



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2021

No. 106

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 17, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DIANA DEGETTE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

O Lord, our God, speak into our lives as You have spoken throughout time. On the day of historic jubilee, speak good news to the poor that they would have occasion to celebrate emancipation from chains that yet bind them.

Proclaim liberty to those still held captive by injustice. Give sight to those blind to Your merciful love. Free all who are oppressed and break every yoke of prejudice and hatred.

Then call upon us to be the bearers of these truths in both word and deed. Cast our eyes on those around us that we would not see slave or free, but brothers and sisters, children of Your creation.

That each person who calls the United States home be allowed to delight in the freedoms afforded them by its democracy.

That liberty and justice would be woven inextricably into the fabric of our Nation and defended on behalf of all her people.

And that henceforward, all may be freed from hate and oppression to enjoy Your perfect design for this Republic.

We pray this, having each been made free in Your name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KELLER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CELEBRATING 100 YEARS OF HOUSTON'S MEXICAN CONSULATE

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of 100 years of the Mexican Consulate's presence in Houston. This is huge for the diplomatic relationship between two neighbors. The consulate was first established in 1920, and today it is the largest diplomatic mission in the city, providing services to tens of thousands of people a year. It is proof of the need to strengthen, now more than ever, our diplomatic ties and tackle our shared opportunities and challenges.

Congratulations, Consul General Alicia Kerber, the first woman to head the consulate's office in Houston. A good neighbor, we have worked together on food drives, COVID testing and vaccines, trade, and immigration rights.

Tomorrow, June 18, the consulate will be opening its new headquarters. Congratulations to the Mexican diplomatic mission in Houston. May we continue to work together the next 100 years.

Congratulations. Felicidades.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF BARBARA MORRIS STAFFORD

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in great sadness. Last night, at 6:16, my friend, a community leader and a member of my district staff, passed away, Barbara Morris Stafford.

Barbara was born in 1953, and was part of a political family. Her father, Howard Morris, was chairman of the Giles County Board of Supervisors. Her husband was a 10-term member of the Virginia House of Delegates, and when he died young, she took over his seat.

Now a single mother to Chris, Elizabeth, and Mary, she served her community for many years as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates; mayor of her hometown of Pearisburg, Virginia; director of the chamber of commerce; and then, for over 10 years and until last night, as a constituent services representative in my district office.

Barbara was a great leader and she will be sorely missed by the community she loved and the community that loved her.

THANKING CAPITOL POLICE

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2897

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, behind me is a sign that has decorated the office doors of my Republican colleagues for the past few months. I agree with the sentiment and I thank the Capitol Police Officers for their heroic defense on January 6, and every day that they protect the seat of this Nation's government.

My problem is that 175 of my Republican colleagues, many who still have this sign on their doors, voted against an independent bipartisan commission to investigate the causes of the January 6 insurrection.

Capitol Police Officers suffered debilitating physical and mental trauma, and two lost their lives because of the events of that day. Unless we understand how this act of terror was accomplished and hold those who are responsible accountable for their actions, it could happen again.

So why did so many Republicans vote against the commission?

Because they are afraid of what could be found. They are afraid that it could affect their future elections.

This is hypocrisy at its ugliest. While Republicans in Congress pay lip service to the Capitol Police and their heroism, they are too cowardly to back a commission that would shed light on the terrorist attack that put the brave women's and men's lives in danger on that terrible day.

VETERANS DESERVE TIMELY SERVICE

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, America's veterans have served our Nation honorably, and they deserve timely access to the benefits they have earned through their service.

The National Personnel Records Center was forced to scale down its operations due to the COVID-19 pandemic and is currently staffed at 25 percent capacity, well below the staffing level needed to process the estimated 5,000 records requests it receives on an average day. These service records are required for veterans to access medical benefits; adjudicate disability claims; and request a commendation, award, or regalia, such as a Purple Heart or campaign service medal.

To date, there is a backlog of half a million veterans' requests at the NPRC and, in some cases, veterans have waited for over a year for documentation. That is unacceptable.

That is why I introduced the Records Act, which would compel the NPRC to fully reopen, address the backlog, and develop a plan to prevent this from ever happening again.

These men and women were willing to lay down their lives in service to our Nation, and we need to continue working to ensure our veterans get the level of responsiveness from their government that they deserve.

DISCLOSE WORKPLACE HARASSMENT

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

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor an amendment to H.R. 1187, a bill that would increase transparency of publicly traded companies to disclose workplace harassment cases, and I am pleased to see this amendment passed in the House yesterday.

Workplace harassment is far too common, and the shareholders and customers of a company should know whether that company fosters a healthy work culture and that it allows its workers to thrive.

Up to six in seven women in the workplace report having experienced sexual harassment. Seven of 10 people of color report experiencing some form of verbal, racial, or ethnic harassment, and those who speak out usually face retaliation. This amendment would bring to light these forms of mistreatment and incentivize companies to prevent harassment in the workplace.

I thank Ms. FRANKEL for her leadership on H.R. 1187, and I encourage my colleagues to support this workplace improvement bill, as well as improving the quality of life.

HONORING THE VICTIMS OF THE MOTHER EMANUEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH SHOOTING

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

Ms. MACE. Madam Speaker, June 17, 2015, was one of the darkest days in Charleston, South Carolina, history. Six years ago today, nine church members were gunned down by a white supremacist at Mother Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Today I rise to honor the lives of those lost that day. South Carolina's African-American community showed enormous restraint and an outpouring of love during this time, even to the irredeemable; and today we stand together, wrapped in the pride of Charleston Strong.

So today I would like to recognize Reverend and State Senator Clementa Pinckney, Cynthia Hurd, Reverend Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Tywanza Sanders, Ethel Lance, Susie Jackson, Depayne Middleton Doctor, the Reverend Daniel Simmons, and Myra Thompson.

You will always be remembered, and may you rest in peace.

CONTINUE THE FIGHT FOR RACIAL JUSTICE

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

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise with great excitement and joy in my heart that today Juneteenth will become a national holiday.

156 years after the end of slavery in this country, we will now, on an annual basis, reflect collectively and, hopefully, begin the process of truth and collective healing as a nation.

But I ask us that we must not stop here. We must continue to go forward to fight for racial justice because in many parts of our country it still exists in the form of housing discrimination and segregation, lack of access to healthcare, and wealth inequality.

It is so humbling to stand here as a Black man in America and take another step toward feeling whole in this country. But we must—we have to come together across party lines to do much more.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FOSTER FRIESS

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege today to rise to honor the life of Foster Friess, an American patriot who was a warrior for conservative and Christian values.

Foster truly lived the American Dream. He started his own business that led to incredible success. But Foster leaves behind a legacy that is far greater than success, as his generosity impacted the lives of countless people.

His favorite Bible verse from Galatians: "Carry each other's burdens, and in this way you will fulfill the law of Christ."

To Foster and his wife, Lynnette, that verse was more than words; it was put into action daily. They were passionate about charitable giving and always looking for ways to lend their support to people in need.

He will be missed by many, and my prayers are especially with his wife, Lynnette, their 4 children and 15 grandchildren.

Foster's life glorified God, and his legacy will live on far beyond his years. We must all learn from his example.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVID SAUSSY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor former Chatham County Commissioner David Saussy of Savannah, Georgia, who passed away on May 19 at the age of 86.

Born the youngest of five children, David moved to Savannah in 1964, and lived the next 57 years in Ardsley Park.

All who knew David remember his Savannah smile and his proud expressions whenever he talked about Savannah's accomplishments. David's countless friends and family members consider him one of the most generous people they knew.

He was on the boards of the Chat-ham-Savannah Authority for the Homeless and the Coastal Center for Development Services, was a founding member of the St. David's Society of Savannah, and served two terms as a Republican County Commissioner.

I am thankful for the immense impact he had on the Savannah community, and I know his legacy will remain.

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

□ 0915

REPEALING THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 473, I call up the bill (H.R. 256) to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 256

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

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 256.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 256. Let me start off by thanking my very good friend and part-

ner, BARBARA LEE, the author of this bill. I am proud to stand with her in her unyielding quest to repeal the 2002 AUMF, and I congratulate her early on for working so hard for over 20 years to get this done.

Nineteen years ago, as a junior Member of Congress, I faced one of the most consequential decisions of my career as an elected official with the United States Congress. The drumbeats of war were reverberating throughout Capitol Hill as the Bush administration prepared to invade Iraq. After carefully considering all the evidence before us, including unanswered questions about post-Saddam Iraq, I cast my vote against authorizing military force against the Hussein regime.

But our vote this morning to repeal the 2002 AUMF is not about relitigating our past. Rather, repealing this outdated authorization is about planning strategically for our future. It is about Congress reclaiming its constitutional obligation to weigh in on matters of war and peace.

On substance, the case for repealing the 2002 AUMF is unassailable. The 2002 AUMF would have no effect on any ongoing military operations in Iraq. The United States is not relying on the 2002 AUMF as the sole authority for any military operations. It has been used as an additional legal justification for strikes by Presidents from both parties but not as the sole authority for any strikes over the last decade. The Biden administration, in an unprecedented move, has announced support for the legislation we are moving today.

Repeal is crucial because the executive branch has a history of stretching the 2002 AUMF's legal authority. It has already been used as justification for military actions against entities that had nothing to do with Saddam Hussein's Ba'athist dictatorship, simply because such entities were operating in Iraq.

Given all of the countries active near Iraq today, including Turkey and Russia, the 2002 AUMF is vulnerable to being abused.

I have heard from my friend, the ranking member, Mr. MCCAUL, as well as other Members opposed to this legislation who expressed two concerns: one on the process, about the need for further briefings and conversations, and another on substance, about Iran-backed groups in Iraq.

On procedure, we should dispel ourselves of the fiction that this is a new issue. Congress has been debating what to do in a post-Saddam Iraq for 18 years, and our status of forces agreement expired in 2011. This has been a frontline issue for nearly two decades, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee moved this bill through regular order.

Regarding the concern about Iran-backed groups, let me once again reiterate that the 2002 AUMF was about removing the Hussein regime in Iraq. It had absolutely nothing to do with Iran. A decade and a half before the 2002

AUMF was passed, Iran and Iraq were fighting each other in a vicious war that lasted almost a decade.

If the President needs to strike these groups to defend our Nation, our diplomatic personnel, or our Armed Forces, he can do so under Article II of the Constitution. If any Armed Forces personnel on the ground need to defend themselves, they have the inherent right under unit self-defense principles.

Today, Congress has a historic opportunity to repeal this outdated authorization and reassert its proper authority over the solemn matters of war and peace.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Chairman MEEKS. We work well together. When we disagree, we do it civilly, and I think that is the way this body should operate. But I do disagree on this one.

I have said many times before that war should not be on autopilot. I do think this is an outdated AUMF, and I do believe that Congress needs to reclaim its war powers under Article I of the Constitution.

I also share the desire to repeal the 2002 AUMF, as well as the 2001 AUMF, but that must be part of a serious process to provide clear, updated authorities against the terrorists who still plot to kill Americans at home and abroad. I still hope to work toward that end with my respected friend, Chairman MEEKS, but a repeal and replacement should be simultaneous.

It is confusing to me that we are jamming through a standalone repeal without basic due diligence; without consulting the State Department, the Defense Department, or the intelligence community; without consulting the Government of Iraq and our coalition partners and allies.

In the 3 months since I made that complaint at our markup, the majority still has not scheduled a single briefing. This, in my judgment, is not a serious legislative process for the most serious issues that we face, and that is war and peace.

This feels like yet another political effort to undo one of President Trump's boldest counterterrorism successes: using the 2002 AUMF to remove Qasem Soleimani from the battlefield.

Soleimani was Iran's mastermind of terror for decades. He was responsible for the death of more than 600 Americans and wounded thousands more. He orchestrated the attack on our Baghdad Embassy. He plotted to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador on American soil here in D.C. He oversaw Iran's support for Assad, who killed hundreds of thousands in Syria. In short, America and the world are much safer with Qasem Soleimani gone.

While the 2002 AUMF was largely about Saddam Hussein, it also clearly

addressed the terrorist threats in and emanating from Iraq. All prior administrations, Republican and Democrat, have used it for that purpose.

Today, the biggest threat in Iraq is not Saddam Hussein. We can all recognize that. But it is the Iran-sponsored terrorist groups attacking our diplomats, our soldiers, our embassy, and our citizens. They cannot be targeted using the 2001 AUMF because they are not associated with the forces of al-Qaida, the Taliban, or ISIS, but they can be targeted using the 2002 AUMF, as the prior administration did to take out Soleimani, consistent with longstanding practice.

Last year, the Trump administration “strongly opposed” repeal, saying it would “terminate a critical legal authority” and undermine our defense “against ongoing threats from Iran and Iranian-sponsored proxies.”

The Biden administration now claims that it does not need the 2002 AUMF for current operations because it has Article II authority to use force without congressional authorization.

