all do our part.

And if we do, then we will meet the central challenge of the age by proving that democracy is durable and strong.

The autocrats will not win the future. America will. The future will belong to America.

I stand here tonight before you in a new and vital hour in the life of our democracy and our Nation.

And I can say with absolute confidence: I have never been more confident or more optimistic about America.

We have stared into an abyss of insurrection and autocracy—of pandemic and pain—and ''We the People'' did not flinch.

At the very moment our adversaries were certain we would pull apart and fail.

We came together. United. With light and hope, we summoned new strength and new resolve. To position us to win the competition for the 21st Century. On our way forward to a Union more perfect. More prosperous. More just—As one people. One Nation. One America.

It's never been a good bet to bet against America. And it still isn't. We are the United States of America.

There is nothing—nothing—beyond our capacity—nothing we can't do—if we do it together.

May God bless you all.

May God protect our troops.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 28, 2021*.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and was referred as indicated:

EC–837. A communication from the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification that Senator Coons and Senator Lankford disqualified themselves from participating in Preliminary Inquiry Case Numbers 30094 and 30226; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHATZ, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 421. A bill to amend the America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 to expand the Indian reservation drinking water program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–17).

S. 559. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–18).

S. 789. A bill to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to Indians (Rept. No. 117–19).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. CANTWELL for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Donet Dominic Graves, Jr., of Ohio, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

*Bill Nelson, of Florida, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

By Mr. PETERS for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Kiran Arjandas Ahuja, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

*Ronald Stroman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2021.

*Ronald Stroman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2028.

*Amber Faye McReynolds, of Colorado, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2026.

*Anton George Hajjar, of Maryland, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2023.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KING, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 1400. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide energy cybersecurity investment incentives, to establish a grant and technical assistance program for cybersecurity investments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1401. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve nutritional and other program requirements relating to purchases of locally produced food; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1402. A bill to amend the Native American Languages Act to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1403. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Move America bonds and Move America credits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1404. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a ''Ghost Army'' that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1405. A bill to authorize the imposition of sanctions with respect to significant actions that exacerbate climate change, to reinforce comprehensive efforts to limit global average temperature rise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1406. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to conduct research regarding and require the use of driver monitoring systems to minimize or eliminate motor vehicle driver distraction; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1407. A bill to enhance the early warning reporting requirements for motor vehicle manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1408. A bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1409. A bill to designate any alien who is or has been engaged in economic espionage or the misappropriation of trade secrets inadmissible and deportable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1410. A bill to codify the temporary scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances by adding fentanyl-related substances to schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1411. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land to Lander County, Nevada, to designate certain wilderness areas in Lander County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1412. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Carson City, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1413. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a final rule revising motor vehicle seat back safety standards; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1414. A bill to provide for the establishment of clean technology consortia to enhance the economic, environmental, and energy security of the United States by promoting domestic development, manufacture, and deployment of clean technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1415. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to reinstate the ban on the export of crude oil and natural gas produced in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1416. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a motor vehicle recall assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1417. A bill to establish a Venezuela Reconstruction Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1418. A bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 1419. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to support and provide incentives for domestic manufacturing of printed circuit boards, to identify national security risks in printed circuit boards imported from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1420. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and Tribal governments and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

S. 1421. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish the Food and Nutrition Education in Schools Pilot Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1422. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for employer-provided worker training; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1423. A bill to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to give Americans the option to delete personal information collected by internet operators as a result of the person's internet activity prior to age 13; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit high deductible health plans to provide chronic disease prevention services to plan enrollees prior to satisfying their plan deductible; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1425. A bill to enable the Federal Trade Commission to deter filing of sham citizen petitions to cover an attempt to interfere with approval of a competing generic drug or biosimilar, to foster competition, and facilitate the efficient review of petitions filed in good faith to raise legitimate public health concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 1426. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a refundable tax credit for parents; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1427. A bill to establish a demonstration project to increase access to biosimilar biological products under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 1428. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable companies to delay the entry of biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biological products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 1429. A bill to provide compensation for United States victims of Libyan state-sponsored terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 1430. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to prevent predatory debt collectors from receiving paycheck protection program loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1431. A bill to prohibit the Director of the Office of Management and Budget from raising the minimum urban area population to qualify a metropolitan statistical area from 50,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 1432. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an electric grid resilience grant program and an electric grid resilience research and development program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 1433. A bill to provide for the crediting of funds received by the National Guard Bureau as reimbursement from States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1434. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to revoke the approval of one opioid pain medication for each new opioid pain medication approved; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 1435. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit product hopping, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1436. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to amend the mission statement of the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CASEY, Ms. ERNST, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1437. A bill to require the Office of Management and Budget to revise the Standard Occupational Classification system to establish a separate code for direct support professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1438. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions to help combat the opioid crisis; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. KING):

S. 1439. A bill to establish procedures regarding the approval of opioid drugs by the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 1440. A bill to make technical corrections to the FAFSA Simplification Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1441. A bill to appropriate an additional amount to improve the Navy shipyard infrastructure of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1442. A bill to establish the Corporation for Career Pathways to promote pathways to unfilled and emerging job markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

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

S. Res. 181. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Carl Lutz; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. Res. 182. A resolution recognizing the late Gilbert Metz, the last Holocaust survivor who lived in Mississippi, and commending all educators who teach about the Holocaust and all genocide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 183. A resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 184. A resolution designating the week of May 2, 2021 through May 8, 2021, as ''Tardive Dyskinesia Awareness Week''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 185. A resolution requesting that the President transmit to the Senate not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of the President relating to the Administration's discussions and plans to assess, mitigate, and prevent growing inflation; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 186. A resolution honoring the humanitarian work of Dr. Aristides de Sousa Mendes do Amaral e Abranches to save the lives of French Jews and other persons during the Holocaust; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. Res. 187. A resolution congratulating the University of Wisconsin Badgers on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Ice Hockey Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Res. 188. A resolution expressing appreciation and recognition for the Trump Administration for the creation of Operation

Warp Speed and the historic development of a COVID–19 vaccine; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 101

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 101, a bill to establish the Environmental Justice Mapping Committee, and for other purposes.

S. 168

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 168, a bill to provide temporary licensing reciprocity for telehealth and interstate health care treatment.

S. 273

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 273, a bill to improve the management of driftnet fishing.

S. 321

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 321, 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. 370

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act and the Federal Meat Inspection Act to support small and very small meat and poultry processing establishments, and for other purposes.

S. 452

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 452, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 480

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 480, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction for qualified business income.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 749

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 749, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance tax benefits for research activities.

S. 771

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 771, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 792

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 792, a bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to modify certain agricultural exemptions for hours of service requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 864

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 864, a bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to plan, develop, and make recommendations to increase access to sexual assault examinations for survivors by holding hospitals accountable and supporting the providers that serve them.

S. 1030

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1030, a bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to install permanent fencing around the United States Capitol, any of the Capitol Buildings, or any portion of the Capitol Grounds.

S. 1077

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1077, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the allowance for depreciation, amortization, or depletion for purposes of determining the income limitation on the deduction for business interest.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 1135

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes.

S. 1278

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1278, a bill to require the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to review any purchase or lease of real estate near a military installation or military airspace in the United States by a foreign person connected to or subsidized by the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and for other purposes.

S. 1289

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1289, a bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to reauthorize and modify the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1378

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1378, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to allow for the retirement of certain animals used in Federal research, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 10, a joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 33

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 33, a resolution supporting the contributions of Catholic schools.

AMENDMENT NO. 1461

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1461 intended to be proposed to S. 914, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs under those Acts, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1423. A bill to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to give Americans the option to delete personal information collected by internet operators as a result of the person's internet activity prior to age 13; 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. 1423

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 ''Clean Slate for Kids Online Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. ENHANCING THE CHILDREN'S ONLINE PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT OF 1998.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1302 of the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6501) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(13) DELETE.—The term 'delete' means to remove personal information such that the information is not maintained in retrievable form and cannot be retrieved in the normal course of business.''.

(b) REGULATION OF UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE ACTS AND PRACTICES IN CONNECTION WITH THE COLLECTION AND USE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION FROM AND ABOUT CHILDREN ON THE INTERNET.—Section 1303 of the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6502) is amended—

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

''(3) FAILURE TO DELETE.—It is unlawful for an operator of a website or online service directed to children, or any operator that has actual knowledge that it is collecting personal information from a child, to fail to delete personal information collected from or about a child if a request for deletion is made pursuant to regulations prescribed under subsection (e).''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) RIGHT OF AN INDIVIDUAL TO DELETE PERSONAL INFORMATION COLLECTED WHEN THE PERSON WAS A CHILD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall promulgate under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, regulations that require the operator of any website or online service directed to children, or any operator that has actual knowledge that it has collected personal information from a child or maintains such personal information—

''(A) to provide notice in a prominent place on the website of how an individual over the age of 13, or a legal guardian of an individual over the age of 13 acting with the knowledge and consent of the individual, can request that the operator delete all personal information in the possession of the operator that was collected from or about the individual when the individual was a child notwithstanding any parental consent that may have been provided when the individual was a child;

''(B) to promptly delete all personal information in the possession of the operator that was collected from or about an individual when the individual was a child when such deletion is requested by an individual over the age of 13 or by the legal guardian of such individual acting with the knowledge and consent of the individual, notwithstanding any parental consent that may have been provided when the individual was a child;

''(C) to provide written confirmation of deletion, after the deletion has occurred, to an individual or legal guardian of such individual who has requested such deletion pursuant to this subsection; and

''(D) to except from deletion personal information collected from or about a child—

''(i) only to the extent that the personal information is necessary—

''(I) to respond to judicial process; or

''(II) to the extent permitted under any other provision of law, to provide information to law enforcement agencies or for an investigation on a matter related to public safety; and

''(ii) if the operator retain such excepted personal information for only as long as reasonably necessary to fulfill the purpose for which the information has been excepted and that the excepted information not be used, disseminated or maintained in a form retrievable to anyone except for the purposes specified in this subparagraph.''.

(c) SAFE HARBORS.—Section 1304 of the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6503) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 1303(b)'' and inserting ''subsections (b) and (e) of section 1303''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsections (b) and (e)''.

(d) ACTIONS BY STATES.—Section 1305(a)(1) of the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6504(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''1303(b)'' and inserting ''subsection (b) or (e) of section 1303''.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit high deductible health plans to provide chronic disease prevention services to plan enrollees prior to satisfying their plan deductible; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1424

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 ''Chronic Disease Management Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. CHRONIC DISEASE PREVENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 223(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) PREVENTIVE CARE SERVICES AND ITEMS FOR CHRONIC CONDITIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (C)—

''(i) preventive care shall include any service or item used to treat an individual with a chronic condition if—

''(I) such service or item is low-cost,

''(II) in regards to such service or item, there is medical evidence supporting high cost efficiency of preventing exacerbation of the chronic condition or the development of a secondary condition, and

''(III) there is a strong likelihood, documented by clinical evidence, that with respect to the class of individuals utilizing such service or item, the specific service or use of the item will prevent the exacerbation of the chronic condition or the development of a secondary condition that requires significantly higher cost treatments, and

''(ii) an individual who has been prescribed preventive care for any chronic condition may be presumed to have been diagnosed with such condition if such preventive care is customarily prescribed for such condition.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to coverage for months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 1429. A bill to provide compensation for United States victims of Libyan state-sponsored terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce the Justice for the Living victims of Lockerbie Act. This bill would create a process to seek justice for a group Pan American World Airways pilots who lost their careers and pensions following the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, and the subsequent bankruptcy and closure of Pan Am.

On December 21, 1988, the State of Libya committed an infamous act of terror by bombing Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, killing 270 innocent civilians. Despite Pan Am's greatly improved financial position in 1988, the media coverage of the terrorist attack wreaked havoc on Pan Am sales leading to its bankruptcy in 1991.

In 2008, the U.S. entered into the U.S.-Libya Humanitarian Settlement Agreement, in which Libya paid $ 1.5 billion to settle claims by U.S. citizens for Libyan-sponsored terrorism. After payments by the State Department to families of death victims from Lockerbie and the La Belle Disco bombing in Germany, compensation to other victims was to be determined by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The Commission could only consider further claims referred to it by the State Department.

One of these claimants was a group of senior Pan Am pilots, most of whom were veterans, who were over the age of 50 and lost and livelihoods when Pan Am went bankrupt and closed. Due to the federally required retirement age of 60 at that time, and the airline industry's seniority system, they were unable to get new pilot jobs with other airlines. Two of these pilots reside in Maine—Ron Fitch of Poland Spring and Schafer Bean of Diamond Cove—and I have heard their stories and their pleas for justice on behalf of their own families and the others who suffered as a result of Libya's acts of terrorism.

Mr. Fitch served nearly ten years in the Air Force and flew rescue helicopters during the Vietnam War. Mr. Bean served in the Navy where he was stationed at the former Brunswick Naval Air Station during the 1960's. Both of these veterans told me that lost their jobs, pensions, health care, and savings as a result of the Pan Am bombing.

This group's initial lawsuit against Libya, which had been joined with the families of those who died at

Lockerbie, was dismissed by the courts due to sovereign immunity. Following the 2008 settlement agreement with Libya, the group of pilots approached the State Department in 2009 seeking the necessary referral to have their claims heard by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. For more than four years the State Department failed to refer the group's claims to the Commission, but following bipartisan letters to then-Secretaries Clinton and Kerry signed by myself and more than 60 other members of Congress, the State Department finally referred the claims in 2013.

After an initial denial of claims in a preliminary ruling by the Commission in July 2016, the group of pilots was granted a hearing in December 2016. So many of the pilots and their families attended the hearing that it was moved to a U.S. District Court courtroom in Washington, D.C. Three senior Pan Am executives testified at the hearing, including the former Pan Am CEO, Thomas Plaskett; former Pan Am Senior Vice President for Finance, Ramesh Punwani; and former Pan Am Vice President of Strategic Planning, Peter Pappas. Each explained why the Lockerbie bombing and the subsequent media coverage directly caused the airline's collapse.