Is that what we are going to do now, is yield to the President's Article II authority without any congressional authorization?

Madam Speaker, that is precisely what this repeal does. It takes our authority, our Article I authorities, away. We are repealing our Article I authority and yielding it to the President of the United States.

Telling the President to rely solely on Article II, in my judgment, is a big step backward from the war powers reform and reasserting Congress' Article I powers.

It is also inconsistent with the War Powers Resolution. That law says that the President's Article II powers are limited to responding to an attack on the territory or Armed Forces of the United States. It does not cover American civilians in a foreign country, such as our contractors, our diplomats, and our embassy, who are under attack, as I speak, in Iraq.

We should not encourage any President to go it alone without Article I congressional authorization.

Finally, today's vote is not happening in a vacuum. This rushed, standalone repeal, without any consultation with the Department of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the intelligence community, as Mr. MAST has consistently talked about, sends a dangerous message of disengagement that could destabilize Iraq, embolden Iran, which it will, and strengthen al-Qaida and ISIS in the region.

We would avoid such dangers by taking up a repeal and a replacement simultaneously. I think both sides of the aisle agree, we need to update this AUMF, and we need to reform it to the modern-day threats in the region. Saddam Hussein is no longer the threat.

Real AUMF reform requires Congress and the administration to work together. The chairman has committed to doing this, and I appreciate and

trust him. We work well together, but we have to do this, to work together with the administration to replace this aging AUMF with updated authorities needed to keep Americans safe from today's terrorist threats, an updated AUMF that reflects the modern-day threats in the region.

Again, I look forward to working together with Chairman MEEKS and our colleagues on this if we are going to be serious about war powers reform. But this bill is not it. This bill is not responsible. We are not doing this the right way. If we are going to repeal it, let's update the AUMF to modern-day needs and reform it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the sponsor of this bill.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me first thank our chairman, Mr. MEEKS, for moving this bill through committee. It wasn't an easy lift, and his leadership was extremely important in getting us to where we are today.

I also thank Leader HOYER, Speaker PELOSI, and let me take a minute to thank our staff: My chief of staff, Julie Nickson, who is here with us today; my legislative director, Gregory Adams; Congressman MEEKS' staff; and all of the staff members who have worked for 20 years to get us to this point.

I also want to thank our Democratic and Republican cosponsors and our outside broad spectrum of groups, like the Friends Committee on National Legislation, Win Without War, the American Legion, and Americans for Prosperity that have fought alongside us.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy and letters of support from many of these groups.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 256—REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002—REP. LEE, D-CA WITH 134 COSPONSORS

The Administration supports House passage of H.R. 256, to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (“2002 AUMF”). This bipartisan legislation would terminate the October 16, 2002, statutory authorization for the use of military force against Iraq.

The Administration supports the repeal of the 2002 AUMF, as the United States has no ongoing military activities that rely solely on the 2002 AUMF as a domestic legal basis, and repeal of the 2002 AUMF would likely have minimal impact on current military operations. Furthermore, the President is committed to working with the Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a narrow and specific framework appropriate to ensure that we can continue to protect Americans from terrorist threats.

In working with the Congress on repealing and replacing other existing authorizations of military force, the Administration seeks to ensure that the Congress has a clear and

thorough understanding of the effect of any such action and of the threats facing U.S. forces, personnel, and interests around the world. As the Administration works with the Congress to reform AUMFs, it will be critical to maintain the clear authority to address threats to the United States' national interests with appropriately decisive and effective military action.

[Press Release—June 14, 2021]

CVA URGES PASSAGE OF 2002 AUMF REPEAL GRASSROOTS VETERANS GROUP APPLAUDS REP. LEE, BIPARTISAN LEADERSHIP ON CRITICAL MEASURE TO RESTORE BALANCE OF POWER

ARLINGTON, VA.—Concerned Veterans for America (CVA) Executive Director Nate Anderson released the following statement urging the U.S. House to pass H.R. 256, Rep. Barbara Lee's bill to repeal the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF):

“Debating, authorizing, and exercising oversight of American military action is one of Congress's most solemn duties. Unfortunately, Congress has largely deferred to the executive branch and neglected its role in matters of war and peace over the last twenty years. Repealing the 2002 AUMF would be an important step toward Congress reasserting its constitutional role in shaping foreign policy and giving the American people a voice. We applaud Rep. Lee for her continued leadership on this issue along with the broad coalition of bipartisan representatives and organizations who have found common ground in this endeavor.”

BACKGROUND

Americans for Prosperity, a partner of CVA, issued a Key Vote Alert for this measure, signaling it will take into account lawmakers' votes in its annual legislative scorecard.

CVA recently led a coalition in sending a letter to members of Congress urging support of a bipartisan resolution introduced by Sens. Kaine and Young to repeal a pair of obsolete AUMFs. The group was joined on the letter by Defense Priorities Initiative, Freedom Works, and the R Street Institute.

CVA has been working to repeal the outdated 2001 and 2002 AUMFs for years, making it a priority for its grassroots and advocacy efforts in its annual policy agendas (2019, 2020, 2021). Notably, though less than a fifth of current members of Congress voted on the 2001 AUMF, it has been invoked to justify 41 operations in 19 countries since passage.

In 2019, the group partnered with VoteVets, a traditional rival, to urge lawmakers to reclaim their constitutional war powers duties. The New York Times wrote about the unlikely partnership. Setting the example for lawmakers and the administration, the groups found common ground on this issue and flew activists and volunteers in to DC to meet with their members of Congress to bring lasting policy change in Washington.

CVA has been staunch in its support of lawmakers who have taken a principled stand and worked to repeal these measures in the past. In 2019, CVA welcomed the addition of the bipartisan War Powers Caucus to Congress, applauding lawmakers for prioritizing the issue. CVA also launched a digital ad campaign thanking lawmakers for standing against endless war, praising lawmakers for voting to ensure proper Congressional input before any offensive military force against Iran.

FEBRUARY 17, 2021.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, As organizations from across the ideological spectrum, we are committed to addressing one of our country's most critical national security needs: ending our forever wars. We don't always agree on the reasons to do so, but we do

agree that nearly two decades of endless war has failed to make us safer and a new approach is necessary. To achieve this goal and reorient U.S. foreign policy away from the unaccountable, interventionist approach we've seen for nearly two decades, Congress must sunset the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) and repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF.

Since its enactment on September 14, 2001, the 2001 AUMF has served as a blank check for endless, global war under multiple presidents. Despite congressional intent to only give then-President George W. Bush the authority to use military force against those responsible for the 9/11 attacks and those who harbored them, the law failed to include any time limits, geographic constraints, specific objectives or an exit strategy. As a result, three successive presidents have used the law to unilaterally expand the nation's use of military force against individuals, groups, and even nation states never intended by Congress. Presidents Bush, Obama, and Trump have used the 2001 AUMF to justify U.S. military action in 19 countries at least 41 times. The expansive U.S. militarized counterterrorism footprint now extends to at least 80 countries, costing an estimated \$6.4 trillion, as well as the lives of thousands of American soldiers, and hundreds of thousands of civilians abroad.

Congress passed the 2002 Iraq AUMF to authorize force against the Saddam Hussein regime. It is not required for any ongoing military activities, as the executive branch relies on an overly broad interpretation of the 2001 AUMF for operations against ISIS, al Qaeda, and other groups. However, both the Obama and Trump administrations expanded their interpretation of the scope of the 2002 Iraq AUMF beyond congressional intent. Most recently, the Trump administration cited it as a legal basis for the targeted killing of Iranian general Qassem Soleimani, an action clearly unrelated to the original scope of the authorization. Retaining this law renders it susceptible to further abuse.

President Biden has stated a desire to end the forever wars. With this in mind, Congress should sunset the 2001 AUMF eight months after a law is enacted and immediately repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF. Rather than expediting a new AUMF, Congress must first publicly debate whether military force is both necessary and appropriate for addressing current security challenges and what, if any, new legal authority may be necessary. In the interim, Article II of the Constitution provides the president with the legal authority needed to defend our country against an actual or truly imminent armed attack.

With a new president who has signalled support for our government's institutional checks and balances and a U.S. public that supports an end to endless war, it is time for Congress seize the opportunity to reassert its constitutional authority over war powers. In fact, the U.S. Constitution places the power to declare war squarely in the hands of Congress for good reason. Our democracy relies on the foundational belief that it is the people to whom the U.S. government remains accountable, not the president. By assigning Congress the sole authority to declare war, our nation's founders sought to ensure that a decision as momentous as the one to wage war was properly debated, scrutinized, and justified. Failing to sunset the 2001 AUMF and repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF now will continue to effectively cede Congress' power over war and peace to the executive branch.

In the past five years, the House of Representatives or its committees have voted to repeal both the 2001 AUMF and the 2002 Iraq AUMF, drawing both Democratic and Republican support. With a new administration

who agrees that these authorizations are outdated, now is the time to finish the work Congress started. We urge you to join Rep. Barbara Lee's effort in turning the page on this unsuccessful chapter of U.S. foreign policy by sunseting the 2001 AUMF and repealing the 2002 Iraq AUMF.

Sincerely,

American Civil Liberties Union, Brennan Center for Justice, Bridges Faith Initiative, BringOurTroopsHome.US, Center for International Policy, Concerned Veterans for America, Council for a Livable World, Demand Progress, Defense Priorities Initiative, FreedomWorks, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Human Rights First, National Religious Campaign Against Torture, Pax Christi USA, Peace Action, Project On Government Oversight, Protect Democracy, Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft, R Street Institute, Secure Families Initiative, September 11th Families for Peaceful Tomorrows, The Center for Victims of Torture, VoteVets, Win Without War, Women's Action for New Directions.

AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY,

June 15, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES, On behalf of Americans for Prosperity's activists in all 50 states, I urge you to vote "NO" on H.R. 1187, the so-called "Corporate Governance Improvement and Investor Protection Act."

Businesses can be a force for good when they serve customers, drive life-improving innovations, and enable employees to find fulfillment in their work. But the best way to do that is through bottom-up approaches, not top-down regulation. Mobilizing the Securities and Exchange Commission to force industry from all corners of the economy to adhere to dubious, ambiguous, and one-size-fits all requirements—as this bill does—will only harm our ability to improve society and undermine America's capacity to lead in the global economy.

H.R. 1187 represents a sweeping expansion of government overreach and dramatic mission creep for the SEC, which has neither the authority, expertise, nor accountability to evaluate the materiality of these disclosures to shareholders and potential shareholders. Further, the standards these regulations set, and the effectiveness of the methods to which those standards would be met, are unclear. As an example, recent evidence has shown there is virtually no relationship between trends in energy-related carbon emissions and top-down climate policies such as the implementation of international agreements, carbon pricing, cap-and-trade, or command and control sectoral regulation. In fact, since the 2007 Massachusetts v. EPA decision, countries as well as states that have not endorsed these policies have generally reduced per capita energy-related carbon dioxide emissions at a far greater pace than those that have.

Beyond this, the very act of forcing companies to meet preset, one-size-fits-all requirements ultimately undermines the leaps in innovation we need to actually achieve our shared goals for the environment and society as a whole. Business leaders and consumers—not politicians and appointed Washington officials—are the driving force to innovate and deliver superior products and services that solve for the needs of today while also pushing our country toward a better future that benefits all.

This bill would also impose new costly burdens on companies, open the floodgates to cronyism, undermine businesses' ability to create new value, and ultimately put a drag on our recovering economy.

We look forward to working together to improve the environment and address other great challenges facing our country. The best way to do that is through bottom-up innovation, not top-down regulation such as those mandated by this bill.

I urge you to vote "NO" on H.R. 1187. This vote will be recorded in our legislative scorecard for the 117th Congress.

Sincerely,

BRENT GARDNER,
Chief Government Affairs Officer,
Americans for Prosperity.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL COMMANDER,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2021.

Hon. BARBARA LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LEE: On behalf of the nearly two million members of The American Legion, I am pleased to express support for H.R. 256, which would repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002. Congress passed the 2002 AUMF to authorize force against Saddam Hussein's Iraqi regime in order to defend the United States against the threat posed by the regime's alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction. This threat proved unfounded and the mission undertaken pursuant to the 2002 Iraq AUMF—designated "Operation Iraqi Freedom"—officially ended on December 11, 2011.

Our servicemembers have accomplished their original objectives in Iraq, a dangerous regime was removed, and the authorization for the war should end. With the understanding that complex global threats cannot be solved by military power alone, we value the importance of sustaining a civilian-led approach of elevating diplomacy and development alongside a strong defense. The American Legion stands ready to assist members of Congress with strengthening our nation's interests and ensuring that diplomacy is the first instrument of national power considered at the highest level.

In accordance with American Legion Resolution No. 22: Addressing the 'Forever War', passed unanimously by our National Executive Committee in meetings held October 14–15, 2020, which urges a renewal of a proper constitutional balance to American foreign policy decision-making by encouraging Congress to repeal and replace outdated Authorizations for Use of Military Force, we strongly support this bill.

We applaud your leadership in addressing this critical issue facing our nation's servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

For God & Country,

JAMES W. "BILL" OXFORD,
National Commander.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just take a minute to honor my dear friend, the late Congressman Walter Jones, a Republican from North Carolina who was my partner for many years to build bipartisan support to bring our troops home.

I am proud to stand with everyone as we exercise our most important duty assigned by the Constitution to decide when and how America goes to war.

We cannot revise history as it relates to why this authorization was put into place.

Eighteen years ago, in front of the infamous "Mission Accomplished" banner backdrop, former President Bush told the Nation that the major combat operations in Iraq have ended.

In 2011, President Obama brought our combat troops home, and yet this authority remains on the books, vulnerable to misuse because Congress has not acted to remove it.

The Bush administration, yes, misled the American people by saying there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, that Iraq posed an imminent threat by drawing a false connection between the tragic events of 9/11 and Saddam Hussein. Those lies and misinformation had deadly consequences. The mistakes continue to haunt us today.

Once the war started, the Out of Iraq Caucus was founded by Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey, me, and led by Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS. Over 80 Members joined. Many of us took our protests to the streets, joining hundreds of thousands protesting the unnecessary, immoral war of choice. Year after year, we worked for the safe and orderly withdrawal of our troops.

I share all this history, not because of nostalgia, but we have to remember why this authorization was passed, because 87 percent of current Members of the House were not here to vote on this AUMF in 2002. The Constitution requires that we cannot appropriate funds for armies for more than 2 years, and yet for almost two decades we have failed to revisit these AUMFs.

To this day, our endless wars continue, costing trillions of dollars and thousands of lives in a war that goes way beyond any scope that Congress conceived or intended.

I want to salute our veterans, our young men and women in uniform. They did everything we have asked them to do. Many veterans support this repeal.

The outdated 2002 AUMF bears no correlation to the threats we face today.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, the President earlier stated his support for the bill, saying that the 2002 AUMF will not impact current military operations, but repeal can prevent our country from entering another protracted engagement under this outdated authority.

We can't afford to leave this in place indefinitely. For two decades it has been in place. This is our opportunity to restore our constitutional role.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to comment that to me it is very interesting, the timing of the gentlewoman from California's repeal. It happened after President Trump had an air strike to take out Soleimani in Iraq, at exactly the same time. He had authority to do so under the 2002 AUMF and Article II under the Constitution.

What is interesting about now, the other side of the aisle was upset when

President Biden struck the Shia proxies in Syria, and that is when we saw this bill resurrect itself again in this Congress. Very interesting timing.

What I object to is that now we are abdicating our responsibility by giving the President Article II authorities alone without any authorization of use of military force from the Congress. They talk a lot about Article I on the other side, but aren't we abdicating our Article I responsibility?

I am all for updating this thing, but to completely do away with it and just give this President Article II authorities to do whatever he wants without any congressional review, in my judgment, is a wrong step forward.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I will just say really quickly: Before Soleimani, we had passed a bill on the AUMF in 2019, so it wasn't in response to President Trump. So this was attempted even before that.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), head of the United States delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and a member of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11. Members of the Bush administration seized on our fear at that time to persuade Americans that Saddam Hussein posed a grave threat to the United States, and Congress passed an Authorization for Use of Military Force without any limitation on how long it could be in effect.

Nineteen years later, and ten years after we formally ended ground operations, it is still law. This is an abrogation of Article I responsibilities and duties of the Congress of the United States.

There is no more profound power vested in us in the Constitution than to send our young men and women into combat. It is long past time that we dealt with this AUMF and righted the imbalance between the powers of Article I, which are exclusively those of Congress, and the powers of Article II for a Commander in Chief only after Congress has acted.

I am proud to support this measure today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), a member of our HFAC committee with strong foreign affairs credentials.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, on October 16, 2002, the United States Congress voted to authorize military action against Saddam Hussein's Iraq. The text of the authorization was clear. That was its purpose. Years later, Saddam Hussein is long dead, and our military action has ended.

The 2002 AUMF is separate and distinct from the 2001 AUMF, which au-

thorized our counterterrorism efforts after 9/11 and which remains in use today.

The 2002 AUMF is not in use. It is long overdue for repeal, which is why we have voted multiple times to repeal the 2002 AUMF with bipartisan support.

Since coming to Congress, I have been very clear, Congress must reassert congressional authority in decisions of war and peace. The authority is required by our Constitution, and it is fundamental to our representation of our constituents, especially our servicemembers.

Our men and women in uniform deserve to see a new era of congressional accountability, one where Members of Congress do not shirk their accountability when it comes to issues of war and peace.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS), the vice chair of the subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations, and Global Corporate Social Impact.

Ms. JACOBS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this critical legislation to repeal the 2002 Authorization For Use of Military Force.

I want to thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and the chair of this committee for their enduring leadership on this issue.

I was in middle school when Congress passed this authorization to use force against Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. Today, as a Member of this body, I am voting to repeal it.

I make this point to remind my colleagues that the decisions around war and peace are some of the most consequential ones we make here. My generation has spent our entire adult lives in the shadow of two long and protracted wars.

I am proud to represent San Diego, a military community that has made incredible sacrifices because of that vote in 2002. Now it is time to take it off the books.

Repealing this authorization would not impact any of our current military operations, but repealing it will prevent a future President from abusing it and reclaim Congress' rightful role in authorizing war, ensuring our servicemembers know that they are not being sent to harm's way without a full debate of this representative body. There is nothing rushed about something that has taken 20 years.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this repeal.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just clarify again. This bill was filed last Congress after President Trump took out the mastermind of terror for two decades in the Middle East, Qasem Soleimani, to challenge his authority to take out one of the biggest

threats to the region and to our American soldiers, 600 of whom were killed and thousands wounded.

That is the genesis for this legislation, and I think that is important to note. If we do away with this without replacing it, we abdicate our Article I authorities in an absolute manner to the executive branch under Article II.

I think that it is important for anyone watching this debate to understand what we are doing here today.

Madam Speaker, with that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I remember over the period of the last Presidency joining my colleagues on both sides of the aisle at various times when statements were made that we are just going to leave Iraq or we are going to leave the Kurds in Syria, and I think that was shortsighted, those statements, so I joined my colleagues on both sides.

But, yet, today, we are debating the repeal of the 2002 AUMF as if we all somehow believe that we are going to magically repeal this and then come up with some narrow replacement that is going to authorize, when we can't really agree that the sky is blue in this group.

But I want to, for a second, look back and say what would have happened when this was introduced originally. So in January of 2014 this repeal was introduced. Let's say we passed it.

What happened since January of 2014? Well, I will tell you. In June of 2014 we began airstrikes against ISIS. Because of the 2002 AUMF, we were able to assist our allies to defeat ISIS in their capital of Raqqa, their stronghold in Mosul, and we even destroyed their caliphate throughout the region.

I know my colleagues who support this legislation have the right intentions in mind, but even President Biden's own Statement of Administration Policy admits that this repeal would have an impact on our military operations. That is why we don't call for a blanket repeal, but a narrowly crafted replacement. Let's do that first.

The bleak reality is that without an authorization to fight terror, more innocent human beings will suffer. Let us not forget the horrors that ISIS perpetrated on innocent men, women, and children. Men were beheaded for practicing their faith, women were stoned to death for trying to flee abusive relationships. Children were made foot soldiers and suicide bombers. Without this AUMF, this would still be happening.

Today, we have militia groups attacking the American Embassy in Baghdad. We have malign forces trying to destabilize the democratically elected Iraqi Government. We have dozens of terror organizations, including ISIS, that want to revive the caliphate which brought so much pain and suffering to so many in the region.

Before we hastily pass this ill-thought-out and ill-timed political leg-

islation, I urge every Member to meet with Intel, to meet with the Department of Defense to hear about the realities of the threats we face in this world, and maybe once that happens and we put aside these partisan stripes for a moment, we can have an honest debate about what a replacement would look like. Short-term political gain has no impact on what foreign actors make in terms of their policy decisions. ISIS and terrorists don't change based on what we debate here, and they certainly didn't give up yet.

We made a decision; the President made a decision to leave Afghanistan. While I disagree with that, I certainly hope he is successful and that my predictions are wrong, but I do know that that sent a message. It sent a message that America is disengaging in the war on terror. What would this send as well, right on the heels of this?

What message would this send to the terrorists who are on the ropes, who haven't attacked in the United States, not because they don't want to, but because we haven't let them because we have fought them on their territory, before they have the ability to organize and attack us here?

What does that message send? Because to a terrorist, all they need is the ability to go out and say, "We are winning," to recruit somebody, to give their life for that terrorist cause.

Madam Speaker, I understand where this is coming from. I deeply would love an AUMF that replaces this the right way, but this is the wrong process and the wrong order to do that. So I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this.

□ 0945

Mr. MEEKS. I want to remind the gentleman that the 2014 strike against ISIS, the primary AUMF, where it was utilized in the 2001 AUMF, continues and still is in existence. Also, when you talk about Soleimani, the primary utilization, still-President Trump talked about Article II. So those still are in existence to protect the American people and at the President's options.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, 19 years ago, this body passed the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force based on lies and misinformation about Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction.

This authorization has entangled us in a decades-long war, costing billions of dollars and tens of thousands of lives.

Millions of young people in this country, including my three children, have never known an America that wasn't at war.

This repeal is long overdue and absolutely vital to protecting the integrity of our system of checks and balances and the security of our Nation and servicemembers.

Today we stand up for Congress' constitutional war powers and the right to

say "no" to conflicts abroad and "yes" to peace.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), a combat veteran, a distinguished servicemember, and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, war powers and AUMF, it is a distant impersonal term to talk about the work of the warfighter. And I think for people on both sides of the aisle, it is anything but impersonal.

Probably all of us in here know people who have passed in our wars, roads named after them, schools named after them, VFWs, and other buildings named after them. It is not impersonal to those of us in here and to those who have been targeted by snipers, have had ordnance dropped on them, walked across fields of improvised explosive devices, were burned alive in Humvees and other pieces of equipment that they served their time in.

It is not impersonal to us. We all know the stories. And I like to believe that we do take that very seriously.

And there is broad-based consensus on the fact that these AUMFs need to be changed. But to do that and to have the appropriate responsibility to those who go out there and fight the wars, we have to talk to the people who go out there and command the battles, that sit in the JOC and sit in the TOC, and sit in the Pentagon.

But, instead, what we did was we had professors from NYU and Harvard and Yale come in and speak to us for a few minutes about their opinions.

But what I can tell you is that a battlefield looks nothing like a lecture hall or a faculty lounge. They are not the same things. And their opinions are not nearly as weighty as those of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Navy or the Commandant of the Marine Corps or one of our combatant commanders.

If we take seriously this power that the 435 of us in this body have, not just to cast a vote, but to cast an informed vote to say that we went out there and did every bit of diligence that we could, it means speaking to those individuals, asking those questions, and then coming to the conclusions that bring us to the votes that we cast.

But without that, we are acting on pure arrogance that we know better without asking any questions, that we know what to do without going out there and seeking any facts, without finding out how this will affect the defense of our homeland. And it is not what gives the honor and respect to those who go out there and defend this country. It is not what gives the honor and respect to them that they deserve.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his service, and I really respect him for what he

put on the line for our country. We will always do that.

But I will also say that those individuals who we did bring before the committee, though they might be professors now, they either served in the DOD or the White House, plus we had a classified briefing in the auditorium with representatives from the Joint Chiefs. So we were making sure that we had to get all of the information that we could in regards to this issue.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health and Global Human Rights and the Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations, and Global Corporate Social Impact.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank the distinguished author of this legislation, Congresswoman LEE, for bringing forth this legislation.

Madam Speaker, for the past 20 years, the 2002 Authorization has been used to wage war and cause destruction around the world.

While many in this Congress have participated in war, I am someone who has endured war and understands the impact it has on innocent lives. The act of war does nothing to make us safer.

Engaging in endless wars has led us to undermining our most important morals: peace, liberty, and justice.

Congress cannot sit idly by as we take more civilian lives and decrease our ability to build prosperity at home.

The more we spend on endless wars, the less we are able to invest in our own people with education, housing, and employment opportunities.

I am pleased that Congress is finally working on restoring its authority over matters of peace and war.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his comments about us seeking advice on Authorization for Use of Military Force from academics from Harvard, Yale, and NYU. And though they may have spent time serving in defense roles, I would remind the chairman that in the hearings that these academics voiced their opinions in, they expressed numerous times that they didn't even have the access to information that we had. They said it over and over. They didn't have the answers that we might have the answers to.

I would say it is incumbent upon this body to seek answers not from those who say we have more information, but to ask somebody who may potentially have more information than us so that we can make a more informed decision about policy that we are tasked with voting on that affects so many.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the chair of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 256.

Let me first recognize the tireless efforts of Representative BARBARA LEE, who has spearheaded this issue for nearly two decades and has been the moral conscience in Congress against endless, unjust wars.