In January 2018, more than a year following that hearing, the Commission ruled against the pilots. Using an undefined standard of proof and applying international law, the Commission argued that Pan Am's demise was not caused by the Lockerbie bombing, contrary to the testimony of the former Pan Am executives themselves. The pilots' referred claim was the very last of the Libya claims adjudicated by the Commission, and the Libya settlement fund is now exhausted from the claims it approved prior to the final adjudication of the pilots' claims.

Mr. President, these terrorism victims were denied an opportunity to even make their case for four years by the Department of State, and when finally referred to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, they were forced to wait another three years for a preliminary ruling and another two years for a final decision, by which point the Commission had already awarded claims that essentially exhausted the settlement funds provided by Libya. That simply is not fair, and I believe these Mainers and other Americans deserve a quick and fair process to compensate them for their losses.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working toward justice for all of the victims of the Lockerbie bombing perpetrated by Libya.

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

S. 1432. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an electric grid resilience grant program and an electric grid resilience research and development program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to join Senator CORNYN in introducing the ''Preventing Outages With Enhanced Resilience and Operations Nationwide (POWER ON) Act of 2021''.

This legislation would authorize the Federal government to offer grants to States and Tribal governments to modernize the electrical grid and better withstand extreme weather events and natural disasters.

It would also serve as a catalyst for our Nation's research and development and deployment of new technologies that will ensure our Nation's grid can meet the challenges of climate change and continue to provide reliable electricity to our citizens.

The ''POWER ON Act'' is a bipartisan step-forward to combating the devastating impact of climate change and keep the lights on for everyone.

This legislation would help protect America's electric grid and make it more resilient.

Climate change is real and nowhere is that fact more clear than in my State of California. As the State continues to experience historic wildfires, droughts, dangerous mudslides, prolonged heatwaves, and extreme wind events that prompt sustained power shutoffs, the Federal government can and must help. We must work with States to invest in our electrical infrastructure and make our grids more reliable.

This legislation would establish a grant program through the Department of Energy for States and Tribal governments to award funds to eligible entities to deploy projects that enhance the resilience of the electric grid.

This legislation specifically includes natural disasters, such as wildfires, and extreme weather such as heatwaves, drought, and high winds as threats to the resiliency of the electrical grid. Additionally, it explicitly includes Public Safety Power Shutoffs, which have become all too routine in California in recent years, as eligible events.

To protect ratepayers, this legislation ensures that a utility may not seek any cost recovery for any grant awarded through this new program.

Lastly, this legislation would establish a grant program through the Department of Energy for research, development, demonstration, and commercial application of innovations to enhance resilience and strengthen emergency response and management of the electric grid.

California has always been a leader in research and development, and this new program would allow universities, national laboratories and others to make our grid smarter and more resilient. This legislation will not only work to harden our grid but it will allow our world-renowned institutions to usher in new technologies that will keep our grid and our citizens safe.

I thank my colleague Senator CORNYN and our House partners, Representatives DORIS MATSUI, JARED HUFFMAN, DOUG LAMALFA, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, KEVIN BRADY, and MICHAEL BURGESS for championing this bill.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the ''POWER ON Act'' as quickly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 181—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CARL LUTZ

Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 181

Whereas Carl Lutz was born on March 30, 1895, in Walzenhausen, Switzerland, but moved to the United States as a young man;

Whereas Carl Lutz became a diplomat, eventually serving at the Swiss consulate in what was then Mandatory Palestine;

Whereas, in 1942, Carl Lutz was transferred to Budapest, Hungary, where he—

(1) served as the Swiss vice consul until the end of World War II; and

(2) represented countries that had severed diplomatic relations with Hungary because of its German alliance;

Whereas Carl Lutz, upon arrival in Budapest, began to work to help Jews receive Swiss diplomatic protection so they could flee Nazi persecution;

Whereas, in 1944, Carl Lutz received permission to issue protective papers to save 8,000 Jews from deportation, which Lutz determined to mean 8,000 families, not 8,000 individuals;

Whereas Carl Lutz extended Swiss protection to 76 buildings that operated as safe houses for Jewish refugees seeking protection, including a department store called the Glass House, which served as a refuge for up to 3,000 Jews and as a headquarters for the Zionist underground;

Whereas, in November 1944, Carl Lutz and his wife, Trudi Lutz, joined a death march to various concentration camps, pulling Jews out of the line to issue as many protective papers as possible;

Whereas, at the end of World War II, Carl Lutz and his coconspirators, including his wife, his staff, and the Zionist underground members, saved over 50,000 Jews, which was half of the surviving Jewish population of Budapest; and

Whereas the United States is deeply indebted to Carl Lutz, who was responsible for the largest civilian rescue mission of Jews during World War II: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life and legacy of Carl Lutz;

(2) recognizes that the heroic effort of Carl Lutz went above and beyond the call of duty to save the Hungarian Jews ''condemned to die'' because he believed it to be a ''matter of conscience''; and

(3) expresses deep appreciation to Carl Lutz on behalf of the United States for facilitating the largest civilian rescue mission of Jews during World War II, saving over 50,000 Jews through the protective papers and documentation he issued.

SENATE RESOLUTION 182—RECOGNIZING THE LATE GILBERT METZ, THE LAST HOLOCAUST SURVIVOR WHO LIVED IN MISSISSIPPI, AND COMMENDING ALL EDUCATORS WHO TEACH ABOUT THE HOLOCAUST AND ALL GENOCIDE

Mr. WICKER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 182

Whereas April 7, 2021, marked the international observance of Yom Hashoah, also known as ''Holocaust Memorial Day'', a day to remember and mourn the millions who died during the Holocaust of World War II;

Whereas Gilbert Metz, born in France and inmate 184203 in Auschwitz and Dachau, was liberated from Dachau on April 29, 1945, and moved to Natchez, Mississippi;

Whereas the Mississippi Legislature passed House Concurrent Resolution 104 titled ''A Concurrent Resolution Commending Gilbert Metz As Mississippi's Only Holocaust Survivor'' on April 4, 1998, which recognized Gilbert Metz as Mississippi's only Holocaust survivor;

Whereas Gilbert Metz, the last Holocaust survivor in Mississippi, passed away on December 17, 2007, and is survived by his 3 children, Sylvain Metz, Helene Johnson and her husband, Mark, and Lawson Metz and his wife, Kay, 5 grandchildren, 3 step-grandchildren, and 4 great- and step-great-grandchildren;

Whereas awareness of the Holocaust is declining, as more than 1 in 5 Millennials and Generation Z individuals in the United States are unaware of the Holocaust or are not sure if they have heard of the Holocaust; and

Whereas educators throughout the United States and the world have committed to teaching about the Holocaust and all genocide to ensure that these atrocities are never forgotten, even as those who endured these dark chapters in human history are no longer with us: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and honors the late Gilbert Metz as the last survivor of the Holocaust in Mississippi;

(2) recognizes the declining awareness and knowledge of the atrocities committed during the Holocaust; and

(3) commends all educators in the United States and the world who teach about the Holocaust and all genocide.

SENATE RESOLUTION 183—CONDEMNING THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN'S STATE-SPONSORED PERSECUTION OF ITS BAHA'I MINORITY AND ITS CONTINUED VIOLATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 183

Whereas in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2020, Congress declared that it—

(1) deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community; and

(2) would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i Faith;

Whereas according to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom's 2017 annual report, ''Since 1979, [Iranian] authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha'i leaders, and more than 10,000 [Baha'i] have been dismissed from government and university jobs [in Iran]'';

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly Resolution on the Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran (A/RES/75/191), dated December 16, 2020, expresses serious concern about—

(1) ''ongoing severe limitations and increasing restrictions on the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief'';

(2) ''restrictions on the establishment of places of worship'';

(3) ''undue restrictions on burials carried out in accordance with religious tenets'';

(4) ''attacks against places of worship and burial''; and

(5) ''other human rights violations, including but not limited to harassment, intimidation, persecution, arbitrary arrests and detention, and incitement to hatred that leads to violence against persons belonging to recognized and unrecognized religious minorities'';

Whereas on January 29, 2020, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom ''condemned an Iranian court order allowing authorities to confiscate properties owned by Baha'is in the village of Ivel in Mazandaran Province'';

Whereas the Iran section of the Department of State's 2019 Report on International Religious Freedom states that—

(1) ''The government bars Baha'is from all government employment and forbids Baha'i participation in the governmental social pension system. Baha'is may not receive compensation for injury or crimes committed against them and may not inherit property. A religious fatwa from the supreme leader encourages citizens to avoid all dealings with Baha'is.'';

(2) ''Baha'is and those who advocated for their rights reported Baha'is continued to be major targets of social stigma and violence, and perpetrators reportedly continued to act with impunity. Even when arrested, perpetrators faced diminished punishment following admissions that their acts were based on the religious identity of the victim.'';

(3) ''There continued to be reports of non-Baha'is dismissing or refusing employment to Baha'is, sometimes in response to government pressure, according to [the Baha'i International Community] and other organizations monitoring the situation of the Baha'is.''; and

(4) ''According to media and NGO reports, Baha'is continued to face charges that included 'insulting religious sanctities,' 'corruption on earth,' 'propaganda against the system,' 'espionage and collaboration with foreign entities,' and 'actions against national security.' Charges also included involvement with the Baha'i Institute for Higher Education (BIHE), a university-level educational institution offering mainly distance learning, that the government considered illegal.'';

Whereas on March 11, 2020, the Department of State released the 2019 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, which states that Iranian authorities ''barred Bahai students from higher education'';

Whereas the Baha'i International Community documented a more than 50 percent increase in hate propaganda directed against the Baha'is in the 12-month period ending in August 2020 compared to prior years with more than 9,500 such articles, videos, or web pages appearing in Iranian government-controlled or government-sponsored media;

Whereas the Government of Iran is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, done at New York December 16, 1966, and is in violation of its obligations under such covenants;

Whereas section 105 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8514) authorizes the President to impose sanctions on individuals who are ''responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009''; and

Whereas the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–158) amends and expands the authorities established under the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–195) to sanction Iranian human rights abusers:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran —

(A) to immediately release the imprisoned or detained Baha'is and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(B) to end its state-sponsored campaign of hate propaganda against the Baha'is; and

(C) to reverse state-imposed policies denying equal opportunities to higher education, earning a livelihood, due process under the law, and the free exercise of religious practices;

(3) calls on the President and the Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations—

(A) to immediately condemn the Government of Iran's continued violation of human rights; and

(B) to demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and the Secretary of State to utilize available authorities to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against the Iranian Baha'i community.

SENATE RESOLUTION 184—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 2, 2021 THROUGH MAY 8, 2021, AS ''TARDIVE DYSKINESIA AWARENESS WEEK''

Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 184

Whereas many people with serious, chronic mental illness, such as schizophrenia and other schizoaffective disorders, bipolar disorder, or severe depression, require treatment with medications that work as dopamine receptor blocking agents (referred to in this preamble as ''DRBAs''), including antipsychotics;

Whereas many people who have gastrointestinal disorders, including gastroparesis, nausea, and vomiting also require treatment with DRBAs;

Whereas, while ongoing treatment with DRBAs can be lifesaving, for some people it can also lead to Tardive Dyskinesia;

Whereas Tardive Dyskinesia is a movement disorder that is characterized by random, involuntary, and uncontrolled movements of different muscles in the face, trunk, and extremities;

Whereas, in some cases, Tardive Dyskinesia may—

(1) cause people to experience movement of the arms, legs, fingers, and toes;

(2) affect the tongue, lips, and jaw; and

(3) cause swaying movements of the trunk or hips and may impact the muscles associated with walking, speech, eating, and breathing;

Whereas Tardive Dyskinesia can develop months, years, or decades after a person starts taking DRBAs and even after they have discontinued use of those medications;

Whereas not everyone who takes a DRBA develops Tardive Dyskinesia, but if Tardive Dyskinesia develops it is often persistent;

Whereas common risk factors for Tardive Dyskinesia include advanced age and alcoholism or other substance use disorders;

Whereas postmenopausal women and people with a mood disorder are also at higher risk of developing Tardive Dyskinesia;

Whereas a person is at higher risk for Tardive Dyskinesia after taking DRBAs for 3 months, but the longer the person is on these medications, the higher the risk of developing Tardive Dyskinesia;

Whereas studies suggest that the overall risk of developing Tardive Dyskinesia after taking DRBAs is between 10 and 30 percent;

Whereas it is estimated that over 500,000 people in the United States suffer from Tardive Dyskinesia;

Whereas, according to the National Alliance for Mental Illness, 1 in every 4 patients receiving long-term treatment with an antipsychotic medication will experience Tardive Dyskinesia;

Whereas years of difficult and challenging research have resulted in recent scientific breakthroughs, with 2 new treatments for Tardive Dyskinesia approved by the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services;

Whereas Tardive Dyskinesia is often unrecognized and patients suffering from the illness are commonly misdiagnosed;

Whereas regular screening for Tardive Dyskinesia in patients taking DRBA medications is recommended by the American Psychiatric Association;

Whereas patients suffering from Tardive Dyskinesia often suffer embarrassment due to abnormal and involuntary movements, which leads them to withdraw from society and increasingly isolate themselves as the disease progresses;

Whereas caregivers of patients with Tardive Dyskinesia face many challenges and are often responsible for the overall care of the Tardive Dyskinesia patient;

Whereas the Senate can raise awareness of Tardive Dyskinesia in the public and medical community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 2, 2021 through May 8, 2021, as ''Tardive Dyskinesia Awareness Week''; and

(2) encourages each individual in the United States to become better informed about and aware of Tardive Dyskinesia.