The decision to go to war is one of the most profound and consequential a nation can make. This 2002 AUMF is outdated, and its repeal will end its legal authority to justify U.S. intervention in Iraq.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole duty to declare war. By repealing this authorization today, we are working to return this power back to the people's House and the Senate. That is how a checks and balances system works.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 256.

Though a combat-tested security partner, Iraq continues to be a fragile state. The 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force allowed the United States to end Saddam Hussein's reign of terror. It also allowed us to return and assist the people of Iraq when decisions made by the Obama-Biden administration led to the formation of ISIS and enabled the terror group to establish a caliphate in northwestern Iraq in 2014.

Now, that same Authorization for Use of Military Force provides the United States with the legal authority for military operations in support of our Iraqi partners, if needed, and against terrorist threats in Iraq, including those from the Iran-backed militia groups.

This critical piece of legislation provided the authority for last year's strike on Iran's terror mastermind Soleimani, whose IEDs, I might remind people, killed more than 600 American soldiers and wounded thousands more.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force also provides authority to strike Iranian-backed Shia militia groups that have and are currently attacking Americans in Iraq.

This shortsighted and purely political effort to repeal the authority without a replacement sends the wrong message and will embolden the Islamic terror groups and the world's largest state sponsor of terror, Iran.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill until we have a viable replacement that addresses the threat of Iran and its proxies.

We have already turned our backs on Afghanistan. We should not repeat this error in Iraq.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our illustrious leader and Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this important and overdue legislation to the floor.

Congratulations to you, Mr. Chairman, for being the chair of the committee and, as your ranking member has said, striving to act in a very bipartisan way. That doesn't hold for today necessarily; but, nonetheless, where there is a will, there is a way.

Madam Speaker, nearly 20 years have passed since the Congress passed the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, and 10 years have passed since the formal end of U.S. military operations: Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Yet, today, 10 years later, our Nation is still operating under an outdated Authorization for Use of Military Force, which risks being used, and in some cases has been used, as a blank check to conduct unrelated military operations.

Let me be clear. Repealing the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force in no way precludes us, our country, from defending our military and diplomatic personnel in Iraq. Article II of the Constitution, the 2001 AUMF, and the bilateral agreements with Iraq permit this.

But it will prevent a situation in which U.S. military personnel are deployed or military operations are conducted, without the approval of Congress or the country, for purposes that are unconnected to the AUMF's original purpose.

We are here because of the courage of Congresswoman BARBARA LEE. No one has been fiercer or more relentless or more principled on this issue. I thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and others who have worked with her over the years.

I thank also our Foreign Affairs chair, GREGORY MEEKS, who has moved this bipartisan priority with both urgency and unity through the committee.

□ 1000

We are pleased that this legislation, which has previously passed the House twice, has over 130 cosponsors. Thank you, also, to Senator TIM KAINE, a longtime leader on AUMF repeal and reform in the Senate, who has introduced a companion bill in the Senate.

Repealing the 2002 AUMF will defend Congress' constitutional authorities and our American democracy's system of separation of powers.

Under the Constitution, it is the Congress that has the sole duty to declare war. We must reassert that authority to decide if and when our country goes to war.

This repeal is also possible because of the leadership of President Joe Biden, who understands and has respect for Congress' constitutional authorities. He understands the need for this action to keep our troops and the American people safe. Again, that is our first responsibility: to protect and defend.

The Congress stands in agreement with the Biden-Harris administration, which has stated that “the President is committed to working with the Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a narrow and specific framework appropriate to ensure that we can continue to protect Americans from terrorist threats.”

Why has that been elusive, for us to come up with a better, more focused plan?

Madam Speaker, just for public information, when we have tried to come up with a newer, fresher, more appropriate AUMF, we have three challenges.

What is the scope? What is the Authorization for Use of Military Force for? Is it for boots on the ground? Is it for air? What is it for? What is the scope that we are giving the authority to the executive branch to use?

What is the geography? How far does that extend? Is this global? Is it specific to a region?

These are important decisions because some of the threats are, shall we say, unpredictable. But that doesn't mean what we do here should be unpredictable.

The third is the timing. How long does it last? What is it for? How far in geography does it extend? And how long does that authority last?

Over time, as we have tried to replace this outdated Authorization for Use of Military Force, we have run into those disagreements internally as well as with the White House. But the more the public knows about our commitment to honoring our constitutional responsibility—and we will work with a President who is not here to undermine that—hopefully, we will have that authorization, as necessary, as we go forward.

As Members of Congress, the first duty we have is to keep the American people safe. That includes our courageous men and women in uniform, who sacrifice every day for our freedoms.

To do this, we must pursue a National Security Strategy and a defense policy that are smart, strong, and strategic. And we look forward to working with the administration on this vital mission.

With that, I again salute our distinguished colleague from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for her persistence and her leadership; our distinguished chairman, Mr. GREGORY MEEKS.

Again, I am grateful for the courteous consideration of this legislation today, although we may not be in complete agreement.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong vote for H.R. 256, to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, and hope that we will have a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. WATERS), the chairwoman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, Chairman GREGORY MEEKS, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Congresswoman BARBARA LEE's resolution to repeal the outdated 2002 AUMF, which was used to start the Iraq war, which killed more than 4,500 American soldiers and approximately 200,000 Iraqi civilians.

As the chair of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I worked with Congresswoman LEE and our former colleague, Lynn Woolsey, to end the Iraq war and bring our troops home.

The Iraq war finally ended in December 2011. We cannot allow this outdated AUMF to be used as a blank check for future wars. It is long past time for Congress to reassert its constitutional role in authorizing and providing oversight over United States military action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

The United States Congress has the sole constitutional power to declare war and, therefore, a constitutional duty to consider, debate, and, if necessary, repeal an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

The very title of this AUMF shows how much it has strayed from its original purpose. The 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq was designed to address the threat posed by an Iraq run by Saddam Hussein. He has been dead for many years.

We have the responsibility to members of the Armed Forces who risk their lives, and the American public who fund these seemingly endless conflicts, to terminate the current 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force. Since 2009, I voted consistently to revoke this open-ended authorization and to reassert Congress' role.

For too long, we have failed this responsibility. Congress must act now to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), a distinguished Member.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we, who are honored to be Members of Congress, are here to pass judgment on the great issues of our time. There is no greater issue of our time than the issue of war and peace. It is about life and death.

We should not be allowed to escape our duty, responsibility, and obligation to vote on issues of war and peace.

We must repeal this authorization so that Congress can take up its responsibility and vote on the great issues of our time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for recognizing me and yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to repeal the AUMF resolution of 2002. Here we are, in 2021.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against that AUMF, and to this day, I believe it produced one of the worst foreign policy disasters in U.S. history. It was built on a lie; it claimed the lives of over 4,400 Americans and countless Iraqi civilians; and it cost our Treasury trillions of dollars.

The Iraq war ended 10 years ago, but this AUMF is still on the books. It is a blank check, and we need to get rid of it. We run the risk that administrations will misuse it to justify future military action and directly undermine Congress' Article I war powers authority.

The House has voted three times to repeal this AUMF, and today, it is time to pass it. Let us have a victory here on the floor—and celebrate another victory that the Supreme Court has upheld the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to recognize a gentleman who I want to thank for his service, for he is a Marine combat veteran who served in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS).

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 256 to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force that sent me and thousands of other young Americans into war in Iraq.

Even though the mission in Iraq has been over for almost a decade, this authorization remains on the books. This is not a mistake or an oversight. It is a dangerous abdication of Congress' responsibility.

The longer this AUMF is on the books, the more opportunity it has to be abused as a blank check for military action in the Middle East without the input of the American people.

The longer this AUMF is on the books, the longer we in Congress are bending our own moral and constitutional duty to debate and to decide when to send American soldiers into harm's way and to look into the eyes of servicemen and -women when we do. We cannot run from this incredible responsibility any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this bill and re-taking Congress' constitutional role in exercising our war powers.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES), my friend.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was a sophomore in high school when Congress gave the green light for war in Iraq. Nearly 20 years later, I am here as a freshman Member of Congress, urging my colleagues to repeal that authorization.

For over half my life, Republican and Democratic Presidential administrations have used the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force as a blank check for war and the justification for aggressive military actions in the Middle East.

Young people today have never known a time when our country was not fighting overseas or conducting strikes on poor and Brown nations. It is time for that to stop.

The American people are tired of endless wars. We need a more peaceful and productive foreign policy grounded in diplomacy and human rights, and we, finally, have an administration that agrees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this resolution, Congresswoman LEE's longtime effort to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

The Constitution is clear: Only Congress has the power to authorize war.

In 2002, this resolution was adopted in order to address the ongoing threat from Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iraq, the threat that it represented to America. Saddam Hussein is gone. A new government has been established in Iraq, and this AUMF is obsolete.

There are threats to the United States, and we have the authority to address those threats when they arise. There are ongoing threats that we ought to be able to debate here on the floor of the House of Representatives and act upon when our security is threatened. But no President of any party should ever be able to reach back two decades when Congress, on a different fact situation, authorized the use of force in order to authorize any use of force that they deemed to be important to them.

Congress has this authority, and we need to assert it. That is what we do today.

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

Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment, once again, that repealing this Author-

ization for Use of Military Force, which has been used in the past to take out Soleimani and other very bad actors, and not replacing it does not uphold our Article I responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, what we are doing is ceding our authority under the Constitution to the executive branch and saying: Oh, Article II, the President has unlimited discretion under Article II to do whatever the hell he wants to do.

That is not what this Congress should be doing. We need to replace this with an updated AUMF that reflects the threats in the region, the current threats, which are Iran and the proxies of Iran that have hit our embassy, have killed our soldiers, and are attacking our diplomats in the region.

□ 1015

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friend from Texas that maybe we should do—if you think Iran is a threat—an AUMF for Iran. This AUMF was for Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution to repeal an almost two decades-long Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by saying thank you, thank you, thank you to my colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

I was an activist back in 2001, leading the largest immigrant advocacy organization and the largest march at the time against the war in Iraq, because we knew that what was happening was wrong. And we were looking at Congress, and saying, Congress needs to make sure they are taking action, and BARBARA LEE stood up at that time on her own.

The 2002 AUMF was based on a lie; a lie that has resulted in hundreds of thousands of lives lost, including civilians, U.S. servicemembers, journalists, humanitarian workers; a lie that was used as the legal basis for military hostilities beyond Iraq, hostilities that were never authorized by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this must be the beginning and not the end of our work to end endless wars. We must continue our work to forge a meaningful engagement with the rest of the world toward a lasting peace. Mr. Speaker, I also thank the chairman for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Just a point of clarification to the chairman. I am not talking about a declaration of war against Iran. What we are talking about is what is the current threat in Iraq. Today, it is proxies, the Shia proxies of Iran in Iraq.

The reason why President Biden hit them in Syria, it is the authorities that President Trump used to take out Soleimani in Iraq, not in Iran. Soleimani, "The Butcher", the master-

mind of terror for two decades, killing 600 American soldiers and wounding thousands more.

I am all for updating this thing, but to replace this and throw it out with not anything to protect our men and women who are in Iraq today, including the diplomats, is highly irresponsible, it is reckless, and it is dangerous.

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

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, I will vote, once again, to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force because we cannot continue endless wars.

Congress passed the 2002 AUMF authorization for war again Saddam Hussein's regime. I voted against that resolution. And, now, here we are nearly 20 years later, and we have seen three successive administrations use the AUMF to wage war in ways that were never intended, that were way beyond the scope of the congressional authorization that was used.

Only Congress has the authority to declare war. And it is time for us to reclaim that authority. We can't let another day go by with this authorization in place. We cannot support endless wars.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the lead Republican on the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying that this argument that we have to get rid of the AUMF is just ridiculous. We pass the National Defense Authorization Act every year. We have passed it every year for 60 consecutive years. If we don't want to authorize something we are doing militarily, we can stop it at any time. So this is a false argument that we have to do this to be able to prevent what we are doing in Afghanistan or Iraq or anyplace else.

But with regard to this specific bill, this is a bad deal for our national security and the safety of American servicemembers overseas. Since the liberation of Iraq, the murderous Iranian regime has armed proxy organizations to kill Americans and innocent Iraqis.

Iran has armed proxy militias with small arms, mortars, rockets, and now sophisticated UAVs that can avoid base defenses. The Obama and Trump administrations both used the 2002 AUMF to target terrorist threats originating from Iraq.

Threats like ISIS and militias backed by Iran have killed and injured American servicemembers and contractors. This bill would repeal the 2002 AUMF and offer nothing in its place; no authorization to mop up ISIS forces or whatever movement comes next; no authorization to target Iranian proxies whose sole goal is to destabilize Iraq and kill Americans.

This bill only offers the illusion of withdrawal. Like President Biden's

failing Afghanistan strategy, it does nothing to change the reality on the ground in Iraq. The threats we face today will remain, and American commanders will be forced to face those threats with one fewer tool than they had the day before.