SENATE RESOLUTION 185—REQUESTING THAT THE PRESIDENT TRANSMIT TO THE SENATE NOT LATER THAN 14 DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF THE ADOPTION OF THIS RESOLUTION DOCUMENTS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE PRESIDENT RELATING TO THE ADMINISTRATION'S DISCUSSIONS AND PLANS TO ASSESS, MITIGATE, AND PREVENT GROWING INFLATION

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 185

Whereas the Federal debt and rising inflation is a real crisis that hurts real Americans;

Whereas the national debt of the United States is $27,900,000,000,000;

Whereas this represents $223,441 in debt per taxpayer;

Whereas in March President Biden and Democrats in Congress pushed through a wasteful $1,900,000,000,000 ''COVID'' spending bill that will further increase the Federal debt to $30,000,000,000,000;

Whereas the Biden Administration and Democrats in Congress continue to push massive spending proposals that would contribute to inflation, which increases the cost of everyday goods and disproportionately affects low-income and fixed-income families;

Whereas the cost of everyday purchases, like diapers and groceries, are increasing while home prices and rents continue to rise;

Whereas food and gasoline prices have risen significantly over the past year, up 3.5 percent and 23 percent, respectively, in March 2021, according to the Consumer Price Index;

Whereas the latest figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show the Consumer Price Index and Producer Price Index increasing 2.6 percent and 4.5 percent, respectively, over the year, the fastest increases in nearly a decade;

Whereas several notable economists have expressed concern about the impact of the Biden Administration's massive Federal spending, with warnings that a stimulus-fueled surge in consumer spending could revive a 1970s-style escalation in wages and prices that could cripple the economy in the years to come;

Whereas the New York Times reported on April 13, 2021, that officials and aides at the White House and the Department of the Treasury have for months held private meetings to discuss inflation and conducted in-depth internal analyses for senior officials and President Biden;

Whereas the content and conclusions of these secret meetings and working groups have not been disclosed and made available to the public;

Whereas the New York Times also reports that ''Mr. Biden's aides are sufficiently worried about the risk of spending fueling inflation that they shaped his infrastructure proposal, which has yet to be taken up by Congress, to funnel out $2.3 trillion over eight years, which is slower than traditional stimulus.'';

Whereas the Biden Administration continues to refuse to address or acknowledge the effects of rising inflation on American families, despite indications that inflation could significantly increase this year; and

Whereas the partisan actions of the Biden Administration have real life consequences for Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President is requested to transmit to the Senate not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of the President relating to the Administration's discussions and plans to mitigate and prevent growing inflation, including a detailed timeline of events and participants as well as any correspondence, reports, presentations, notes, or memorandum produced in preparation for, during, or as a result of these activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 186—HONORING THE HUMANITARIAN WORK OF DR. ARISTIDES DE SOUSA MENDES DO AMARAL E ABRANCHES TO SAVE THE LIVES OF FRENCH JEWS AND OTHER PERSONS DURING THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. ROMNEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 186

Whereas Nazi Germany invaded France on May 10, 1940, and after brief but intense hostilities, secured the surrender of France on June 22, 1940;

Whereas, as a consequence of the Nazi conquest, the lives of French Jews and Jewish and non-Jewish persons of other nationalities seeking refuge in France were put in grave and imminent danger;

Whereas many thousands of those persons fled to Bordeaux, France, and elsewhere in southwest France, seeking to traverse Spain and escape to Portugal;

Whereas, in 1939, the Government of Portugal under Antonio de Oliveira Salazar issued Circular 14, which sharply restricted the availability of visas to displaced persons;

Whereas the Consul General of Portugal in Bordeaux was Dr. Aristides de Sousa Mendes do Amaral e Abranches;

Whereas, in June 1940, confronting a humanitarian crisis and in defiance of Circular 14, Sousa Mendes, assisted principally by his diplomatic colleagues Jose de Seabra, Manuel de Vieira Braga, and Emile Gissot, issued without charge tens of thousands of visas, including thousands to fleeing Jews;

Whereas Sousa Mendes reportedly stated, ''I declare that I shall give, free of charge, a visa to whosoever shall request it. My desire is to be with God against Man rather than with Man and against God.'';

Whereas those visas, as well as Sousa Mendes' personal intervention at the border between France and Spain, enabled the refugees to reach safety in Portugal;

Whereas, in July 1940, the Government of Portugal under Oliveira Salazar responded by recalling Sousa Mendes, dismissing Sousa Mendes later from active diplomatic service, and subjecting him to economic retribution and subsequent ostracism;

Whereas, in 1941, Sousa Mendes explained, ''In truth, I disobeyed, but my disobedience does not dishonor me. I chose to defy an order that to me represented the persecution of true castaways who sought with all their strength to be saved from Hitler's wrath. Above the order, for me, was God's law, and that's the one I have always sought to adhere to without hesitation. The true lesson of Christianity is to love one's neighbor.'';

Whereas, in 1954, Sousa Mendes died penniless in Lisbon, Portugal, under the cloud of the discipline imposed for his defiance;

Whereas, in 1966, Yad Vashem recognized Sousa Mendes as a Righteous Among the Nations for his selfless efforts to save Jewish

lives at personal risk to himself, making Sousa Mendes the first of a number of diplomatic rescuers to be so honored;

Whereas, in 1988, the United States Senate passed Senate Resolution 270, 100th Congress, agreed to June 23, 1988, to commemorate Sousa Mendes' humanitarian efforts;

Whereas, in 1986, President of Portugal Mario Soares posthumously rehabilitated Sousa Mendes, decorating Sousa Mendes as an Officer of the Order of Liberty;

Whereas, in 1988, the Parliament of Portugal posthumously granted Sousa Mendes the status of Ambassador;

Whereas, in 1995, President of Portugal Mario Soares posthumously bestowed on Sousa Mendes the Grand Cross of the Order of Christ;

Whereas, in 2017, President of Portugal Marcelo Rebelo de Sousa posthumously bestowed on Sousa Mendes Portugal's highest honor, the Grand Cross of the Order of Liberty;

Whereas, in 2020, the Parliament of Portugal unanimously voted to memorialize Sousa Mendes in the National Pantheon in Lisbon; and

Whereas, in 2020, on the 80th anniversary of his heroism, the United States Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad initiated commemorations in honor of Sousa Mendes in Bordeaux, France, and Portugal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and salutes the humanitarian and principled work of Dr. Aristides de Sousa Mendes do Amaral e Abranches, Consul of Portugal in Bordeaux, France, for acting with great courage and at personal risk to issue transit visas to French Jews and other persons, sparing them from Nazi occupation and the Holocaust, thus saving many thousands of innocent lives; and

(2) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit copies of this resolution to—

(A) the President; and

(B) the President of the Assembly of the Republic of Portugal.

SENATE RESOLUTION 187—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN BADGERS ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 187

Whereas, on March 20, 2021, the University of Wisconsin Badgers won the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Ice Hockey Championship and finished the season with an impressive record of 17-3-1;

Whereas the University of Wisconsin Badgers senior forward Daryl Watts scored a spectacular game-winning goal in overtime to give the Badgers a 2 to 1 victory over the Northeastern University Huskies in the national championship game;

Whereas the University of Wisconsin Women's Hockey Team won their 6th national title, adding to championship seasons in 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, and 2019;

Whereas the 2020 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Ice Hockey Championship was cancelled due to the COVID–19 pandemic;

Whereas the University of Wisconsin Women's Hockey Team won back-to-back national championships for the second time in program history, having also won in 2006 and 2007;

Whereas the following players should be congratulated for their hard work and dedication in representing the University of Wisconsin: Kennedy Blair, Breanna Blesi, Grace Bowlby, Natalie Buchbinder, Britta Curl, Delaney Drake, Lacey Eden, Chayla Edwards, Jane Gervais, Teagan Grant, Dara Greig, Katie Kotlowski, Cami Kronish, Nicole Lamantia, Casey O'Brian, Brette Pettet, Maddie Posick, Caitlin Schneider, Grace Shirley, Sophie Shirley, Mayson Toft, Daryl Watts, Makenna Webster, and Maddi Wheeler;

Whereas the University of Wisconsin Badgers were guided by a superb coaching staff of Mark Johnson, Dan Koch, Jackie Crum, Mark Greenhalgh, Sis Paulsen, Stefanie Arndt, Jim Snider, Justin Kakuska, AJ Harrison, and Billy Breider;

Whereas the University of Wisconsin Women's Hockey Head Coach Mark Johnson was named the U.S. College Hockey Online (''USCHO'') Coach of the Year and has coached the Badgers for 18 seasons, producing 539 wins and 6 national championships to become the all-time winningest coach in the history of college women's hockey;

Whereas the University of Wisconsin Women's Hockey Team—

(1) also captured the 2021 Western Collegiate Hockey Association Conference's regular season and tournament championships;

(2) featured 4 players who earned USCHO All-American honors at the end of the season: Daryl Watts, Grace Bowlby, Sophie Shirley, and Lacey Eden; and

(3) has had a long history of players, past and present, who also represent the University of Wisconsin on the international and Olympic stage;

Whereas the players and staff persevered through the challenges presented by the COVID–19 pandemic, including the cancellation of games and limited attendance at LaBahn Arena in order to protect the health and safety of the players, staff, and loyal fans throughout the State of Wisconsin; and

Whereas the Badgers Women's Hockey Team has brought great pride and honor to the University of Wisconsin and its alumni, loyal fans, and the State of Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Wisconsin Badgers on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Ice Hockey Championship;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, and staff who contributed to this unprecedented championship season; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate prepare an official copy of this resolution for presentation to—

(A) the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, Rebecca Blank;

(B) the Athletic Director of the University of Wisconsin, Barry Alvarez; and

(C) the Head Coach of the University of Wisconsin Women's Hockey Team, Mark Johnson.

SENATE RESOLUTION 188—EXPRESSING APPRECIATION AND RECOGNITION FOR THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION FOR THE CREATION OF OPERATION WARP SPEED AND THE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT OF A COVID–19 VACCINE

Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 188

Whereas COVID–19 has infected more than 28,000,000 people in the United States and taken the lives of more than 500,000;

Whereas, on May 15, 2020, President Trump unveiled Operation Warp Speed, the nationwide effort to accelerate development of an effective COVID–19 vaccine;

Whereas Operation Warp Speed successfully ''deliver[ed] by the end of [2020] a vaccine at scale to treat the American people'';

Whereas Operation Warp Speed, to date, has supported the authorization of 3 COVID–19 vaccines in 9 months, rather than years;

Whereas the Department of Defense and the Department of Health and Human Services partnered together to support the development, manufacturing, delivery, and administration of such COVID–19 vaccines;

Whereas the Director of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Francis Collins, praised the Trump Administration for the unprecedented success of Operation Warp Speed including that multiple safe and effective COVID–19 vaccines ''got done in 11 months from when we first knew about this virus [which] is at least 5 years faster than it's ever been before'';

Whereas, on October 16, 2020, the Trump Administration and Operation Warp Speed announced a public-private partnership to leverage the expertise of certain private sector entities to distribute and administer COVID–19 vaccines to nursing homes and long-term care facilities as quickly as possible, protecting the most at-risk populations in the United States;

Whereas, on December 8, 2020, President Trump signed an Executive Order prioritizing access for the people of the United States to the COVID–19 vaccines purchased by the United States Government;

Whereas, on December 11, 2020, the Food and Drug Administration authorized the first vaccine for emergency use to prevent COVID–19;

Whereas, on December 14, 2020, an intensive care unit nurse in New York City became the first person to receive the COVID–19 vaccine in the United States;

Whereas Operation Warp Speed helped to support development, manufacturing, and distribution of vaccines, including procuring an initial 400,000,000 doses of COVID–19 vaccines, contract options that the Biden Administration is reportedly levergaing to purchase additional doses;

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, by the time President Trump left office, more than 21,000,000 doses of a COVID–19 vaccine had been administered in the United States;

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, on January 20, 2021, the last day in office for President Trump, 1,511,443 doses of a COVID–19 vaccine were administered, setting the United States on pace to meet the initial goal of the Biden Administration to administer 100,000,000 vaccines within the first 100 days of the Biden presidency; and

Whereas the rapid development and deployment of COVID–19 vaccines has helped the United States combat the spread of COVID–19, protect at-risk populations in the United States, and begin the process of reopening the schools, offices, and public spaces of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the accomplishments of the Trump Administration and Operation Warp

Speed in supporting the development of COVID–19 vaccines; and

(2) expresses sincere gratitude to President Trump and his Cabinet for the vital contributions of Operation Warp Speed to supporting public health.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1471. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1460 proposed by Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 914, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs under those Acts, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1472. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1460 proposed by Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 914, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1473. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1460 proposed by Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 914, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1474. Ms. HASSAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 914, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1475. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1460 proposed by Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 914, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1471. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1460 proposed by Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 914, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs under those Acts, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 210 (relating to clean water State revolving funds), add the following:

(c) FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT ALLOTMENTS.—Section 205 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1285) is amended—

(1) by striking the section designation and heading and all that follows through the end of subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"SEC. 205. ALLOTMENTS.

''(a) FISCAL YEARS 2022 AND THEREAFTER.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) BUY AMERICAN OVERSIGHT.—The term 'Buy American oversight' means any activity carried out by the Administrator for the management or oversight of the requirements of section 608.

''(B) UNITED STATES TERRITORY.—The term 'United States territory' means—

''(i) American Samoa;

''(ii) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

''(iii) the United States Virgin Islands; and

''(iv) Guam.

''(2) INITIAL ALLOTMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025, of the amounts made available to carry out this section for the fiscal year, the Administrator shall provide for each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any other territory or possession of the United States, United States territories, Indian Tribes, and Buy American oversight an allotment equal to not less than the allotment described in the following table:

"Recipient	Allotment
Alabama	0.005
Alaska	0.005
Arizona	0.005
Arkansas	0.005
California	0.005
Colorado	0.005
Connecticut	0.005
Delaware	0.005
District of Columbia	0.005
Florida	0.005
Georgia	0.005
Hawaii	0.005
Idaho	0.005
Illinois	0.005
Indiana	0.005
Iowa	0.005
Kansas	0.005
Kentucky	0.005
Louisiana	0.005
Maine	0.005
Maryland	0.005
Massachusetts	0.005
Michigan	0.005
Minnesota	0.005
Mississippi	0.005
Missouri	0.005
Montana	0.005
Nebraska	0.005
Nevada	0.005
New Hampshire	0.005
New Jersey	0.005
New Mexico	0.005
New York	0.005
North Carolina	0.005
North Dakota	0.005
Ohio	0.005
Oklahoma	0.005
Oregon	0.005
Pennsylvania	0.005
Puerto Rico	0.005
Rhode Island	0.005
South Carolina	0.005
South Dakota	0.005
Tennessee	0.005
Texas	0.005
Utah	0.005

"Recipient	Allotment
Vermont	0.005
United States territories	0.015
Virginia	0.005
Washington	0.005
West Virginia	0.005
Wisconsin	0.005
Wyoming	0.005
Indian Tribes	0.0025
Buy American oversight	0.001.

''(B) ADDITIONAL ALLOTMENTS TO STATES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND PUERTO RICO.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025, of the amounts made available to carry out this section for the fiscal year remaining after all allotments under subparagraph (A) are provided for that fiscal year, the Administrator shall provide an additional allotment to each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in an amount based on the proportion that, as determined in the most recently published annual estimate of the Bureau of the Census—

''(i) the population of the State, District of Columbia, or Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, respectively; bears to

''(ii) the total population of all States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

''(3) ALLOTMENT UPDATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2026 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Administrator shall use an updated allotment formula for amounts made available to carry out this section consistent with the formula developed pursuant to subparagraph (B)—

''(i) by not later than September 30, 2025, to ensure updated allotments are in effect for fiscal year 2026; and

''(ii) thereafter, by not later than 1 year after the date of submission of any new clean watersheds needs survey and associated data under section 516(b)(1)(B).

''(B) FORMULA.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall develop, by regulation, a formula for the calculation of allotments to States, United States territories, and possessions of the United States under this section, in accordance with clause (ii).

''(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(I) BASES.—The formula under clause (i) shall be developed based on—

''(aa) the State needs identified in the most recently available clean watersheds needs survey prepared by the Administrator under section 516(b)(1)(B);

''(bb) the State population results of the most recent decennial census; and

''(cc) the most recently available water quality impairment component ratio published by the Administrator for purposes of this Act.

''(II) WEIGHT.—In developing the formula under clause (i), the Administrator shall give—

''(aa) 50 percent weight to the survey referred to in subclause (I)(aa);

''(bb) 30 percent weight to the census referred to in subclause (I)(bb); and

''(cc) 20 percent weight to the ratio referred to in subclause (I)(cc).

''(4) SAVINGS PROVISION.—To the extent practicable, the Administrator shall continue developing the allotment formula under paragraph (2) until the date on which the Administrator completes preparation of a new clean watersheds needs survey under section 516(b)(1)(B) for purposes of the updated formula under paragraph (3).'';

(2) in subsection (g)(1), by striking ''shall not exceed 4'' in the first sentence and all that follows through the second period and inserting ''shall not exceed the greater of 4 percent and $400,000.''; and

(3) in subsection (m)(1)(B), by striking ''for this fiscal year.'' and inserting ''for that fiscal year.''.

SA 1472. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1460 proposed by Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 914, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs under those Acts, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. RESERVATION OF WATER RIGHTS AT NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

Section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) WATER RIGHTS.—

''(1) NO RESERVATION OF WATER RIGHTS.—In designating a national monument under subsection (a), the President may not reserve any implied or expressed water rights associated with the national monument.

''(2) APPLICABLE LAW.—Water rights associated with a national monument designated under subsection (a) may be acquired for the national monument only in accordance with the laws of the State in which the water rights are located.''.

SA 1473. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1460 proposed by Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 914, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs under those Acts, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SELECTION CRITERIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5028(b) of the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 3907(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

''(L) The extent to which a project considers collaborative project delivery methods that—

''(i) reduce overall project costs;

''(ii) reduce the contribution of Federal grant assistance;

''(iii) enable the project to proceed at an earlier date than the project would otherwise be able to proceed;

''(iv) mitigate environmental impacts; or

''(v) result in such other benefits as the collaborative project delivery methods may provide.''; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''(K)'' and inserting ''(L)''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 5022 of the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 3901) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (15) as paragraphs (3) through (16), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) COLLABORATIVE PROJECT DELIVERY METHOD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'collaborative project delivery method' means a method for procuring and delivering a capital project that involves close collaboration among the owner of the project, the designer of the project, and the contractor for the project from design through completion, including a construction management at-risk method and a design-build method.

''(B) ASSOCIATED DEFINITIONS.—

''(i) CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT AT-RISK METHOD.—The term 'construction management at-risk method' means a delivery method in which the owner of a project retains an engineering firm and a construction management at-risk firm under 2 separate contracts for design and construction, respectively.

''(ii) DESIGN-BUILD METHOD.—The term 'design-build method' means a delivery method under which the owner of a project enters into a single contract with a design-builder to design, seek permits for, construct, test, and commission a project.''.

SA 1474. Ms. HASSAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 914, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs under those Acts, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 142, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 144, line 5, and insert the following:

''(II) a community described in section 1459A(c)(2);

''(ii) has plans to identify or has identified opportunities in the operations of the public water system to employ new, existing, or emerging, yet proven, technologies, including technology that could address cybersecurity vulnerabilities, as determined by the Administrator, that enhance treatment, monitoring, affordability, efficiency, or safety of the drinking water provided by the public water system, including technologies not identified in the study conducted under subsection (a)(1); and

''(iii) has expressed an interest in the opportunities in the operation of the public water system to employ new, existing, or emerging, yet proven, technologies, including technology that could address cybersecurity vulnerabilities, as determined by the

Administrator, that enhance treatment, monitoring, affordability, efficiency, or safety of the drinking water provided by the public water system, including technologies not identified in the study conducted under subsection (a)(1).

''(B) PROGRAM.—The term 'program' means the competitive grant program established under paragraph (2).

SA 1475. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1460 proposed by Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) to the bill S. 914, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs under those Acts, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—RECLAMATION PROJECTS

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF ST. MARY CANAL REHABILITATION PHASE 1 PROJECT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PROJECT BENEFICIARY.—The term ''Project Beneficiary'' means any entity that enters into a contract with the Secretary to receive irrigation water or other associated project benefits in exchange for paying for allocated project costs of the St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation.

(3) ST. MARY CANAL REHABILITATION PHASE 1 PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project'' means any activity associated with the construction of the St. Mary Diversion Dam or St. Mary Canal Headworks within the St. Mary Storage Unit of the Milk River Project authorized by Congress on March 25, 1905.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project'' does not include any activity associated with the operation or maintenance of the St. Mary Storage Unit.

(b) USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—The Secretary may use appropriated funds to carry out the St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project.

(c) PARTICIPATION OF BLACKFEET TRIBE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the Blackfeet Tribe with respect to any replacement activities carried out under the St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project.

(2) EFFECT ON RIGHTS OF TRIBE.—This section shall not be considered to be an Act appropriating funds for the rehabilitation of the St. Mary Unit for purposes of section 3708(b)(2)(A) of the Blackfeet Water Rights Settlement Act (Public Law 114–322; 130 Stat. 1823).

(d) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—The Federal share of the total cost of the St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project shall be not less than 26.04 percent, which shall be nonreimbursable to the United States.

(e) STUDY OF ABILITY TO PAY.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which funds are first appropriated for the St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project under subsection (g), the Secretary shall conduct, at Federal expense, a study of the ability of the Project Beneficiaries to pay, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary, the costs of the St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project.

(f) REPAYMENT TERMS.—Based on the study conducted under subsection (e), the Secretary shall establish the repayment terms for the Project Beneficiaries with respect to the St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to adjustment under paragraph (2), there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $52,000,000 for the St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project for the period of fiscal years 2022 through 2032.

(2) ADJUSTMENT OF AMOUNT.—The amount referred to in paragraph (1) may be increased or decreased in accordance with ordinary fluctuations in development costs incurred after the date of enactment of this Act, as indicated by any available engineering cost indices applicable to construction activities that are similar to the construction of the St. Mary Canal Rehabilitation Phase 1 Project, as determined by the Secretary.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have 15 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 BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on legislation and nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing nominations.

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 Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

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 Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 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 Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 10 a.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 Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 1:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

The Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 4:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATION AND BORDER MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Government Operation and Border Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 28, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that Jakob Lindaas, the AAAS fellow from my office, have floor privileges for the rest of today's session.

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

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS APPOINTMENTS

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2021.

Hon. KAMALA D. HARRIS, Washington, DC.
President of the Senate, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the Rules of the Select Committee on Ethics, this is to notify you that Senator Christopher A. Coons, Chairman of the Select

Committee on Ethics, and Senator James Lankford, Vice Chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics, in their discretion and as permitted under Committee Rules, disqualified themselves from participating in Preliminary Inquiry Case Numbers 30094 and 30226.

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 179, we, Senator Brian Schatz and Senator James Risch, were appointed Chairman and Vice Chairman respectively for these matters. Additionally, Senator Ben Ray Lujan and Senator John Boozman were appointed to the Select Committee on Ethics for these matters.

Sincerely,

BRIAN SCHATZ,
Chairman.
JAMES E. RISCH,
Vice Chairman.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 914 on Thursday, April 29, the following amendments be reported by number and that they be the only amendments in order to S. 914: Rubio-Scott amendment No. 1471, as modified; Shaheen amendment No. 1461; Kennedy amendment No. 1469; and Lee amendment No. 1472.

Further, that at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, April 29, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with 60 affirmative votes required for adoption of the Lee amendment and passage of the bill; further, that upon disposition of the amendments, amendment No. 1460, as amended, if amended, be agreed to; the bill be considered read a third time, and at 1:45 p.m., the Senate vote on the passage of the bill, as amended, with 2 minutes for debate equally divided prior to each vote; and finally, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114–255, appoints the following individuals to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee: Ms. Lisa Frey of Kentucky and Dr. Steven Hester of Kentucky.

HONORING THE HUMANITARIAN WORK OF DR. ARISTIDES DE SOUSA MENDES DO AMARAL E ABRANCHES TO SAVE THE LIVES OF FRENCH JEWS AND OTHER PERSONS DURING THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 186, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 186) honoring the humanitarian work of Dr. Aristides de Sousa Mendes do Amaral e Abranches to save the lives of French Jews and other persons during the Holocaust.

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

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 186) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN BADGERS ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 187, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 187) congratulating the University of Wisconsin Badgers on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Women's Ice Hockey Championship.

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

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 187) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2021

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 8:25 p.m. today, and upon reconvening, proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint session of Congress provided under the provisions of H. Con. Res. 30; and that upon the dissolution of the joint session, the Senate adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 29, 2021; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; and that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 34, S. 914, Drinking Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Act of 2021, as provided under the previous order.

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

Mr. CARPER. We will gather in the Senate Chamber at 8:15 p.m. this evening to proceed as a body to the House of Representatives for President Joe Biden's address.

Joe Biden is the first Delawarian ever elected President of the United States.

If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it recess under the previous order.

RECESS

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:26 p.m., recessed until 8:25 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives to receive a message from the President of the United States.

Thereupon, the Senate, preceded by the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Kelly Fado; the Secretary of the Senate, Sonceria A. Berry; and the Vice President of the United States, KAMALA HARRIS, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States, Joseph R. Biden, Jr.

(The address delivered by the President of the United States to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress is printed in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered, at 10:20 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 29, 2021, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

JENNIFER LESTER MOFFITT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS, VICE GREGORY IBACH.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MEREDITH BERGER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, VICE CHARLES WILLIAMS.

GINA MARIA ORTIZ JONES, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE MATTHEW P. DONOVAN, RESIGNED.

FRANK KENDALL III, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE BARBARA MCCONNELL BARRETT.

CAROLINE DIANE KRASS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE PAUL C. NEY, JR.

MICHAEL LEE CONNOR, OF COLORADO, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE R. D. JAMES.

CHRISTOPHER PAUL MAIER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE OWEN WEST.

HEIDI SHYU, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING, VICE MICHAEL D. GRIFFIN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MARK COLON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE NEAL J. RACKLEFF.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ALEJANDRA Y. CASTILLO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, VICE JOHN FLEMING.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SAMUEL T. WALSH, OF NEW YORK, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE WILLIAM COOPER.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARCIA STEPHENS BLOOM BERNICAT, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF THE MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE, VICE CAROL Z. PEREZ.

RENA BITTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (CONSULAR AFFAIRS), VICE CARL C. RISCH.

DANIEL J. KRITENBRINK, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS), VICE DAVID STILWELL.

GENTRY O. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (DIPLOMATIC SECURITY), VICE MICHAEL T. EVANOFF, RESIGNED.

ANNE A. WITKOWSKY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (CONFLICT AND STABILIZATION OPERATIONS), VICE DENISE NATALI.