Repealing the 2002 AUMF without a replacement only undermines our national security. It offers no real solution to the issues.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my friend that this 2002 AUMF has not been utilized as the sole reason or the sole authority in over 10 years. The 2001 AUMF is still in effect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN), who is a colonel, retired, and we thank him for his service in our military.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman LEE for her leadership on repealing the 2002 AUMF. That was the authorization that sent me and hundreds of thousands of servicemen and -women to Iraq since the invasion in 2003. The justification for that war was fundamentally flawed.

But to be certain, the purpose of the 2002 AUMF established a broad military mission in Iraq. Yet, I have no doubt that that mission that we were given has been completed. And, sadly, the Nation has lost more than 4,400 brave soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who were engaged in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

It is time for us, for Congress and the American people, to formally recognize the end of America's 2002 mission in Iraq. This is an important first step. As Congress, once again, reasserts its responsibility in the use of our military forces by authorizing frameworks that address current threats to our Nation and that we authorize the use of military force only as the last resort.

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. We need to exercise our Article I constitutional responsibilities and update this outdated AUMF. That is precisely what we are arguing today. We are not saying that we should replace this, but we shouldn't repeal without an updated AUMF that reflects the modern-day threats.

As I close later, I will talk about the chairman and I working on that effort. That is what this body should be doing, because otherwise, if we repeal this, we are again ceding our Article I responsibilities to the executive, and just giving him unlimited Article II powers.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE), and I thank the gentlewoman for her bipartisan spirit in coming down to the floor today to speak on this AUMF.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on the other side

of the aisle for giving me a minute on this issue. I want to thank our veterans that have given lifelong service to their country.

Nearly two decades ago, Congress authorized the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but ever since, three President's, both Republican and Democrat, have used this permission to drag out conflicts and to get us into new ones.

Americans who weren't even alive on 9/11 or during the invasion of Iraq are still fighting and dying there, in Syria, across Africa, and who knows where else. Our Founders wisely gave Congress the exclusive constitutional authority over whether our Nation goes to war.

Sadly, Congress has failed to perform this sacred duty for far too long. This is about restoring the powers set forth in Article I. Congress can go to war with anyone under Article I. When Washington drags us into a war, they aren't the ones who go do the fighting and dying, our children are. The very least we can do is give their parents a say in when and where and if their kids will fight and die thousands of miles away.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think I laid out our arguments, and I think it is irresponsible to repeal this authority, which still is used to protect our embassy diplomats and soldiers in Iraq against the Shia proxies of Iran.

I am committed to work with the chairman to update this outdated AUMF. And I think if there is any agreement in this Chamber, and also on both sides of the aisle, it is that we need to modernize it to the modern-day threats.

And as I read from the President's Statement of Administration Policy, the President says: I am committed to working with the Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a framework appropriate to ensure that we can continue to protect Americans from terrorist threats.

I agree with the President of the United States, and I think the chairman does as well. We have to do this, and it is not going to be easy, but it is time to update this outdated AUMF.

I would prefer to have repealed and replaced it with our updated AUMF. But as BRIAN MAST, a heroic veteran who lost his legs in battle, said, We cannot just repeal this and talk about updating when we haven't even talked to the Department of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the intelligence community about what is the modern-day threat, and what we need to do in Congress to exercise our Article I responsibilities that we have a responsibility to do, and not just cede everything to the executive branch under Article II.

The argument is made, well, this could be done under Article II. Well, that is probably true. But are we not abdicating our responsibility and ceding it to the executive branch by doing this? I would argue that we are.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with the motion to recommit.

If we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on Foreign Affairs to consider my amendment to H.R. 256. It responds to the serious escalation by Hamas against Israel that we saw in May.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARBAJAL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1030

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, Hamas launched over 4,000 rockets at our closest allies in the Middle East. This was a stark reminder of the dangerous threats that Israel faces from Hamas, Hezbollah, Iran, and other terrorist organizations.

For this reason, our MTR makes sure that the United States can quickly react to Israel's security needs in the event of future attacks.

If enacted, this language would establish contingency plans to provide Israel with defense articles such as munitions, ISR technology, aircraft, and related services. It would also create a waiver to expedite arms transfers if Israel is under threat of military attack.

This language passed the House last Congress with broad bipartisan support, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it today.

I fear that the 2002 AUMF repeal we are considering today without a replacement may embolden our adversaries, especially Iran—the largest state sponsor of terror in the world—and its proxies by signaling that we are retreating from the Middle East.

Our MTR is intended to send a strong message that this is absolutely false. It will also send a message that passage will demonstrate our ironclad support for Israel and all our allies in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his hard work. As he has indicated, it is a pleasure working with him on this committee and working collectively and having open and honest dialog where we agree and where we disagree. The manner in which we do that, I think, serves this body in a very good way, and I look forward to continuing to work with him in that regard.

Even though we see this a little differently, I will say right now that I am

ready to work with the gentleman in repealing and replacing the 2001 AUMF. I think that is what we utilized as primary for the 2014 ISIS issue in dealing with all of the terrorists and terrorism that is going on. But the 2002 AUMF was specific to Iraq.

Our duty and our responsibility in what took place is over. There comes a time when certain AUMFs simply become outdated and need to be repealed. We are going to do two others. We have an AUMF still on the books from 1957. We have another one that is on the books from 1991. There is no need to repeal and replace. They are outdated. Once they become outdated, let's just remove them from the books.

So let me again reiterate this: the repealing of the 2002 AUMF would have no effect on any outgoing military operations in Iraq. In fact, the only thing leaving the AUMF on the books does is risk inviting future administrations to try to stretch its legal authority and bypass Congress' constitutional obligation to make decisions on matters of war and peace, thereby getting past and abdicating our responsibilities under Article I authority and allow the executive to interpret the AUMFs far beyond their intent.

So the repeal of the 2002 AUMF is only one in a series of steps that Congress must take to reclaim its Article I authority, but it is, indeed, an important step. Today's historic vote is a turning point to quickly bring an end to this outdated AUMF. I understand from listening to the Senate that the Senate's intention also is to quickly bring the 2002 AUMF repeal for a vote.

So I look forward to Congress no longer taking a backseat on some of the most consequential decisions our Nation can make.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, the Out of Iraq Caucus, and a cosponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 256, which repeals the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq passed by Congress nearly twenty years ago on October 16, 2002 as Pub. L. 107-243.

I extend my thanks and deep appreciation to our colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for her tireless and unwavering devotion to repealing this misguided AUMF and acknowledging the grievous mistake history has shown it to be and as many of predicted at the time it would be.

Congress never intended for the 2002 AUMF to have such broad and extended reach.

Over the last 18 years, we have seen 3 Presidents use this legislation as a blank check to engage in serious military action.

The 2002 AUMF is an outdated piece of legislation and repealing it will not affect any current military operations.

Moreover, the 2002 AUMF is unnecessary because everything the 2002 AUMF covers is already fully covered under the 2001 9/11 AUMF, except for attacks against Iran.

Congress passed the 2002 AUMF to address the perceived threat posed by the re-

gime of Saddam Hussein and the AUMF permitted the President to use the armed forces as "necessary and appropriate" to "defend U.S. national security against the continuing threat posed by Iraq" and to "enforce all relevant Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq."

U.S. military deployments and operations carried out pursuant to the 2002 AUMF—dubbed Operation Iraqi Freedom—officially concluded in 2011.

Almost 18 years after the resolution's passage, the United States recognizes the sovereignty of Iraq and considers Iraq a key ally.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole duty to declare war and repealing obsolete Authorizations for Use of Military Force (AUMFs) is essential for Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities.

Leaving the 2002 AUMF in place increases the likelihood that future presidents will use it as a basis to start a new war, or expand a current one, without Congress's explicit authorization.

In July 2019, the House adopted a Lee amendment to NDAA virtually identical to H.R. 256, To Repeal the AUMF Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, by a bipartisan vote of 242 to 180.

The overly broad 2002 AUMF represents deterioration of Congressional oversight.

As our brave service members are deployed around the world in combat zones, Congress is missing in action.

Congress must repeal the 2002 AUMF immediately to fulfill its constitutional obligation to provide oversight and consent on matters of war and peace.

As provided under the War Powers Resolution of 1973, absent a Congressional declaration of war or authorization for the use of military force, the President as Commander-in-Chief has constitutional power to engage the U.S. armed forces in hostilities only in the case of a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, since the objectives which led Congress to pass the 2002 Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF) have been achieved, I believe the authorization to use that military force expired automatically.

That is why thirteen years ago, on October 31, 2007, I introduced H.R. 4020, the "Military Success in Iraq Commemoration Act of 2007," which acknowledged and affirmed that the two objectives of the 2002 AUMF—(1) to defend the national security of the United States and (2) to enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq—had in fact been achieved and called upon the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe a national day of celebration commemorating military success in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, where a Congressional authorization to use military force has expired, the President must obtain a new authorization to continue the use of force.

As a co-equal branch of government, it is Congress's right and responsibility to be fully consulted regarding any potential plans to expand military operations in the region, to assess whether such action is in the national security interest of the United States and our allies, and to withhold or grant authorization for the use of military force based on this assessment.

As we have learned from the painful and bitter experience of the past 18 years, at the initiation of hostilities, the costs in terms of blood and treasure of U.S. military interventions abroad are often underestimated and the benefits overstated.

More than 6,800 American service members gave the last full measure of devotion to their country on battlefields in Afghanistan and Iraq, with hundreds of thousands more returning with physical, emotional, or psychological wounds that may never heal.

The direct economic cost of the war in the Persian Gulf exceeds \$1.07 trillion, including \$773 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funds, an increase of \$243 billion to the Department of Defense base budget, and an increase of \$54.2 billion to the Veterans Administration budget to address the human costs of the military involvement in Iraq.

We should not repeat the mistakes of the past and the legislation before us is directly aligned with the will of the American people.

I commend my colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE for introducing this legislation and urge all Members to vote for H.R. 256 and repeal the misguided and certainly outdated 2002 Authorization For Use of Military Force in Iraq.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 256, legislation to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 ("2002 AUMF").

This authorization has outlived its usefulness, if it ever had one. My position on the Iraq war has been clear: I opposed the occupation of Iraq and the damage it unleashed. We were wise to exit this quagmire while retaining the ability to address any legitimate security threats emanating from this region.

But we left the 2002 AUMF in place, which was a mistake. First the Obama Administration and now the Biden Administration have made clear it is no longer needed. As noted by the Biden Administration, "repeal of the 2002 AUMF would likely have minimal impact on current military operations."

Additionally, I share concerns that failure to repeal the 2002 AUMF will allow it to continue to be misused to legitimize U.S. military actions that were never contemplated when it was passed, including in areas far outside of Iraq.

It's time that Congress begins to reclaim its war powers. Repealing this outdated 2002 AUMF will also allow our country to refocus our military strategies and efforts towards defending against legitimate national security threats facing our country. We will never stop open ended war if we never reconsider the open-ended authorizations that are feeding them. The Constitution is clear about Congress' authority. These are difficult decisions but every time we punt on reasserting our authority regarding sending our men and women in uniform to war, we weaken our institution and our democracy.

Today's vote marks the fourth time in the past three years that the House has passed similar legislation in a bipartisan fashion. Today's action hopefully marks the last time we do so and that we will finally see this legislation enacted into law.

I support H.R. 256 and the termination of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCaul moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 256, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCCAUL is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to provide assistance to the Government of Israel in order to help enable Israel to defend itself by itself and develop long-term capacity, primarily through the acquisition of advanced capabilities that are available from the United States.

SEC. 3. CONTINGENCY PLANS TO PROVIDE ISRAEL WITH NECESSARY DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.

The President shall establish and update as appropriate contingency plans to provide Israel with defense articles and defense services that are determined by the President to be necessary for the defense of Israel.

SEC. 4. WAIVER FOR EXISTING OR IMMINENT MILITARY THREAT TO ISRAEL.

Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) WAIVER FOR EXISTING OR IMMINENT MILITARY THREAT TO ISRAEL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving information that Israel is under an existing or imminent threat of military attack, the President may waive the requirements of this Act and direct the immediate transfer to Israel of such defense articles or defense services the President determines to be necessary to assist Israel in its defense against such threat. Amounts obligated or expended to carry out this paragraph shall not be subject to any limitation in law, or provision of any bilateral agreement, relating to the amount of United States assistance authorized to be made available to Israel.

“(2) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—As soon as practicable after a transfer of defense articles or defense services pursuant to the authority provided by paragraph (1), the President shall provide a notification in writing to Congress of the details of such transfer, consistent with the requirements of section 36 of this Act.”.