ANNE A. WITKOWSKY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE COORDINATOR FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND STABILIZATION, VICE DAVID MALCOLM ROBINSON.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

ELIZABETH SCHOFF WATSON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE KATHERINE BRUNETT MCGUIRE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

ED GONZALEZ, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE SARAH R. SALDANA.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JAVIER M. GUZMAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE JOSEPH H. HUNT, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BRENDAN J. CULLINAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JAMES B. KAVANAUGH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JUSTIN P. OVERBAUGH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

KYLE R. ABRUZZESE
NICOLE M. ALEXANDER
ANTHONY J. ALLEN
JACOB A. ALLEN
JAMES C. ANDERSON
CHRISTOPHER R. ANTHONY
GABRIEL A. ARAUJO
CRAIG D. ARNOLD II
JAMES S. ARTHURS, JR.
MARK A. AXTELL
RICHARD J. BAILEY
ANDREW J. BAILIFF
CHAD M. BAKER
GREGORY B. BAKER
KEVIN S. BALENTINE
MICHAEL D. BALES
TIMOTHY S. BALL
ANDREW R. BALLOW
JONATHAN D. BATE
JAMES M. BEAN
JEFFREY M. BEEMAN
TYSON J. BEHNKE
DANIEL R. BELL
NICHOLAS P. BELL
LUKAS B. BERG
BRIAN W. BIFULCO
ADRIAN O. BIGGERSTAFF
PATRICK BILLMANN
RANDALL F. BITTNER
JEFFREY S. BLACK
BENJAMIN T. BLANE
JAMES A. BLOOM, JR.
DUSTIN D. BLUM
RYAN L. BOEKA
ANDREW S. BOGGS
JOHN Q. BOLTON
DANIEL K. BOURKE
GERALD L. BOWMAN
GABRIEL R. BOWNS
ANDREW H. BOYD
CHESTER D. BOYLES
JORDAN G. BRADFORD
MARK BRANA
JOSEPH R. BRANCH
KEVIN L. BRASWELL
JAMES V. BRAUDIS
MICHAEL D. BRIMAGE
SHELDON E. BROEDEL
ANDREW A. BROWN
JEREMY P. BROWN
WILLIAM R. BROWN
RUSSELL A. BUCKHALT
TANYA J. BUCKLEY
ERICK D. BUCKNER
HERMAN E. BULLS, JR.
JOHN A. BURKHART
BRETT M. BUTLER
JOHN P. BYLER
JOSEPH K. BYRNES
MATTHEW J. CAHILL
MATTHEW E. CAIN
JOSHUA J. CAMBRA
GREGORY W. CANADY
MICHAEL V. CANN
DAVID CARATTINI
PETER D. CARETTO
JUSTIN D. CARLTON
JASON D. CASTRO
RACHEL M. CEPIS
KURT E. CHEESEMAN
DEBORAH L. CHEN
TIMOTHY W. CHESS
JOHN K. CHUNG
EDWARD CLARK III
TOBIAS R. CLARK
JOSHUA W. CLEMMONS
JONATHAN A. COE
ELISABETH G. COFFEE
SEAN R. COFFMAN
JARED D. COIL
CHRISTOPHER T. COLBERT
TAD J. COLEMAN
MARK E. CONKLIN
WILLIAM F. CONNERS
DANIEL G. CORBETT
JOSEPH R. CORSENTINO
JONATHAN S. COUCH
DAVID R. COWAN
JUSTIN W. CROCKER
WILLIAM A. CROSS
RICARDO CRUZ
JUSTIN M. CUFF
NICHOLAS C. CURRIE
CARL J. DANKO
ESTAN N. DAVIS
KARL A. DAVIS, JR.
DAVID A. DELLERMAN
THEODORE C. DEMARIA
BRIAN J. DERMODY
RANDY S. DESJARDIN, JR.
MICHAEL G. DESTEFANO
JOSEPH J. DIDOMENICO
JOHN P. DOLAN
JOSHUA R. DRAKE
JOHN T. DREW
BRANDON R. DROBENAK
NICHOLAS R. DUBAZ
THOMAS G. DULL
ANDREW S. EAGEN
STEVEN A. EATON
BRANDON T. ELLISON
SCOTT D. ELWELL
JONATHAN W. ERWIN
JACOB M. ESTRADA
BRIAN D. EVANS
DAVID R. FARRAR
JENNIFER L. FAUTH
DARRELL E. FAWLEY
ELISE V. FFITCHFREEBURG
KATIE R. FIDLER
EDUARDO M. FIGUEROA
ARI D. FISHER
DEREK R. FITZPATRICK
THOMAS G. FITZPATRICK
WILLIAM M. FLATHER
RANDOLPH J. FLEMING
CORY S. FLORENCE
JOHN C. FORD
CHAD M. FORSYTHE
NATHANIEL I. FOUST
AMOS C. FOX
JUSTIN L. FRAZIER
JOSEPH A. FREDERICK
LAURA P. FRYAR
TARIK K. FULCHER
TERRY E. GAMBREL
CHRISTOPHER R. GARNETT
JAMES A. GARRISON
WILFORD L. GARVIN
CHRISTOPHER L. GILLULY
ERIC M. GLASSMAN
JEFFREY L. GOINES
ALBERT J. GOMEZ
DANIEL E. GONZALEZ
DELVIN M. GOODE
GARY C. GOODMAN
KYLE E. GOODRIDGE
DANIEL D. GOODWIN
JARED G. GRAHAM
JEREMY L. GRAY
WALTER C. GRAY
BRADLEY S. GREAVER
ROBERT W. GREEN
ROBERT W. GREEN
GERALD W. GREENLEE
DAVID W. GRIFFITH
RUSSELL P. GRIGSBY
BRIAN D. GRIMSLEY
BRIAN L. HAAS
DENNIS W. HALL
SANG K. HAN
HENRY V. HANSEN
PAUL W. HANSON
TODD J. HARALSON
PAUL B. HARGROVE
STEPHEN G. HARNSBERGER
EDWARD N. HARRISON
JASON L. HAWKINS
MICHAEL D. HEBERT
MICHAEL L. HEFTI
TIMOTHY J. HEISLER
RYAN A. HINTZ
SCOTT M. HINZ
MATTHEW T. HOLDEN
SEAN M. HOLLARS
EDWARDARTHUR K. HOOMALU
ZACHARY T. HOOVER
BENJAMIN J. HORNER
KEVIN A. HORRIGAN
JEREMY N. HORTON
JOSHUA A. HOWARD
JACOB J. HUBER
DANIEL R. HUFF
TY HUFFMAN
LEE C. HUMPHREY
ROBERT W. HUMPHREY
LISA M. HUNTINGTON
ERICA HUSTON
RICHARD W. B. HUTTON
NICHOLAS R. INGRAO
RUSSELL J. ISAACS
MATTHEW A. IVES
MARK W. IVEY
BENJAMIN R. JACKSON
NICHOLAS M. JAMES
HEATH L. JENNI
BRIAN R. JENSON
CHRISTIAN R. JOHNSON
ROLLAND H. JOHNSON
RYAN R. JOHNSON
KYLE M. JOHNSTON
MICHAEL L. JONES
CAMDEN S. JORDAN
MICHAEL J. KAISER
ADAM M. KARR
MICHAEL R. KEASLER
ADAM C. KELLER
DAVID R. A. KELSO
ELIJAH S. KERNRUESINK
ALEXANDER A. KERR
DON Y. KIM
STEVE Y. KIM
WILLIAM J. KIMMINS
CARL A. KING, JR.
CHARLES W. KING
BRENT B. KINNEY
KYLE A. KIVIOJA
JASON R. KNEIB
ANDREW M. KOCHLI
MICHAEL P. KOVALSKY
BRADLEY J. KRAUSS
APRIL M. K. KREIGHBAUM
KEVIN F. KRUPSKI
TIMOTHY V. KUDZIA
WILLIAM R. LAMBERT
JOSHUA A. LARSON
PETER A. LAWALL
JOSHUA O. LEHMAN
MICHAEL A. LENGEL
KENYON M. LENO
DAVID J. LENZI II
MELISSA L. LEWIS
DOUGLAS T. LINDSAY
MATTHEW R. LOMMEL
NATHAN P. LONGWORTH
CHRISTOPHER G. LOSCHIAVO
CHRISTOPHER R. LOSSING
DANIEL R. LUDWIG
SHAYNE W. LUNDY
JOSHUA A. LYONS
JERRAULD MA
IAN B. MACGREGOR
TANIKA T. MACIAS

MORGAN MAIER
JOSEPH R. MANGAN
REIMUND G. MANNECK
REED T. MARKHAM
ADAM M. MARSH
JOSEPH L. MARSHALL
KEITH A. MARSHALL
ANDREW P. MARTIN
PHILLIP E. MASON
JACOB J. MATHEWS
RONNIE L. E. MATHIS
SCOTT K. MATTINGLY
BRETT M. MATZENBACHER
JOEL D. MAXWELL
ROBERT C. MCBRIDE
MATTHEW D. MCCARTY
IAN M. MCCONNELL
CHARLES T. MCCORMICK
BENJAMEN A. MCDANIEL
PATRICK W. MCLAIN
DANIEL W. MCMANUS
MATTHEW D. MCNEAL
JEFFREY B. MEINDERS
THOMAS J. MENN
PATRICK D. MERRISS
SEAN A. MERRITT
ANTHONY A. MESSENGER
JOHN A. MEYER
JOSHUA A. MEYER
RUSSELL J. MICHO
RYAN R. MIDDLEMISS
BRIAN M. MIDDLETON
CHRISTOPHER M. MILLER
STEVEN J. MILLER
PAUL B. MINNIE
DANIEL W. MITCHELL
RUSSELL G. MITSCHERLING
MICHAEL P. MOAD
WECHNER MOMPREVIL
KENT B. MONAS
JEFFREY P. MOORE
MICHAEL B. MOORE
TODD A. MORI
DOUGLAS J. MORRISON
DOUGLAS L. MORTON
JOHN F. MULHOLLAND
DAVID M. MYERS
JOSEPH E. MYERS
ROBERT W. NAHABEDIAN
FREDRICK O. NASH
JOSEPH M. NATTER
MATHEW B. NEYLAND
CHRISTIAN C. NICOLAS
JONATHAN C. NIELSEN
KEVIN M. NOGLE
ERIK S. NORMAN
CHRISTOPHER B. ODOM
NICOLO O. OLCESE
PATRICK J. OROURKE
JUAN J. ORTIZ
JUSTIN J. OTTENWALTER
ALAN R. OVERMYER
JOSEPH E. OWENS
DANIEL V. PACE
ROBERT A. PARSONS
GREG A. PASQUANTONIO
JUSTIN S. PATTON
DANIEL K. PECK
CHAD A. PELTIER
IAN T. PEOPLES
ANDREW A. PFEIFFER
ANDREW R. PHILLIPS
JOSEPH J. PHILLIPS
IAN C. PITKIN
MATTHEW L. PRATT
DAVID J. PUZZO
WILLIAM C. PYANT
DAVID B. QUAYLE
JOHN D. RADNOCZI
RAMON A. RAMOS
MIKEL E. D. RESNICK
BRIAN P. REVELL
ROSS M. RIDGE
TERRY L. RIESEL, JR.
PATRICK M. RIORDAN
ANGEL J. RIOSPELATI
ERICH K. ROBERTS
JASON E. ROBERTS
ERIC N. ROLES
WIDMAR J. ROMAN
JONATHAN ROMANESKI
RITA C. ROSALESGONZALEZ
TYLER J. RUND
WILLIAM A. RUSSO
LINDSAY A. RYAN
RACHEL S. RYSAAC
PHILIP A. SANABRIA
CESARE A. SANTAROSA
HAYDEN D. SCARDINA
CHARLES L. SCHAEFER
ROBERT J. SCHAFFLING
MATTHEW B. SCHARDT
JAMES L. SELF
TIMOTHY W. SHEBESTA
JOHN T. SHELTON
JONATHAN L. SHERRILL
JASON M. SHICK
WOO C. SHIN
NATHAN E. SHOWMAN
ROBERT J. SHUMAKER
STEPHEN M. SIEGNER
BRIAN J. SILVA
JOSHUA I. SILVER
CHRISTOPHER D. C. SMITH
JUSTIN M. SMITH
MICHAEL K. SMITH
SCOTT W. SMITH
WADE H. SMITH
MATTHEW C. SMOOSE
ANTHONY J. SNIPES
DAVID M. SPANGENBERG
JOHN D. STAEHELI
MICHAEL P. STALLINGS
DANIEL R. STANLEY, JR.
NEIL B. STARK
TRAVIS J. STELLFOX
NICHOLAS J. STOUT
LYNN W. SULLIVAN
RANDALL A. SUMMERHILL
ADAM F. SUMMERS
MICHAEL P. SWANGER
MARK A. SWINEY
CHRISTOPHER S. SYLVAIN
MATTHEW M. TARAZON
ANDREW M. TEAGUE
THOMAS J. TEPLEY
CHAD E. THIBODEAU
DEMARIUS L. THOMAS
JOHN C. THOMAS
KEVIN M. THOMAS
PETER A. THOMAS
CHARLES E. THOMPSON
LEVI THOMPSON
MASON W. THORNAL
MARY E. THORNTON
JEREMY E. TILLMAN
JOHN P. TOLL
TRAVIS N. TOOLE
CESAR TORRES
GERARD L. TORRES
LEHA R. TOTTENWADE
RYAN T. TRAVIS
KYLE T. TROTTIER
ALLEN M. TRUJILLO
CHRISTOPHER A. TURNER
LANGSTON J. TURNER
BRADLEY R. VANCE
JAMES R. VANCE
PHILLIP T. VAUGHN
MICHAEL L. VENAFRO
TREVOR J. VONNAHME
JARED H. WAGNER
BRIAN C. WALKER
JOSHUA J. WALKER
LIAM P. WALSH
TIMOTHY C. WALTON
LINCOLN R. WARD
CHRISTOPHER M. WARDLAW
JAMES L. WATSON
ANTHONY M. WERTZ
PETER J. WETTERAUER
TERRON O. WHARTON
JAY S. WHITTAKER
JAMAINE J. WILLIAMS
JOSEPH W. WILLIAMS III
LINUS D. WILSON
LLOYD B. WOHLSCHLEGEL
SCOTT F. WOIDA
MATTHEW R. WOOD
SHAWN T. WOODARD
PHILLIP J. WORKS
AMOREENA L. YORK
SHAUN M. YOUNG
RONALD J. YUHASZ, JR.
PATRICK H. YUN
JOSHUA J. ZARUBA
ANDREW F. ZIKOWITZ
DANIEL T. ZIMMER
D016107
D015553
D016185
D015585
G010173
D015428
D012381
D013804
D013805
D015696
D015989
D013878
D015461
D016137
D015309
D015829
D015482
D015697
D012084

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JASON K. ABBOTT
STEPHEN R. ABRAMS
VASILIOS AGAPIOS
NEIL R. ALCARIA
PAUL W. ALDAYA
CHRISTOPHER R. ALLEN
NATASJA K. ALLEN
MATTHEW D. APOSTOL
CHRISTOPHER M. ARDOHAIN
MARK C. ASKEW
JANE W. BAER
ALEXANDER D. BAILEY
CHRISTOPHER L. BALA
TRISH A. BASILE
TIFFANY R. BATISTE
JOHN R. BELANGER
LAUREN J. BELL
MICHAEL G. BENNER
WILLIAM R. BENNETT
MICHAEL C. BLAKE
CHRISTOPHER A. BOLZ
JEFFREY M. BONHEIM
JONATHAN S. BORDERS
SAMUEL J. BOYD
AARON S. BRAGG
SEAN P. BREEN
CRAIG A. BREWER
DEVIN R. BRIGHT
TERRENCE T. BRUNO
STEPHANIE M. BULLOCK
MARREO T. BURCH
DAX E. BURROUGHS
SPENCER R. CALDER
CHRISTOPHER R. CALWAY
DANIEL P. CAPOZZA
GLEN E. CARR II
PAUL M. CARROLL
JOHNATHAN N. CARTER
RAYLEE D. CAVAZOSCAVASIER
CHANEL M. CHAMBERLIN
ALICIA R. CHAPMAN
CHAD J. CHAPMAN
CHRISTOPHER J. CHRISTIANA
WOOWON CHUNG
GARRETT A. CLOSE
SEAN R. COCHRAN
LOUIS D. COGSWELL
RYAN E. COLLINS
RYAN D. CONLEY
MICHAEL P. COOKE
STEPHEN T. COPPEDGE
DAVID L. CORNELIUS
BRENT P. COURTNEY
JEREMY P. CURRIN
WAYNE J. DAHL, JR.
AARON J. DANIELE
EVAN R. DAVIES
MATTHEW D. DAVIS
SCOTT M. DAVIS
WILLIAM J. DENN
BRIAN A. DEVLIN
SHERINA D. DIAMOND
JOHN R. DOLLARD
CHRISTOPHER A. DRERUP
JERRY V. DREW
BRIAN J. DROHAN
DUSTIN W. DURST
JUSTIN J. DWYER
ADAM R. EATON
NOAH M. EBAUGH
MARQUAY EDMONDSON
ANDREW M. ELJDID
ASHLEY R. ELLIS
INGA A. EMERY
VITO J. ERRICO
SAMUEL O. FADARE
AARON J. FERGUSON
SLOAN C. FISK
MARGARET J. FITZPATRICK
THOMAS C. FLOUNDERS
MATTHEW J. FONTAINE
JOHN T. FOSTER
STEVEN L. FOSTER
JEREMY J. FOX
KEVIN J. FROMM
ANDREW E. FULTON
BRANDON M. FULTON
GREGORY S. GALSTAD
ARTURO M. GARCIA, JR.
ANDREW D. GARDNER
JOHN A. GAYDA
VITALY D. GELFGAT
DANIEL J. GERSHEY
WALTER A. GIBBONS
ABRAHAM P. GOEPFERT
BENJAMIN W. GONG
EDUARDO A. GONZALEZ
RICHARD A. GONZALEZ
EDDIE M. GORBETT
VINCENT C. GOTHARD
VIVIANA GOTTSCHALL
JUSTIN S. GRATZEL
EDWARD W. GREEN, JR.
KYLE A. GREENBERG
KEVIN J. GRILO
BRENDAN W. GRISWOLD
MATTHEW P. GROSS
ALLAN C. GRYSKEWICZ
TODD R. HABITZREUTHER
DAVID P. HALPERN
STEPHEN B. HARKER
MARK R. HASEMAN
WILLIAM J. HENNESSY
THOMAS M. HICKEY
MATTHEW S. HICKS
ANDREW J. HIGHTOWER
JASON C. HILLMAN
ANTHONY T. HOEFLER
MAURIO S. HOLSTON
NICHOLAS M. HOLTZ
CLARISA A. HORTON
PAUL C. HORTON
PAUL E. HOUK
DANIEL R. HUDALLA
BLAKE K. HUFF
JASON P. HUSSEY
SCOTT A. HUTCHISON
NICHOLAS D. JEFFERSON
NATHAN A. JENNINGS
SPENGER JEUNE
MATTHEW J. JOHNSON
TIMOTHY M. JONES
STEPHEN J. JOOSTEN
BARCLAY D. KEAY
EVAN B. KELLY
ANDREW R. KEMP
BENJAMIN J. KIM
JACOB J. KIM

DANIEL J. KOEPKE
NICHOLAS J. KRANITES
MICHAEL W. KUMMERER
TIMOTHY W. LAMBERT
JAMES M. LAMBRIGHT
JOHN E. LANDRY
BRIAN S. LANEY
TIMOTHY H. LAWRENCE
COLIN L. LAYNE
TODD R. LETELLIER
DONALD W. LINCOLN
NICHOLAS R. LINSE
JAMIE C. LONG
ADAM S. LOUTZENHISER
WILLIAM C. LUKA, JR.
IZABELLA LUNDY
KYLE R. LUOMA
PAUL A. LUSHENKO
SANTINO A. MAFFEI
OMOLOLU O. MAKINDE
MATTHEW W. MANESS
RYAN J. MANN
WILLIAM N. MARMION
CATHERINE M. MARTINEZ
DEAN A. MATHIS
HEATHER L. MCCLELLAN
RICHARD J. MCCUAN
JOSHUA L. MCDONALD
JAMES M. MCKAY
JOSHUA S. MEADOR
PAUL J. MILAS
NICOLE R. MINER
TABBER N. MINTZ
MALIKAH S. MORGAN
MARCUS A. MORGAN
JOHN R. MORRIS
PETER C. MUELLER
JOSHUA P. MULFORD
MICHAEL S. NAFF
RYAN M. NEELY
RUSSELL J. NELSON
UCHENNA K. NJOKU
PRISCELLA A. NOHLE
CHRISTIAN S. W. NOUMBA
JOSHUA N. NUNNALLY
RAYMOND W. ODONNELL
COURTNEY R. OLSON
KYLE D. PACKARD
MICHAEL J. PADDEN
NATHAN L. PARKER
RALPH S. PARLIN
WILLIAM B. PARSONS, JR.
JOSHUA J. PASSER
EDWARD D. PATTERSON
STEVEN P. PATTERSON
JOSEPH W. PAYTON
JOSEPH D. PERRY
ROBERT D. PHILLIPS
SPENCER W. PHILLIPS
TIFFANY L. PHILLIPS
MATTHEW J. PICKLE
THOMAS C. PLANT
MARTHA A. PLUMLEY
WALTER E. PRATT
AARON M. PROBST
ALAN E. PUENTE
RUBEN RAMOS
CHRISTOPHER J. RANKIN
RANDY D. READY
AARON J. RETTKE
BRANDON W. RICHARDS
JAY R. RICHARDSON
PAUL F. RICKMEYER
DANIEL W. RIESENBERGER
ROBERT D. RIGGS
BETH A. RIORDAN
AARON S. RITZEMA
JOHN R. ROBINSON
DAVID G. RODRIGUEZ
D S. ROGERS
DAVID ROKHLIN
PATRICK R. ROOD
CHRISTOPHER W. ROPER
MARTIN R. ROSARIO
MICHAEL E. ROSCOE
JAMES F. ROSEBERY
KRISJAND A. ROTHWEILER
CHARLES P. ROWAN
COREY H. RUCKDESCHEL
JOSEPH D. RUHL
BENJAMIN J. RYDER
SIMON D. SANCHEZ
ANDREW R. SANDSTRUM
CESAR H. SANTIAGOSANTINI
CLIFFORD K. SCHAEFER
MARK S. SCHMIDT
ERIC J. SCHMITZ
RAYMOND C. SCHULTZ
JOSHUA D. SCHULZ
RYAN M. SEE
BENJAMIN J. SEIBERT
MICHAEL D. SEMINELLI
NICHOLAS R. SHAW
VICTOR M. SHEPHERD
JOHN J. SHERIDAN
CHRISTOPHER E. SHERWOOD
WILLIAM J. SHIELDS
HEIDI B. SHIRLEY
ERIC J. SIDIO
JASON T. SILER
CHRISTOPHER W. SIMS
JESSE L. SKATES
AARON K. SMITH
BENJIMAN A. SMITH
PHILIP J. SMITH
ROBERT E. SNOW
CAMERO K. W. SONG
TIMOTHY P. SORENSEN
STEVEN K. SOUZA
STEVEN S. SPEECE
WILLIE C. SPENCER II
CHRISTOPHER M. STACY
AUSTIN T. STARKEN
CRAIG D. STARN
TIMOTHY K. STATON
PATRICK R. STAUFFER
THEODORE W. STEPHENS
JONATHAN D. STJOHN
ERIC R. STOLLE
BRADLEY STUBBLEFIELD
DANIEL S. SUMMERS
ERIC A. SWETT
DERRICK N. SYED
CALVIN W. TAETZSCH
ADAM L. TALIAFERRO
JONATHAN C. TAYLOR
WILBERT E. THIBODEAUX III
LYNDSEY L. THOMPSON
ARTURO A. TIBAYAN
AUDREY T. TIUMALU
DARIA A. TOLER
KENNETH E. TORRES
NANCY I. TUCKER
JASON A. TURNER
NICHOLAS R. TURNER
LORIN D. VEIGAS
DAVID W. VENEY
PATRICK S. WACHUTKA
CHRISTOPHER S. WADSWORTH
JULIE A. WAGNER
JOSEPH W. WALKER
JASON R. WARD
JASON C. WATSON
ANNAH M. WEAVER
BRITTANY L. WEIGHTMAN
BRYANT A. WELLMAN
ASHLEY E. WELTE
MATTHEW C. WESMILLER
EVAN M. WESTGATE
SARAH M. WHITTEN
ROBERT H. WIDMYER
MATTHEW P. WILKINSON
ANTHONY WILLIAMS
REBECCA B. WILLIAMS
SONG H. YI
BASIM M. YOUNIS
CHAD M. ZINNECKER
G010318
D015996
G010464
D016182
D016159
G010257
D016124
G010228
D015435
G010485
D015441
D015609
G010725
G010369
G010127
G010446
G010335
G010641
D015469
D015268

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ISAIAH C. ABBOTT
ROBYN L. ACKERMAN
FRANK L. ADAMS
HENRY J. AGUIGUI
KWAME O. AGYEMANG
JOHN H. ALBRIGHT
JAMES I. ALFARO
MARRIO A. ALMADA
GREGORY B. ANDREWS
BENJAMIN K. ANDRUS
AUBREY R. ASHFORD
LEONARD J. BAKLARZ
ANDREW J. BAME
AUSTIN J. BANFORD
APRIL L. BAPTISTEROBERTSON
VEDNER BELLOT
DANIEL J. BELZER
JEFFREY C. BESS
ROLAND L. BETHEA
ANDREW D. BIONDI
BRYAN K. BLOCKLINGER, JR.
ZACHARY R. BOCK
SHARI S. BOWEN
DAVID J. BOWERS
PATRICE L. BOYLAND
ORNA T. BRADLEYSWANSON
KEYANTE M. BRADSHAW
BART B. BRIMHALL
JAMES D. BROOKS
KEIRN C. BROWN
MINDY A. BROWN
NADIYA BRYANT
RANDALLE M. CARTER
TIMOTHY J. CASHEN
DAVID E. CERRATO
JILLIAN C. CHANG
JIMMY Y. CHANG
NICHOLAS J. CHERRY
YONG C. CHOE
MICHAEL H. CHON
NATHANIEL S. CINCALA
TRAVIS T. COATES
ANDREW W. COLSIA
NANCY A. COLSIA
CHRISTOPHER D. COOK
JAMES R. COOK IV
TWYGENA M. COTTON
STEPHANIE B. CRAWFORD
CAROLINA CRUZ
STEVEN R. CUSACK
JORGE DELTORO
MATTHEW J. DERFLER
JOHN A. DICKSON
MICAH J. DIGREZIO
DAMIAN L. DIXON
SEAN W. DONAHOE
KRISTIN M. DONETH
YAKENA M. DOUGLAS
TARON S. DUKES
DUSTIN C. DUMBRAVO
JOHN D. DUNLAPP
BRETT T. DUNNING
KENNETH P. ELGORT
JARED S. ELLISS
ROBIN A. ESKELSON
KYLE D. FAILS
PEDRO E. FERNANDEZ
JAMES F. FINK
PAUL R. FLANIGEN
NICHOLAS R. FORLENZA
JEFFREY D. FOSTER
RORY C. A. FOSTER
CYNTHIA A. GARCEAU
JONATHAN G. GARDNER
CHRISTOPHER B. GARRETT
DAVID C. GARRISON
MATTHEW J. GARVIN
NICHOLAS R. GAUVIN
TIMOTHY P. GIBBONS
RYAN P. GILLES
CHRISTINA N. GILLETTE
HALDANE C. GILLETTE
JEREMY J. GLENZ
MICHAEL A. GOLD
MARSHALL L. GRAY
CALEB S. GREEN
NATHAN L. GREER
MEILING T. GUARINO
DANIEL P. GUSTKE
LARRY M. GWINN
ERIC J. HALLGREN
SHAUNA N. HANN
MICHAEL R. HANNAH
ERIK M. HANSEN
MICHAEL S. HARRELL
JAMES E. HARRIS IV
JEFFREY M. HART
DIRK C. HASBACH
JASON A. HAYNES
KEITH R. HEINDL
JOSEPH D. HENDERSON
RONALD A. HENDERSON
JAMES B. HICKEY
EARL D. HILDEBRAND
MATTHEW E. HILL
CRYSTAL E. HINES
PATRICK T. HORVAT
ERIN J. HUMELSINE
JERRICK J. HUNTER
WALTER L. IVORY, JR.
RODNEY D. JACKSON
RONALD D. JACKSON
LENDRICK Y. JAMES
JOSEPH H. JOHNSON III
CHRISTOPHER B. JONES
CRYSTAL R. JONES
JACOB V. JONES
HASSAN M. KAMARA
ANDREA B. D. KAPAN
JASON T. KAPPES
ADAM D. KATZ
MICHAEL Z. KEATHLEY
MICHAEL B. KEE
ZACHARY J. KEEFER
CAMERON M. KEOGH
JOHN F. KIEFER
BRIAN R. KNUTSON
WILLIAM B. KOBBE
JODI D. KRIPPEL
LAMOND I. LACEY
GAVIN R. LASKOWSKI
ROYDREGO V. LAVANT
JOSEPH J. LEE
DAVID B. LEVERETT
ZACHARY M. LEWIS
WALTER D. LILLEGARD
WILLIAM D. LINCOLN
JASMIN A. LIRIO
YITEH LIU
BENJAMIN J. LUKAS
ALLEN J. LUNA
LIONEL MACKLIN, JR.
BRIANNA M. MAIER
STEPHEN M. MALLORY
CAMERON D. MAPLES
LENFORD D. MARTIN
MICHAEL J. MARTIN
RYAN P. MARTIN
RICHARD MARTINEZ
CARLOS J. MARTINEZNIEVES
ANTON H. MASSMANN
ROGELIO A. MATA
BRADLEY A. MATTISON
FREDERIK MAUL
MATTHEW G. MAXWELL
JEREMY J. MCCRILLIS
LATECIA S. MCGRADY
ALFREDO P. MIRANDA