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

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 219, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—204

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

NAYS—219

Adams	Carson	Dean
Agullar	Carter (LA)	DeFazio
Allred	Cartwright	DeGette
Auchincloss	Case	DeLauro
Axne	Casten	DelBene
Barragán	Castor (FL)	Delgado
Bass	Castro (TX)	Demings
Beatty	Chu	DeSaulnier
Bera	Cicilline	Deuch
Beyer	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Escobar
Blunt Rochester	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bonamici	Cohen	Espallat
Bourdeaux	Connolly	Evans
Bowman	Cooper	Fletcher
Boyle, Brendan	Correa	Foster
F.	Costa	Frankel, Lois
Brown	Courtney	Galleo
Brownley	Craig	Garamendi
Bush	Crist	Garcia (IL)
Bustos	Crow	Garcia (TX)
Butterfield	Cuellar	Golden
Carbajal	Davids (KS)	Gomez
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny K.	

Gonzalez, Vicente	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Sánchez
Gotthelmer	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Green, Al (TX)	Manning	Scanlon
Grijalva	Massie	Schakowsky
Harder (CA)	Matsui	Schiff
Hayes	McBath	Schneider
Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Schrader
Himes	McEachin	Schrier
Horsford	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Houlahan	McNerney	Scott, David
Hoyer	Meeks	Sewell
Huffman	Meng	Sherman
Jackson Lee	Mfume	Sherrill
Jacobs (CA)	Moore (WI)	Sires
Jayapal	Morelle	Slotkin
Jeffries	Moulton	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Mrvan	Soto
Johnson (TX)	Murphy (FL)	Spanberger
Jones	Nadler	Speier
Kahele	Napolitano	Stansbury
Kaptur	Neal	Stanton
Keating	Neguse	Stevens
Kelly (IL)	Newman	Strickland
Khanna	Norcross	Suozi
Kildee	O'Halleran	Swalwell
Kilmer	Ocasio-Cortez	Takano
Kim (NJ)	Omar	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kirkpatrick	Panetta	Titus
Krishnamoorthi	Pappas	Tlaib
Kuster	Pascrell	Tonko
Lamb	Payne	Torres (CA)
Langevin	Perlmuter	Trahan
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Trone
Larson (CT)	Phillips	Underwood
Lawrence	Pingree	Vargas
Lawson (FL)	Pocan	Veasey
Lee (CA)	Porter	Vela
Lee (NV)	Pressley	Velázquez
Leger Fernandez	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Levin (CA)	Quigley	Schultz
Levin (MI)	Raskin	Waters
Lieu	Rice (NY)	Watson Coleman
Lofgren	Ross	Welch
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Wexton
Luria	Ruiz	Wild
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Williams (GA)
Mace	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Malinowski	Ryan	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Doyle, Michael	Green (TN)	Rice (SC)
F.	Harshbarger	Torres (NY)
Fallon	McHenry	

□ 1102

Messrs. CASE, MRVAN, STANTON, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ZELDIN, DAVIDSON, HOLLINGSWORTH, and BUDD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, due to a committee hearing with Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen, I was unable to make rollcall Vote 171 on the Motion to Recommit offered by Mr. McCaul of Texas. I would like the record to note that I would have supported the Motion to Recommit and have a long history of supporting our ally, Israel.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas	Gonzalez, Vicente	Kim (NJ)
(Gomez)	(Pallone)	
Cicilline	(Gomez)	Kirkpatrick
(Pingree)	Granger	(Stanton)
Cleaver (Davids	(Arrington)	Langevin
(KS))	Grijalva (García	(Courtney)
DeSaulnier	(IL))	Lawson (FL)
(Thompson	Himes	(Evans)
(CA))	(Courtney)	Lieu (Raskin)
Frankel, Lois	Hoyer (Brown)	Lowenthal
(Clark (MA))	Johnson (TX)	(Beyer)
Gimenez (Waltz)	(Jeffries)	Meng (Clark
	Kahele (Mrvan)	(MA))

Mullin (Lucas)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Levin
(CA))
Roybal-Allard
(Escobar)

Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Sherrill
(Pallone)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Strickland
(Kilmer)

Swalwell
(Gallego)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wagner
(Walorski)
Wexton
(Connolly)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BONAMICI). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 161, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—268

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene

Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Feenstra
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster

Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pannetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley

Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rosendale
Ross
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schraeder
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Steel
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suzuki
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiffany

NAYS—161

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bost
Brady
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Calvert
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Clyde
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)

Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Malliotakis
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McKinley
Meuser
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar

Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—2

Green (TN) McHenry

□ 1127

Mr. ISSA changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, due to an unavoidable conflict, I was forced to miss votes on June 17, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 170,

“yea” on rollcall No. 171, and “nay” on rollcall No. 172.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Ciilline
(Pingree)
Cleaver (Davids
(KS))
DeSaulnier
(Thompson
(CA))
Frankel, Lois
(Clark (MA))
Gimenez (Waltz)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
(Gomez)
Granger
(Arrington)
Grijalva (Garcia
(IL))
Harshbarger
(Kustoff)
Himes
(Courtney)

Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Kim (NJ)
(Pallone)
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)
Langevin
(Courtney)
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Lieu (Raskin)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Meng (Clark
(MA))
Mullin (Lucas)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Payne (Pallone)

Porter (Levin
(CA))
Roybal-Allard
(Escobar)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Sherrill
(Pallone)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Strickland
(Kilmer)
Swalwell
(Gallego)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wagner
(Walorski)
Wexton
(Connolly)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

□ 1130

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DISPARITY AND FAIRNESS IN GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(g)(1) of House Resolution 8, 117th Congress, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, of the following Members to the Select Committee on Economic Disparity and Fairness in Growth:

Mr. HIMES, Connecticut, Chair
Ms. KAPTUR, Ohio
Ms. MOORE, Wisconsin
Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ, Texas
Ms. JAYAPAL, Washington
Ms. CRAIG, Minnesota
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
Ms. JACOBS, California

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the House majority whip the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to my friend from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip of the House.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman letting me stand in today for the majority leader.

Next week, on Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes expected no earlier than 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete

list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider:

H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, which would make it easier for those who have suffered age discrimination in the workplace to file a complaint and seek redress;

H.R. 1443, the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, which would ensure that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau keep statistics on credit reporting for LGBTQ-owned businesses in the same way as it does for women- and minority-owned companies and small businesses; and

H.R. 239, Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, which would allow women receiving healthcare services from the VA system to access basic contraceptive care without paying copays similar to coverage provided under the Affordable Care Act.

We will consider three resolutions of disapproval to reverse regulatory actions made under the prior administration, which have all been passed by the Senate:

S.J. Res. 13 would reverse the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's rule that had obscured information about the factual and legal basis the Commission used to make determinations on discriminatory practices;

S.J. Res. 14 would overturn the prior administration's Environmental Protection Agency rule that removed protections from dangerous methane emissions that exacerbate the climate crisis; and

S.J. Res. 15 would overturn a rule by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and allow States once again to regulate these lenders and protect consumers in order to rein in predatory lenders and rent-a-bank schemes.

MR. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for walking us through those. Of course, I would first like to, as we note that the majority leader is not here, wish Mr. HOYER a speedy recovery. I got to speak with him yesterday, and he is doing better and appreciates the prayers and thoughts from our colleagues.

And I told him: You don't have to rush back. You want to make sure you get better before you come back.

And I know from experience to take the time and get better. And I offered, by the way, use of my physical therapist, and maybe he and I will do some joint physical therapy when he returns. But he was in good spirits and is looking forward to coming back. I know the gentleman from South Carolina shares that as well.

MR. CLYBURN. Absolutely.

MR. SCALISE. I am sure the gentleman from Maryland is watching right now as he is recovering, but I said, we are used to sparring and having some fun conversations back and forth through the Select Subcommittee

on the Coronavirus, but we also look forward to seeing him back in the middle of this fray soon, too.

If I may, I did want to ask. There were a couple of bills that deal with the origin of the coronavirus, and I know we have been having those conversations about trying to get a deeper investigation into the origin of the coronavirus. But the Senate had passed over a few weeks ago a bill, S. 1867, that came out of the Senate unanimously back in May, which requires the Director of National Intelligence to declassify information that relates to the origin of COVID-19.

I am not sure if this is a bill that you all were looking at bringing up, but we wanted to just ask if we could have S. 1867 brought to the House floor. It was a bill that passed unanimously out of the Senate, which does indicate that there was strong interest on both sides to get that information declassified so we can get more information about the origin of COVID for all of our Members to be able to see, not just those Members that have access to that information.

I am not sure, again, if the gentleman was looking at that, but if that is something you all could look at, I think it would be well received by both sides, and then would help us quickly get that information available for all to see.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

MR. CLYBURN. You and I have been having this discussion for quite a while with our select subcommittee activities. I have not seen the legislation that you make reference to, but I am sure that the majority leader has. And, like you, I am looking forward to his speedy recovery so he can get back into this spot. I am a little more familiar with sparring with you in our select subcommittee than on this floor.

But having said that, I think you are aware that the Biden administration has already directed the United States intelligence community to examine this issue, calling on the intelligence community to redouble their efforts to report their findings by August 24 and to keep Congress fully apprised of their work.

We have confidence in their ability to conduct a robust evidence-based inquiry into the origin of the coronavirus and will not allow House Republicans to irresponsibly hijack this issue for partisan purposes. We want to see this thing happen, and you and I have had this discussion. And because they have got until August 24—that is, what, 3 months from now, or less—I think we will be in a good place to let the Intelligence Committee do its work.

MR. SCALISE. There is an old adage: "Why put off tomorrow what you can do today?"

There is unanimous support for S. 1867 to not wait until August. And, in fact, it was May when Senators—all Republicans and all Democrat Senators—recognized that this is some-

thing we should do and we should do now, and this would get more information out to the public, as well as to our Members.

I would also ask if the majority would look at H. Res. 90, which is a resolution that supports the international investigation into the origin of COVID-19.

There are many countries. We have heard a lot of European countries have expressed interest in having an international commission to look into this. I don't know why the United States would be reluctant to be a part of that investigation.

But, again, in light of all of the new information that has come out, some emails recently since our committee has met, show more and more that there is a high likelihood that COVID-19 started in the Wuhan lab. Whether it was intentional or not, there is strong evidence pointing to the fact that it likely started there.

We have not had a single hearing, not any of the standing committees, and here we have a committee that, by its name, the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus was established for the purpose of investigating COVID-19, all elements of it, not just what is happening here in America.

We just recognized over 600,000 deaths from COVID-19 on the steps of the Capitol just a few days ago. So, clearly, it has hit our country hard, but it has hit the whole world hard. Millions of people have died. And now there is real evidence that has come out, including from some of our own scientists here in America, that they may have been aware over a year ago that COVID-19 originated in the lab as opposed to what the original projections were that it was a bat-to-human transmission. Now there is a lot of evidence pointing to the opposite of that.

In fact, many of us were calling for that investigation over a year ago, and some were called conspiracy theorists, yet now the hard scientific data shows that it may have been, in fact, started in that lab.

Why are we not having those hearings now in our committee, other committees, again, not months from now?

But if China knew of this, there may not be scientists that we can get access to, but we have American scientists who were in communication with those scientists. Whether it is directly or indirectly, there may have been taxpayer funds that were involved in that. We should be trying to find that out now. And China may be trying to cover some of that up.

The quicker we can get those hearings and those investigations, the more we can find out while it is still possible to find it out. I think it would help a lot of us to understand what really happened, what went wrong.

Because if it was started in that lab, this would be a disaster dramatically greater than Chernobyl in terms of devastation to the world, loss of human life. We should all want to be finding

out. There were a lot of investigations into Chernobyl. This is dramatically worse than Chernobyl. And if it was self-made, that is something we should be investigating now. I am not sure why there is a reluctance to do it.

But I would ask the gentleman, if I could just reiterate, I know we sent a letter—over 200 of our colleagues signed on—asking that we investigate it, all the committees of jurisdiction, including ours.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman that I am as anxious to know exactly what happened as he is. And the American people want to know exactly what happened. The fact of the matter is, though, we have several committees that are investigating, including the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology have indicated that they intend to look into the matter.

Now, like you, I am from the South, and you can get too many cooks in the kitchen. And I am fully aware that to have a plethora of committees stumbling over each other trying to get to the bottom of this will serve no useful purpose.

So I want to see things done here as close to regular order as we possibly can have them done, and to let the committees of jurisdiction conduct their investigation, this administration working through its intelligence department doing the investigations, and I am sure they will come up with the kind of information that would do us as citizens and as Members of this great body justice.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, we will continue to press for that investigation.

And, you know, I am from New Orleans, and I know what it is like to have cooks in the kitchen, but I also know how important it is to have a lot of eyes looking at the same thing. And the more eyes looking into something where there is mystery, where there is uncertainty, where there is speculation, I think the more people looking at this, the better.

Again, our committee is uniquely set up. There are other committees that are set up to look at different aspects of it. We should all be looking at it because the more questions we ask—it seems like right now more questions are raised. We need to get answers to those questions, and we get those answers by having that oversight hearing. We don't want some kind of Soviet-style coverup. We want to be looking at those questions and having people brought in.