IZAR MOORE
CARLOS G. MORALES
NICHOLAS L. MORGAN
ALLISON N. MORSE
PETER O. MOUSSEAU
RACHEL A. MULLHOLLAND
SHAWN C. NAIGLE
BENJAMIN T. NAKAMURA
JOSEPH W. NALLI
CHRISTOPHER M. NASH
SETH B. NASON
BRANDON E. NIXON
JONATHAN D. OBLON
JACOB P. OLSZEWSKI
TIMOTHY J. OWENS
KIMBERLY E. PAGE
JOEL PARKER
TRAVIS G. PECK
CHRISTOPHER D. PENDLETON
CHARLES L. PHILLIPS
TRAVIS A. PHIPPS
CLINTON E. PIERCE
NATHAN D. PLATZ
JOHN A. PLITSCH
JUSTIN D. PRIESTMAN
ROBERT J. PRIGMORE
JERMAINE C. PRUITT
IRMA M. QUINN
CHAD E. RABURN
JACQUELINE S. RALSTON
LUCAS J. RAND
RUBEN A. RANGEL
PATRICK R. RICE
STEVEN C. ROBINETTE
EDWARD D. ROBINSON
RICHARD F. ROGERS
CASEY A. RUMFELT
JASON A. RUSSELL
DARSHAREE J. SAIK
MARIA E. SANCHEZ
MATTHEW B. SCHADE
HEATHER L. SCHMITT
ELIZABETH A. SCHWEMMER
ANDREW M. SCRUGGS
JOSIE E. SHAHEEN
JEFFREY D. SHAMSI
LESLIE A. SHIPP
ERIC P. SHOCKLEY
JAMES E. SHORT
DIECILLA T. SLEDGE
KEVIN R. SMITH
STEVEN T. SMITH
EMILY H. SPENCER
JASON E. STAIB
GWENDOLYN E. STAUFFER
MIGDALIA SUMMERVILLE
JASON A. SUPNET
ALLEN J. TAYLOR, JR.
KASANDRA B. THARP
COLE M. THERKILDSEN
WALDRELL J. THOMAS, JR.
JOSHUA E. THOMPSON
JEFFREY L. TIMMONS
MATTHEW A. TURCOTTE
RODRICO P. VARGAS
NICHOLAS D. VIAR
PETER J. VILLALUZ
JUAN M. VIRUETCOLLAZO
JENNIFER L. VOGEL
HAROLD K. WATSON
MATTHEW M. WEBB
IAN A. WELCH
RYAN P. WELCH
GARY L. WHEELER
BARRY J. WHITE
STUART P. WILLIAMS
MATTHEW R. WIMMER
SHADRIKA Y. WITHERSPOON
JEDIDIAH M. ZAFFKE
VANCE E. ZEMKE
D015517
D016196
D014993
D016229
D015485
D012944
D015178

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRYAN B. AULT
BRIAN M. BAPTIST
SCOTT A. BEAL
JASON K. BURFORD
MARC D. CLEVELAND
SARAH E. CRANE
MATTHEW C. DIVICO
FELIX FIGUEROA
DAVID L. HAMLIN
SHAMEKA T. HYDER
KIRKLIN J. KUDRNA
JASON R. LATHEY
BRIAN G. LEBIEDNIK
PAUL H. LEE
LEE C. LORENZ
DONALD S. MINCHEW
CHRISTOPHER A. MYER
RYAN M. NELSON
ROMAN S. OLESNYCKYJ
RICHARD P. PURCELL
JASON H. SEALES
KERRIE M. SECOND
VALARIE A. SOLIS
ROCK A. STEVENS
TIMOTHY A. STEWART
RICHMOND P. THORNTON
DANIEL S. WILCOX
TIMOTHY J. WILLIAMS
ROBERT F. WILLIAMSON
TIMOTHY D. ZALESKY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DANIEL C. ALDER
TYLER K. ANDERSEN
JAMES E. ARMSTRONG III
DANIEL S. ARTINO
MARC J. AUSTIN
ANDREW J. BAKER
JAMES A. BARBER
JAMES A. BARLOW
STEVEN S. BARTLEY
SHAWN M. BAULT
JAMES A. BEAULIEU
JONATHAN S. BENDER
KEITH W. BENEDICT
TOBIAS A. BENNETT
MICHAEL R. BERRIMAN
BRIAN E. BETTIS
KEVIN T. BLACK
LANE A. BOMAR
JASON L. BUURSMA
RYAN C. CAGLE
ELIZABETHANNE M. CAIN
PEDRO A. CAMACHO III
BRIAN C. CAMPBELL
DON L. CANTERNA, JR.
ARGOT CARBERRY
JOHANNES E. CASTRO
LARRY D. CASWELL, JR.
THOMAS D. CHAPEAU
DAVID M. CONNER
CHRISTOPHER J. G. COOK
JOHN W. COPELAND
CHAD P. CORRIGAN
AARON L. COX
CLAYTON D. CURTIS
DOUGLAS J. CURTIS
TODD M. DANIELS
CHRISTOPHER M. DEMPSEY
CHRISTIAN N. DIETZ
MICHAEL J. ENGLIS
CHARLES E. ERGENBRIGHT
FRANK J. FAIR
MICHAEL S. FARMER
MICHAEL C. FIRMIN
MICHAEL C. FLYNN
BRYAN W. FRIZZELLE
BRENDAN R. GALLAGHER
ANDREW A. GALLO
JOSHUA M. GASPARD
MICHAEL E. GATES
JONATHON M. GENGE
BRIAN D. GILBERT
ANTHONY W. GORE
MORGAN D. GREENE
TIMOTHY J. HANLEY
JODY D. HANSEN
JUSTIN D. HARPER
DAVID F. HENNING, JR.
JAMES H. HITE IV
SCOTT W. HORRIGAN
JAMES C. HOWELL
JUSTIN D. HUFNAGEL
MARCUS S. HUNTER
GALEN L. HUSS
WHITNEY O. JENSEN
JAMON K. JUNIUS
KIRK J. JUNKER
STEVEN L. KANE
LOUIS M. KANGAS
AARON J. KAUFMAN
ALLEN L. KEHOE
ANTHONY A. KELLER
EDWARD E. KENNEDY
THOMAS J. KILBRIDE
RUSTIE W. KIM
CHARLES M. KNOLL
FRANK K. KRAMMER, JR.
PAUL I. LASHLEY
JAMIE R. LAVALLEY
HARRIS T. LAWRENCE III
CEDRIC G. LEE
ANDREW J. LENNOX
NATHAN L. LEWIS
STEWART C. LINDSAY
JEREMY F. LINNEY
CLIFTON J. LOPEZ III
COLIN P. MAHLE
LISA R. MANN
NED B. MARSH
MARK R. MCCLELLAN
RODNEY D. MCCUTCHEON
GREGORY W. MCLEAN
JOHN H. MCNAMARA
TIMOTHY P. MEADORS
JOEL MILLAN
JOHN P. MILLER III
JAMES M. MODLIN, JR.
BENJAMIN L. MORALES
PAUL W. MORESHEAD
BRAD A. MORGAN
JAYSON B. MORGAN
SEAN M. MORROW
DUANE L. MOSIER
BRIAN G. MULHERN
PHILIP J. MUNDWEIL
MATTHEW R. MYER
ROBERT J. NEWBAUER
GERALD A. NUNZIATO, JR.
KITEFRE K. OBOHO
ERIK C. OKSENVAAG
JAMES T. PALMER
BRANDON W. PARRISH
ALEXIS PEREZCRUZ
JEFFREY W. PICKLER
NICHOLAS J. PLOETZ
THOMAS T. PUTNAM
CHRISTOPHER J. RICCI
KENNETH P. ROCKWELL
MICHAEL R. RODICK
JOSEPH W. RUZICKA
KATHRYN P. SANBORN
MARC J. SANBORN
KEITH P. SANDOVAL
JOHANNIE SANMIGUEL
CHARCILLEA A. SCHAEFER
MATTHEW J. SCHER
JAMES H. SCULLION
JAMES D. SHEFFIELD
WILLIAM H. SHOEMATE II
KEVIN W. SIEBOLD
RONALD C. SMITH
STEPHEN T. SMITH
RICHARD D. STEARNS
DAVID J. STEWART
KEVIN P. STONEROOK
JAMES C. STULTZ
EDWARD T. SULLIVAN
RYAN P. SULLIVAN
STEPHEN P. THIBODEAU
MASON D. THOMPSON
LAZANDER C. TOMLINSON
PATRICK R. TOOHEY
BRENDAN P. TOOLAN
GREGORY E. TURNER
ROBERT E. UNDERWOOD III
DAVID A. UTHLAUT
CHRISTOPHER J. VITALE
TREVOR S. VOELKEL
RUSSELL O. WAGNER
STEPHEN C. WALKER
LEE S. WALLACE
JASON R. WAYNE
REGINALD D. WHITE
JAMES M. WIESE
REGINALD E. WILLIAMS, JR.
BARRY WINNEGAN
PAUL W. WITKOWSKI
MATTHEW S. WOLFE
RYAN K. WORKMAN
TIMOTHY F. WRIGHT
ALEXANDER L. YOUNG
D011241
D004327
D016136
D003125
D012873
D010456
D016171
D011535
D016000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ERIC R. ADAMS
BENJAMIN K. AFEKU
THOMAS A. BABBITT
DANIEL B. BATEMAN
TODD A. BOOK
THOMAS J. BOUCHILLON
ANDREW S. BROKHOFF
ERICKA M. BROOKS
RETT B. BURROUGHS
ROGER M. CABINESS II
JAMES D. CAHILL
VERONICA A. CARROLL
LATRICE K. CLARK
NICHOLAS J. CLARK
KRISTINA J. CORNWELL
CASEY D. COYLE
ANDREW D. CROY
EDWARD D. CUEVAS
PATRICK J. CULPEPPER
KEVIN F. CUMMISKEY
JASON N. DAUGHERTY
ARNEL P. DAVID
HEIDI B. DEMAREST
MICHAEL B. DORSCHNER
BRIAN P. DUNN
JOHN N. DVORAK
KENNETH C. EVANS
LEE A. EVANS
JASON C. FARMER
WILLIAM A. FERRARO
JOHN D. FINCH
HEATHER M. FISK
NORA L. FLOTT
CHRISTOPHER P. FOLK
ANDREW J. FORNEY
SAMUEL T. FULLER
RONNIE E. GERONIMO
TIMOTHY M. GIBBONS
JOSEPH I. GILBERT
JARROD J. H. GILLAM
ROBERT B. GILLESPIE
GARY J. GOLUBSKI
MATTHEW W. GRAHAM
ERIC H. HAAS
ALAN M. HAMMONS
AUDRICIA M. HARRIS
JEREMY D. HARTUNG