There are American scientists, some people who work for this United States Government, who could help us answer those questions, and they haven't been brought forward. We can compel them to come forward, especially in light of these emails that have come out recently, which show that some of those scientists were aware over a year ago that it may have started in the lab.

□ 1145

That was not shared with us in previous hearings. I think a lot of our Members on both sides would like to find that information out as much as we can. And the more we are asking questions, the more I think we will get answers that everybody in the country and around the world wants to know. So, we will continue to press for that.

I also want to ask about the appropriations process. I understand the Committee on Appropriations is starting to do some work to start bringing up the bills in committee so that we can, hopefully, have an appropriations process move forward. We would be strongly encouraging a bipartisan appropriations process but also an open appropriations process.

So, as we look to the floor schedule, we are hearing that maybe in July some of these bills would come to the floor. As the gentleman knows, when we bring appropriations bills to the floor, whether it is a fully open process or even a modified process, you typically have well over 100 amendments that come to the floor on these appropriations bills.

Does the gentleman anticipate that we would start, around July, seeing some of those bills come to the floor? And will we have that ability on the floor to have those kinds of amendments brought forward in a process that we have seen in the past?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

The Committee on Appropriations has announced that it will start its process next week with four subcommittee markups. Over the next 2 weeks, and then the week of July 12, the committee will complete subcommittee and full committee markups on all 12 of the annual appropriations bills.

We plan to consider the bills on the floor the final 2 weeks of July, when we are in session. That will be the week of July 19 and July 26.

Now, I suspect that we will be close to what the gentleman just indicated he would like to see with the schedule. I am certain that the Committee on Appropriations will do everything it possibly can to keep that schedule so that we will complete all of our work before the August break.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and we look forward to that robust process through both committee and, ultimately, on the floor.

The last point, I wanted to ask about deals with infrastructure. We are seeing a lot of different groups both in the House and Senate that are working on various infrastructure plans. I know we had Members on our side, Ranking Member GRAVES and others, who rolled out a plan recently that covers traditional infrastructure, which would be roads and bridges—even broadband, waterways—paid for along the way, not with tax increases but with responsible budgeting.

I wanted to ask because we are hearing different reports on what may or may not come to the House floor. Budget reconciliation, possibly, and tax increases, unfortunately, are still being floated out there, which is different from what we are hearing right now with the bipartisan Senate plan.

Can the gentleman shed light on what is anticipated on the floor, whether it would be a budget reconciliation bill in the weeks or months ahead or maybe a bipartisan plan, which we would surely encourage, laying out some ideas of infrastructure that would be bipartisan that we would support?

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman could answer that, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the gentleman is aware that I am very anxious about doing things in a bipartisan way when that can be achieved.

Now, the majority leader has announced that during the week of June 28, the House will take up the INVEST in America Act, a 5-year surface transportation reauthorization bill that was approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure by a bipartisan vote.

I think the gentleman is aware of the pretty long session, all-night session, that both parties in that committee undertook. I think that they have produced a product that will make these key investments in smart, safe, sustainable, and resilient transportation infrastructure that is needed by the American people to move goods and services throughout our country efficiently, effectively, and equitably. I could not go through this colloquy with the gentleman and not invoke those three words that he is so familiar with.

Now, at the same time, we must remember that our Nation's infrastructure is comprised of far more than roads and bridges. I often talk about the advent of the internet. I could remember when it first came on the scene, everybody referred to the internet as the "information superhighway." I have always advocated that it is time for us to start treating the information highway the same way we treat the interstate highways.

So, I agree with the gentleman that we should move with an infrastructure bill, but I want him to know that I think it is important that the Accessible, Affordable Internet for All Act is a part of that.

I know this debate has been going on as to whether or not we ought to move on a bipartisan bill that focuses on traditional infrastructure. For anything to be traditional, it has to be in our past, but I think it is time for us to be looking to the future when we talk about infrastructure and to have an infrastructure bill come through this body that focuses on the future of healthcare, which cannot be efficient, effective, or equitable without broadband.

Online learning is a must for our children. We know COVID-19, according to all the experts, may not be the last time that we are faced with such a pandemic. There are some predicting that there could come another, maybe not in my lifetime but maybe in yours. We must be prepared.

So, I am hopeful that this infrastructure bill that we move through this body will not just be traditional but will be looking to the future so we can have the kind of legislation that will prepare our children and grandchildren for a world that we hope they will be competitive in.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Hopefully, we can have that debate and work together to achieve that vision for the future as we are dealing with the problems of today and our infrastructure needs for today, but also do it in a fiscally responsible way. I think that is what the two sides, especially in the Senate, are looking at.

I still haven't gotten an indication, specifically, as it deals with some kind of reconciliation bill that may or may not come to the floor. Hopefully, it is not some attempt to raise taxes and do things that would undermine our economy, our competitiveness, and our ability to create more opportunities for people to achieve the American Dream by entering into the workforce and ultimately moving their way up and having their own opportunities as well, which would be undermined with higher taxes.

If that part of the equation gets brought in, clearly, that changes the dynamic. But, hopefully, we stick to the traditional infrastructure needs that you and I would both agree need to be met. Hopefully, we can find a path to get there together. That is what we will be working toward in the week ahead.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has nothing else, I am prepared to yield back.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I don't have anything else. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to stand in here today.

I say to him that I would hope that as we go forward with this discussion, we will look at this whole issue as the title of the bill indicates: Invest in America. When we make investments, financial investments, the money may leave our coffers, but it comes back sometimes tenfold.

So there is a big difference between raising taxes and making investments.

Mr. SCALISE. Hopefully, we can keep that difference in mind.

I appreciate the gentleman filling in, and we will see the gentleman from Maryland back soon enough and maybe even moving a little faster than before. I am not going to challenge him to a race because he would defeat me in that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from South Carolina, and I yield back the balance of my time.

RECOMMITTING ON JUNETEENTH

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1865, freedom finally came for the last enslaved African Americans in the United States when Union soldiers arrived in Galveston, Texas, more than 2 years after President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation.

Today, 156 years later, President Biden will be signing a law to make Juneteenth a new Federal holiday. It is a cause for celebration. It should also serve as an occasion for learning and for this country to reflect on our history and recommit to doing the vital work to ensure that the lasting effects of slavery, bigotry, and racism are replaced with hope, dignity, and equality for all.

We can start with the Senate passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, legislation to reform policing and address systemic racism and bias within law enforcement, and finally making the John Lewis Voting Rights Act a law, passing it.

Today, we celebrate this historic designation of Juneteenth as a Federal holiday. Tomorrow, we get back to work.

BIDEN INFLATION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the hidden tax that is plaguing hardworking Americans. This hidden tax is inflation.

Under President Biden, we have seen the largest spike in 13 years, with consumer prices surging 5 percent in May. Core inflation rose at its fastest pace since 1992.

American families are being forced to pay more for the products that they need. Gasoline is 56.2 percent more expensive today than 12 months ago. Transportation services have increased 11.2 percent. Together, food and energy prices have increased 3.8 percent. Even used cars and truck prices have increased 29.7 percent.

Yet, Democrats rammed through a trillion-dollar package that is crushing small businesses and hurting hardworking American families by incentivizing Americans to stay at home and not get back to work. We are currently down 7.6 million jobs from our pre-pandemic levels. Our inflation is rising because of President Biden's far-left tax-and-spend proposals.

Americans cannot afford the Biden inflation tax. We know wasteful government spending will not solve this crisis, no matter how many times President Biden and the Democrats propose it.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANITA EHLERS

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

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Anita Ehlers, a constituent member of the Barrington, Illinois, community I represent and, more importantly, a friend.

I never knew Anita when she didn't have cancer. But for a long time, I didn't know that she did. She just never let it define who she was.

I knew her as a wonderfully kind, hardworking woman who was committed to making the world a better place.

Our Speaker often reminds us: "We don't agonize. We organize." Every time she says it, I see Anita's face in my head.

I never saw her feel sorry for herself. Every time I was with her, it seemed like all the thoughts in her head were on how to make the world a little better for everybody else: her husband, Gregg; her daughters, Julia and Lindsay; her friends and neighbors; me and all the folks she was motivating.

As a women's marcher, a climate protector, an ally for the LBGT community, a universal health coverage champion, a union member, a teacher, and a lung cancer support advocate, she never agonized. She organized.

The world, and our district, is a sadder place without her. But I take inspiration because she always made our community a better place.

May we all find the strength to follow her example, to make the world around us a little easier for everybody else, no matter the adversity that we may personally face.

1200

PREPARATIONS TO EVACUATE AFGHAN INTERPRETERS

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

Mr. MEIJER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the dire situation of our interpreters in Afghanistan, where we are over halfway through our planned withdrawal. Meanwhile, almost 20,000 Afghans who worked with U.S. forces are anxiously awaiting special immigrant visa approval, a process that can take years. Making matters worse, our Kabul Embassy suspended visa operations last week due to a surge in COVID cases.

Mr. Speaker, President Biden must immediately start preparations to evacuate those Afghans to Guam to safely await visa approval. My colleagues and I on the Honoring our Promises Working Group urged the administration to do so 2 weeks ago, but we have yet to hear back. This is unacceptable.

President Biden ended the remain in Mexico for economic migrants but insists on a remain in Afghanistan policy

for Afghans who risked their lives to help American forces. While they wait, the Taliban are hunting them down. Dozens have already been killed while bureaucrats dither.

We cannot abandon our Afghan allies to die. We must get them to Guam.

ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE AND CLEAN ENERGY

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we cannot unravel infrastructure from climate. As we consider bold new investments in America's infrastructure, our choices will shape our climate future for better or worse.

Failing to address climate pollution and clean energy in our infrastructure work will force future generations of Americans to cover a blank check. And we are already passing on grave and growing costs for our past failures to act.

But let me put this another way: seizing opportunities to tackle climate change in our infrastructure work will help us build legislation that makes America cleaner, safer, and more competitive as a Nation. It will save countless lives and create millions of good American jobs.

If we make climate a priority, our workers will miss fewer days on the job, and our kids will miss fewer days at school. Our local budgets will suffer less strain. Our infrastructure dollars will go farther. The things we build will last longer.

Climate is a growing threat that demands urgent, bold action. And doing nothing about it is doing something, it is condemning the United States to become a weaker, sicker, and poorer Nation. This is our path to choose. Do we allow America to further decline or choose a more sustainable, prosperous, and just future? To me, the decision is clear: Let's move forward.

CRISIS AT THE BORDER

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

Ms. HERRELL. Mr. Speaker, this week I received a letter and these photos, in fact, more photos than just this, from a constituent. The photos were taken on his ranch at 5 a.m. earlier this week from a game camera about 15 miles north of the border.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Russell Johnson dated June 13, 2021, and I would like to read a few excerpts from the letter.

"When President Biden signed the proclamation ending border wall construction, we saw a dramatic increase in illegal foot traffic through our ranch."

I can no longer allow my children to play outside unless an adult is with them to mon-

itor the areas around them. People who have dropped out of groups crossing have stopped at my house wanting to use the phone, WiFi, and call their smuggler. This is very concerning, as often my wife is at home alone with our children, and I am hours away working on the ranch. These people are desperate. And it is only a matter of time before someone gets hurt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the border in New Mexico is not like the other borders in cities around El Paso or the ports of entry, here there is a huge difference.

JUNE 13, 2021.

REPRESENTATIVE HERRELL. My name is Russell Johnson. I am a fourth-generation cattle rancher in southern Luna County. I ranch along side my wife, two children, my father, and my mother. Our ranch borders the international boundary with Mexico for a little over 8 miles. My family has ranched on this same piece of land since 1918. What we are experiencing on the border today is not only a risk to my family, but our state and this nation.

When President Biden signed the proclamation ending border wall construction, we saw a dramatic increase in illegal foot traffic through our ranch. There now exists a gap in the wall that separates the United States from Mexico on our ranch. It is approximately 3/4-mile wide along with a border monument access gate that was not installed leaving a gap about 12 feet wide. Not only did President Biden's proclamation end the construction of the physical barrier, but it also stopped all other infrastructure and technology that was to go with it. Improved access roads for Border Patrol, lighting, sensor technology and camera systems were all part of the project that was abruptly ended. The situation at the border has progressively worsened because of this decision. Talking with local Border Patrol Agents, group size in our area has gone from four to six people in a group, to now being upwards of twenty. This is all crossing and passing through not only my property, but our homes and business.

I can no longer allow my children to play outside unless an adult is with them to monitor the areas around them. People who have dropped out of groups crossing have stopped at my house wanting to use the phone or have access to my Wi-Fi to call their smuggler. This is very concerning as often my wife is at home alone with our children and I am hours away working on the ranch. These people are desperate. It's only a matter of time before our home is broken into.