JARED B. HARTY
RACHELLE T. HATHAWAY
CHRISTINA HAYES
DAVID C. HAZELTON
DUSTIN G. HEUMPHREUS
NINA L. HILL
ULEKEYA S. HILL
CHRISTOPHER S. HOBGOOD
JOHN P. HORNING
YESENIA HUTCHER
BRADLEY J. ISLER
JASON E. ISON
JUNEL R. JEFFREY
BIJI T. JOHN
JOSHUA D. KASER
TILISHA C. LOCKLEY
DIANA C. LOUCKS
DAVID W. LOWE
WILLIAM M. H. MARTIN
TOM O. MATCHIN III
HEATHER N. MCATEER
KELLY M. MCCAY
SEAN M. MCCLURE
CORY T. MCKOY
SCOTT D. MCLEARN
ROBERT A. MCVEY, JR.
JASON S. MEISEL
JOHN J. MELO
JENNIFER S. MENDEL
CHRISTOPHER L. MENG
PHILIP A. MESSER
APRIL D. MILLER
LAUREN J. S. MILLER
PATRICK J. MILLER
SHYLO R. MORRISON
AIMEE J. MOWRY
RUSSELL G. NOWELS
MARGARET A. NOWICKI
RANDY T. OVERSTREET
THOMAS J. PAFF
WILLIAM W. PARSONS
DAVID A. PHEASANT
CLINDON J. PHILLIPS
CHAD M. PILLAI
DANIEL J. POOLE
PHILLIP D. PORTER
SUKHDEV S. PUREWAL
PHILLIP RADZIKOWSKI
MICHAEL P. ROGOWSKI
ANDREA M. ROSALES
ROBERT RUBIANO
CLIFTON D. SCHMITT
TINA M. SCHOENBERGER
JAMES H. SCHREINER
BENJAMIN K. SELZER
RYAN C. SHIPLEY
CRAYTON E. SIMMONS
STEPHEN T. SKELLS
HOWARD M. SMYTH
JARED W. SNAWDER
PATRICK L. SOULE
JOHN M. SOVA
KEVIN L. STEELE
CHRISTOPHER N. STELLE
MICHAEL K. STINCHFIELD
POVILAS J. STRAZDAS
OLIVER D. STREET
MARK C. STURGEON
DANIEL P. SUKMAN
JORDON E. SWAIN
BRENDAN S. TAYLOR
ISAAC L. TAYLOR
CHRISTOPHER J. THOENDEL
BRANDON S. THOMPSON
MICHAEL W. TILTON
NATALIE E. VANATTA
RANDALL S. VERDE
HANS J. WEBER
KEITH B. WEIDNER
CHRISTOPHER E. WELD
CHARLES R. ZIPPERER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MICHELLE M. AGPALZA
MATTHEW H. ALEXANDER
JONATHAN E. ALLEN
LAVERNE O. AMARA
ERIC W. ANDERSON
CORY D. ARMSTEAD
ALEXANDER C. BABINGTON
BRANDON J. BAER
KATRESHA M. BAILEY
JONATHAN A. BODENHAMER
JASON D. BOHANNON
JAMES R. BURKES
INDERA Z. L. CHANDLER
JASON A. COLE
MATTHEW D. COX
JAMES L. CROCKER
CRAIG A. DANIEL
JUSTIN L. DEARMOND
JANA K. FAJARDO
PATRICK D. FARRELL
BRENNAN C. FITZGERALD
RICHARD D. FRANK
GRETCHEN J. GARDNER
JOEL P. GLEASON
JEREMY C. GOTTSHALL
JOHN E. GRAY, JR.
DAVID G. GUIDA
THOMAS J. HEILMAN
TIMOTHY R. HICKMAN
RACHAEL M. HOAGLAND
LAURA G. HUTCHINSON
MICHAEL F. IANNUCCILLI
PATRICE N. JOHNSON
SCOTT R. JOHNSON
CHRISTOPHER S. JONES
JEET H. KAJI
PATRICK L. KNIGHT
EVERETT LACROIX
JAMES A. LINDH II
JOHN F. LOPES
GAVIN O. LUHER
RANDALL A. LUMMER
REBEKAH S. LUST
THOMAS R. LUTZ
ANDREW J. LYNCH
ALINA C. MARTINEZ
KENNETH W. MCGRAW
JOSEPH V. MESSINA
THOMAS R. MONAGHAN, JR.
CHARLES L. MONTGOMERY
CHRISTOPHER L. MOORE
SAMUEL W. MORGAN III
DONYEILL A. MOZER
RYAN C. NESRSTA
MATTHEW P. NISCHWITZ
RYAN E. OCAMPO
JEREMIAH S. OCONNOR
DEANNE M. OJEDA
WILLIAM J. PARKER III
FRANCISCO PENA
GERALDO A. PERALTA
CURTIS S. PERKINS
THEODORE J. PETERS
TERRY A. PHILLIPS
JEFFREY A. POQUETTE
MATTHEW A. PRICE
GABRIEL W. PRYOR
JENNIFER L. RADER
DOUGLAS N. RALPH
STEPHEN D. RAMELLA
DANIEL O. RAMOS
SHERDRICK S. RANKIN
WILLIAM A. REKER
TIMOTHY M. RENAHAN
ANTHONY B. ROGERS
GEORGE W. ROLLINSON
JUAN R. SANTIAGO, JR.
MICHELLE L. SCHAUMBURG
JASON W. SCHULTZ
CLARISSE T. SCOTT
JEFFREY J. SCOTT
TRAVIS L. SEPT
ALPHONSO SIMMONS, JR.
QUINTINA V. SMILEY
JEFFREY A. SMITH
LAKICIA R. STOKES
JEFFREY R. STRAUSS
RICHARD M. STRONG
COURTNEY M. SUGAI
LYDIA Y. THORNTON
LOREN D. TODD
KEITH D. TOLER
PAUL A. TOMCIK
ISAAC M. TORRES
ANDRE L. TOUSSAINT
LEILANI M. TYDINGCOAMARANTE
BRADLEY S. WAITE
MOLLY J. WEAVER
APRIL J. WHARTON
GARY D. WHITTACRE
COREY D. WOODS
SCOTT F. WYATT
CURTIS L. YANKIE
CHRISTINE R. YOUNGQUIST
BROCK A. ZIMMERMAN
D010656
D014957
D015670

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

THOMAS K. BRENTON
JARED L. BUCHANAN
RICHARD M. CRUZ, JR.
LESLIE D. GORMAN
PATRICK J. MALONE
NADINE K. NALLY
STEPHEN A. ROBERTS
WILLIE RODNEY
DEREK I. SCHMECK
MATTHEW D. SHAW
CHRISTOPHER M. STAUDER
DENNIS J. WEAVER
D016054
D010918

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 7064:

To be major

AARON T. MURRAY
TIFFANY H. Y. PIKELEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER L. HANSEN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DANIEL W. LAUX

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

BENJAMIN R. VENTRESCA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PATRICIA H. AJOY
JENNIFER N. BARNES
DANIEL G. BETANCOURT
ANGELA M. EDWARDS
NEAL T. GARBETT
JOSE R. GOMEZ
WADE C. THAMES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ROBIN C. CHERRETT
KIMBERLY M. FREITAS
MATHIAS K. ROTH
MIKE E. SVATEK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JOSEPH B. HARRISON II
JASON B. HOMER
KENNETH W. KEMMERLY, JR.
MICHAEL J. MCCAFFREY
JOSIE L. MOORE
TORIANO A. MURPHY
BRIAN L. SCHULZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

TAYLOR R. FORESTER
JAIME L. HILL
PATRICK E. LANCASTER
JAMES A. PAPPAS
VICTOR T. TAYLOR, JR.
YOLANDA M. TRIPP
DAVID C. WEST
DANIELLE S. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DAVID B. DAMATO
DONALD C. FERGUSSON
ANDREW E. MAROCCO
EDWARD A. MCLELLAN III
ROMAN C. MILLS
DANIEL R. RAHN
NOEL A. SAWATZKY
ANDREW M. SCHIMENTI
ANDREW T. STEELE
ANTHONY J. TORIELLO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ROY L. HENKLE
ERIC T. RUIZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

STEVEN J. DWYER
RANDY R. REID

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

THOMAS P. ABBOTT
HOLMAN R. AGARD
WILLIAM J. ALLEN
JASON D. ANDERSON
ZOE B. ARANTZ
DAVID W. AYOTTE, JR.
ALEXANDER T. BAERG
PATRICK T. BAKER
JOHN P. BARRIENTOS
JOHN B. BENFIELD
DANIEL S. BENSE
JEFFREY D. BETZ
DAVID K. BLAUSER
WILLIAM C. BLODGETT, JR.
DREW A. BOROVIES
CHRISTOPHER R. BRENNER
DANIEL W. BROWN

WESLEY A. BROWN
JASON C. BUDDE
THOMAS H. BUNKER
DAVID L. BURKETT
LENNARD D. CANNON
JOSEPH J. CAPALBO
RYAN R. CARSTENS
BENNETT M. CHRISTMAN
JOHN C. COLEMAN
DAVID S. COLES
BRADLEY D. COLETTI
KENNETH R. COLMAN
THOMAS J. COOPER
CLINTON A. CORNELL
COLIN CORRIDAN
KEVIN D. CULVER
BRIAN A. CUMMINGS
KIM M. DACOSTAAZAR
JASON A. DALBY
DAVID J. DARTEZ
JAMES A. DAVENPORT
LUKE H. DAVIS
THOMAS R. DAVIS
KEVIN T. DEAN
JASON W. DEBLOCK
MARY K. DEVINE
GREGORY P. DEWINDT
MICHAEL R. DOLBEC
WILLIAM M. DULL
ARIC H. EDMONDSON
THEODORE J. ELKINS
RUSSELL H. EVERITT
CHARLES D. FAIRBANK
JEFFREY A. FARMER
DAVID W. FASSEL
MARTIN N. FENTRESS, JR.
ROGER C. FERGUSON
MICHAEL D. FISHER
CHRISTOPHER J. FORCH
MATTHEW W. FOSTER
EDWARD R. FULTZ
ROBERT J. GARIS
ANDREW C. GASTRELL
LEONARDO GIOVANNELLI
RAY A. GLENN
VICTOR J. GLOVER
BRUCE W. GOLDEN
DAVID W. GROGAN
JONATHAN J. HAASE
ETHAN D. HAINES
DAVID M. HALPERN
JOHN M. HALTTUNEN
JOHN W. HAMILTON
NICHOLAS S. HAMPTON
PETER J. HATCHER
MICHAEL J. HAYMON, JR.
ALBERT B. HEAD III
CHRISTOPHER A. HEDRICK
CHAD J. HEIRIGS
MICHAEL C. HELTZEL
STEPHEN J. HENZ
WADE B. HILDERBRAND
KENNETH B. HOCKYCKO
RODERICK L. HODGES
JAMES H. HOEY
NATHAN HORNBACK
GEORGE A. HOWELL
ERIC A. HUNTER
JUSTIN T. ISSLER
RODOLFO JACOBO
ANTHONY C. JAMES
QUINTIN L. JAMES
BRENT H. JAQUITH
HEATH E. JOHNMEYER
KELLEY T. JONES
STERLING S. JORDAN
DANIEL E. KITTS
ANDREW J. KLUG
ARAS M. KNASAS
ANDREW B. KOY
JUSTON R. KUCH
KRISTOPHER A. LANCASTER
BRIAN M. LAUBER
JOSEPH G. LAUTENSLAGER
MARK W. LAWRENCE
RYAN B. LEARY
LEONARD M. LEOS
KYLE P. LESLIE
JASON N. LESTER
CHAVIUS G. LEWIS
MATTHEW H. LEWIS
FRANK M. LOFORTI
DUSTIN T. LONERO
DEREK W. LOTHRINGER
DAMON B. LOVELESS
JOHN S. LUCAS
MATTHEW P. LUFF
ERIK T. LUNDBERG
NATHAN D. LUTHER
JIWAN A. MACK
CASEY M. MAHON
JUDSON D. MALLORY
ALEXANDER S. MAMIKONIAN
KEITH E. MARINICS
ROBIN N. MARLING
MATTHEW G. MAXWELL
KEVIN L. MCCARTY
PATRICK M. MCKENNA
MICHAEL V. MCLAINE
KEVIN R. MCNATT
ERIC W. MCQUEEN
JEREMY A. MILLER
LESLIE A. MINTZ
LENARD C. MITCHELL
MATTHEW MOLMER
KURT J. MUHLER
RILEY W. MURDOCK
MICAH D. MURPHY
LAWRENCE D. NANCE
DAVID F. NASH
GREGORY S. NERY
THOMAS J. NIEBEL
MATTHEW J. NIESWAND
SHAWN P. OCONNOR
MATTHEW C. OLSON
MICHAEL T. OREILLY
TIMOTHY L. OSBORNE
GEOFFREY B. PAGANO
MICHAEL A. PAISANT
WALTER E. PARKER III
SHANNON L. PATTERSON
DAVID L. PAYNE, JR.
CHRISTOPHER P. PENN
MATTHEW N. PERSIANI
TODD A. PIKE
BENJAMIN C. POLLOCK
DOUGLAS PRATT
COLIN A. PRICE
TREVOR J. PROUTY
JONATHAN P. PUGLIA
JOHN L. RANDAZZO
MORGAN D. ROBERTS
RYAN K. ROGERS
ROBERT W. ROSE
NATHAN L. ROWAN
ANDREW T. ROY
FRANK J. RYAN III
RICHARD D. SALAZAR
DOUGLAS R. SATTLER, JR.
WILLIAM A. SHAFER
NICHOLAS C. SMETANA
STEPHEN D. STEACY
MICHAEL A. STOKER
MICHAEL J. STRAUSS
JAMES A. STRICKLAND
PATRICK J. SULLIVAN
MARK A. SWINGER
DAVID N. TAFT
CHERIE TAYLOR
MATTHEW J. THARP
BRANDON E. TODD
CRAIG M. TRENT
ROBBY D. TROTTER
JASON L. TUMLINSON
CHAD K. UPRIGHT
STACY L. UTTECHT
WARREN VANALLEN
HENRY S. VASQUEZ III
MATHIAS J. VORACHEK
EMILY M. WALL
RUSTY J. WILLIAMSON
CHADRICK O. WITHROW
RICHARD J. WITT
MATTHEW W. WRIGHT
STACY M. WUTHIER
JOSHUA D. WYNN
STEPHEN M. YARGOSZ
STEPHEN V. YENIAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DANIELE BRAHAM
DANA J. CHAPIN
PATRICK M. COPELAND
JAMES C. DARKENWALD
THOMAS J. MCKEON II
ROBERT L. MORAN
DAVID E. PAVLIK
JAMES D. POE
RICHARD E. SCHMITT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

SHAWN G. GALLAHER
MATTHEW A. HAWKS
THOR MARTINSEN
JULIE A. SPENCER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHAEL P. AIENA
LAWRENCE BRANDON, JR.
WILLIAM B. CLEVELAND, JR.
ETHAN R. FIEDEL
JOSHUA M. FIELDS
FRANKLIN J. GASPERETTI
DAVID G. HANTHORN
BRIAN D. HEBERLEY
JUAN E. HINES
CLINTON T. LAWLER
JASON G. MASSEY
BRIAN K. MCLAIN
JOSEPH D. MEIER
JESSE H. NICE
BRIAN E. PHILLIPS
KIAH B. RAHMING
MARK A. SCHUCHMANN
LUIS F. SOCIAS
TYRONE Y. VOUGHS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JOSH A. CASSADA
DAVID R. DRAKE II
GREGORY M. HARKINS
DANIEL P. MARTIN
BISHER F. MUFTI, JR.
GLENN P. RIOUX
CECILY E. WALSH
JOHN A. WALSH
JASON D. WEAVER
JOHN L. YOUNG III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

KEVIN D. BITTLE
REECO D. CERESOLA
ERIC W. EDGE
CLAYTON B. MASSEY
MICHAEL P. MULHERN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JODIE K. CORNELL
PATRICK L. EVANS
JOSHUA A. FREY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JEFFREY N. DUGARD
MARVIN D. HARRIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

KENNETH O. ALLISON, JR.
OMAR G. MARTINEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ROY M. HOAGLAND II

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 28, 2021:

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SAMANTHA POWER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.