The increase in traffic is also affecting our business. Much of southern New Mexico is suffering a D4 drought. We are having to supplement our cattle to get to the monsoon season. This hardship is being compounded by the people crossing the border illegally. Currently, we have decent natural grasses in the pasture bordering Mexico. Our cattle are not utilizing this rangeland properly because they are constantly getting spooked by the people crossing. This is pushing them into drier areas with not enough suitable feed for them to consume. The cattle are also susceptible to contracting stress induced illnesses like Pasteurella Pneumonia from constantly being run off. We have experienced this before under similar border conditions. If not treated quickly, cattle can die within 48 hours. We are experiencing this not only on parts of the ranch that border Mexico, but further north as well.

Our day-to-day operations have been negatively impacted. We now try to work in pairs at a minimum. With no cellphone service in our area, it is safer to work with someone with you, so you have somebody to watch your back. This slows our work progress

down and increases the length of time it takes to get tasks down.

On June 4, 2021, my father and I encountered four groups of illegal immigrants on our ranch totaling well over 30 individuals. Border Patrol was able to apprehend all four groups, but they told me something that I found very troubling. They said that there were only eight agents in the field that evening. Deming Border Patrol Station is responsible for the area we live in. The station's area of responsibility includes well over 60 miles of border. Eight agents were expected to cover all of that during their shift. This does not make for a very secure border. Encountering groups crossing and a lack of manpower in the field is becoming the norm. The Patrol Agent in Charge at the Deming Border Patrol Station told us that they are averaging 650 apprehensions a week. These are apprehensions, they do not include the people that are successfully making their illegal entry.

It is important to note that we do not have unaccompanied minors or family groups crossing through our area. They are all young, adult males in good physical shape. All the people I have encountered are wearing full camouflage, to include face coverings and carpet or sponge booties on their feet. These people are not turning themselves in, they do not want to be caught.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time we have experienced issues regarding the border. What differs this time from others is that our government is not trying to do anything to resolve the issue. I feel like as a citizen of this country, I do not matter in the eyes of our government. The State of Texas has declared a state of emergency in many if not all its counties that border Mexico. Texas is doing this because the Federal Government is not addressing the issue. Enough pressure will be put on the Texas border that New Mexico will see an even larger increase in illegal traffic as it will be pushed west. This bothers me greatly.

I am writing you today to make you aware of the situation on the border in our area and to ask for help. Border Patrol manpower is strained, and our local law enforcement is stretched thin. Ideally, the border wall and all infrastructure and technology need completed. In the meantime, we desperately need more boots on the ground to help with this surge in illegal traffic. We also need better cellphone coverage in these remote areas. Not being able to call for law enforcement or emergency service is a huge safety concern. Last, but certainly not least, we need help getting this administration to address the border crisis. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Respectfully,

RUSSELL JOHNSON.

HONORING WILLIAM ALLEN PULLUM

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of William Allen Pullum.

Navarre is a community in my district in Florida that is one of the fastest growing. It is vibrant, full of warfighters, workers, and lovely people. Bill Pullum is the father of Navarre.

He was born in 1947 and lived most of his life in this community. He joined the Army in 1967 as an Army helicopter

pilot and earned the Silver and Bronze Stars, as well as two Distinguished Flying Crosses in Vietnam before being honorably discharged in 1970.

He was involved in every aspect of life from real estate to business development, chambers of commerce, Kiwanis Clubs. There was hardly a cause in Navarre that Bill Pullum and his family did not support.

He was dedicated as a family member, a husband, a father, and was instrumental in mission work in Honduras throughout his life.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the late Bill Pullum for his life of service to our country and to the community in my district.

RECOGNIZING DICKINSON HIGH SCHOOL SOFTBALL CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 5, the Dickinson High School girls softball team capped off an extraordinary season by winning the North Dakota Class A State Championship.

Dickinson had 13 hits, and Mataya Mortensen's dominant pitching performance led to the team's first-ever State title. Dickinson's 10-0 win was their 30th in 33 games. Mortensen surrendered only two hits in the shutout. And senior Paige Balliet ended the game with a walk-off double to trigger the 10-run run.

Dickinson finished the season with 30 and 3. They had 487 hits, 110 doubles, 19 triples, and 51 home runs. Their team batting average was .464, and they averaged 14.5 runs a game, contrasted with a team ERA of 1.42 and 250 strikeouts in 196 innings.

Both Taya Hoplauf and Jenna Decker were named to the all-State team, and Coach Amanda Mickey was named coach of the year.

Congratulations to the entire team on a great year, especially Paige Balliet and Madison McChesney.

HONORING DR. STEPHEN PRESCOTT

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

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of the late Dr. Stephen Prescott, former Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation president.

Dr. Prescott served OMRF with outstanding leadership for 15 years, building the institution into what it is today. He dedicated his life to a scientific career, immersed in medical research, and loved traveling the world, often in conjunction with his professional commitments. But what he loved more than anything was his wife of 52 years, Susan, his two children and grandchildren.

During his time at OMRF, Dr. Prescott oversaw the largest campus expansion in the foundation's history, making the facility one of only 11 Autoimmunity Centers of Excellence in the United States.

Throughout his career, he received numerous awards, authored more than 250 scientific articles, served on the NIH, and even founded a biotech company. As a direct result of his many years of hard work and accomplishments, he was inducted into the Oklahoma Hall of Fame in 2020.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Prescott made an immense impact on OMRF, and as a result, the lives of thousands of Oklahomans. As a leading facility for health research, I want Americans to know how instrumental his role was in creating a facility where researchers are working hard to understand and develop new treatments for diseases like cancer, heart disease, and aging.

I am honored to recognize Dr. Prescott, and I am grateful for the profound impact he has had on my district and far beyond. He will be greatly missed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RAYMOND TRUJILLO

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

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Raymond Trujillo, a patriotic American, a United States marine, and a dutiful officer in Collier County, Florida. He tragically passed away in May at the age of 56 years old.

Raymond dedicated his life to giving back through service. He joined the United States Marine Corps as a teenager. Devoted to the Marine Corps creed, *semper fidelis*, Raymond spent 17 years in the military proudly serving our Nation.

Upon his exit from the military, Raymond continued his service in his community by becoming a police officer with the Collier County Sheriff's office, to which he would serve the Collier County community for more than 20 years.

Alongside his brothers and sisters in blue, Raymond protected the Collier County community for more than 20 years. For years, he worked in the Youth Relations Bureau helping to mold and shape the children of today and the future leaders of tomorrow.

Growing up in California, Raymond was a lifelong Oakland Raiders fan and loved the game of football, so much so he spent his spare time coaching youth football.

In a moment of history where police officers are vilified, hated, and looked down upon, Raymond Trujillo wore the badge with honor, dignity, and respect.

Raymond was a proud father to three sons, Raymond III, Alexander, and Jason, and a loving grandfather of three, who were his pride and joy.

My prayers are with his fellow marines, his brothers and sisters in blue, and his family.

As the Representative of Florida's 19th Congressional District, it is an honor to stand here today celebrating the life of an American patriot who dedicated his life to a simple, yet so often forgotten creed: Service above Self.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF OTTO WARMBIER

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

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Otto Frederick Warmbier as we approach the fourth anniversary of his tragic death on June 19, 2017.

Otto was a kind and studious young man, raised in Ohio, was salutatorian of his high school and attended the University of Virginia. At the age of 22, he was imprisoned and tortured by the North Korean regime following a school tour in 2015 and died a few days after he was released.

Mr. Warmbier experienced what no American or human being should ever have to go through. The United States will not back down from holding the North Korean regime accountable for human rights abuses.

As one of the first Korean-American women to serve in Congress and a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I will continue to do my part to advocate for global human rights and hold violators accountable.

We remember and honor Otto, always.

RECENT UPTICK IN INFLATION IN OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to note with great alarm the recent uptick in inflation in our country.

Last month, the Consumer Price Index rose over 5 percent, which is over 2½ times the Fed's target rate for inflation in our country.

The price of lumber—although, thankfully, it has declined the last week—is still over three times what it was just a few months ago. The price of fuel is over 50 percent higher. And that mirrors the price of many commodities from corn to soybeans.

This is alarming, not just from a macroeconomic standpoint, but most importantly, from the standpoint of the constituents we represent. The Members of this Chamber might be able to afford to spend 50 percent more to fill the tank of their car, but unfortunately, many of the people we represent cannot. And that burden of inflation is an unseen tax on the least advantaged members of our society, the members of the lower class, and the working poor.

Economists tell us that this uptick in inflation is directly related to the

spending policies of our government, and we need to get our fiscal house in order to prevent this in the future.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUCHINCLOSS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

□ 1215

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL SAMUEL LOMBARDO

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the life of Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Lombardo.

Sam and his family legally immigrated to the United States from Italy. He enlisted to serve in the Army National Guard's 28th Infantry Division just 1 month following the start of World War II.

After training, he was deployed to Europe where he would serve as platoon leader and executive officer of I Company, 394th Infantry Regiment, 99th Division, and he would always remind constituents in northwest Florida that he fought in the Battle of the Bulge.

During this time, Lieutenant Colonel Lombardo and his platoon created their own makeshift flag out of scraps of red and blue cloth. For the white, they used German surrender flags. They used this as their battle flag in victorious campaigns across the Rhine and Danube Rivers.

Following World War II, Lieutenant Colonel Lombardo continued his service to our country in Korea and Vietnam.

Throughout his service, Lieutenant Colonel Lombardo earned the Silver Star, the Bronze Star with "V" for Valor, as well as an Oak Leaf Cluster with Meritorious Achievement among 10 other medals.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the late Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Lombardo.

I asked Sam how he was able to be so healthy after more than 100 years living on the planet Earth. He said that his secret was red wine and almonds at night. I think I will have a little of both in his honor this evening.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

RECOGNIZING MUSCATINE HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a high school in my district that was recently recognized for their commitment to student success.

For over 15 years, Iowa has partnered with the ACT's college application campaign to increase the number of first-generation college students and students from low-income households in applying for and pursuing higher education.

I am proud to announce that, in 2020, 176 Iowa schools participated in the college application campaign, and all together, 504 students completed 1,578 college applications. Of the 176 schools that participated, Muscatine High School in my district was awarded the 2020 School of Excellence Award for Iowa from ACT. Muscatine was selected for this great award based on their commitment to student success and for serving as an exemplary model for Iowa's college application campaign.

Congratulations to the students and faculty at Muscatine for being leaders in academic achievement and for serving as a great role model for student success in Iowa and the entire Nation.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is wonderful to hear that about Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

NEW SPENDING INITIATIVES

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GOHMERT for yielding to me.

For anyone who is not particularly familiar, we have sort of mechanisms. Last night, we were running late, and once we hit 10 o'clock, we were shut off. And trying to do 21 boards in 8 minutes, I apologize to those who have to try to take our words down.

But I wanted to just touch on a couple of things. One really quickly, we were just blessed to have Secretary Yellen in front of Ways and Means. I have tremendous respect for and have built a relationship with her when she was Federal Reserve Chair.

I want us all to pay attention to a promise that the Secretary and the President have made, and that is the new spending initiatives will be covered by the new taxes, the new revenues. I assume that is an honorable way to do it. We will fight over what the spending priorities are, and none of these games where we are going to do 15 years of tax hikes to cover 10 years of spending because, let's be honest, that is a complete fraud on the American people.

But the best math that is coming out from a number of groups right now is the tax hikes that are being proposed, the revenues, are only going to cover maybe, if you are being optimistic, Mr. Speaker, on the receipts, 50 percent of the new spending.

Yesterday, I think it is Penn Wharton that put out their model, I guess last week, that the capital gains tax itself loses \$33 billion over the first 10 years. So, it is not scored to 15 years; it is 10.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you do what is called the basis, which is how much is subject to the capital gains tax even though the perversity of it is that a huge portion of that is actually inflation we are going to tax, it would raise, in their model, \$133 billion. The administration, the Democrats, have said this will be 330. So, they are only hitting about one-third of the revenues that have been promised from the capital gains tax.

I really want to help the Democrats keep their promise that their new \$4 trillion proposed spending will be covered by their new receipts, their new revenues. They have a really interesting math problem. Either they are going to have to cut their spending substantially in half or dramatically raise taxes on the American people.

We asked Secretary Yellen: Should we expect a value-added tax? Is a VAT in our future?

The math is really ugly—we are going to talk about that in a second here—to cover all these new spending initiatives plus just the demographic curve that is already about to crush us, debtwise.

The answer was an interesting one. It is: Well, that is not part of our current proposal.

For everyone who is interested in tax policy—and I accept that maybe some of us are a little bit on the geek side—I am fascinated with the tax on Medicare financing. Keep an ear out because the only way I think the left is going to get these types of revenues is to actually go to completely new revenue-raising, new tax regimes.

Let's talk about what I consider is the greatest fragility of our Nation's future. It turns out it is not Republican or Democrat policy. It is demographics.

What is the fastest growing demographic in the United States? It is getting old. We are graying very, very fast. It is baby boomers.

When you look at this chart—and we did this last night, but we did it sort of caffeinated, very fast—take the next 30 years. This is without all the new spending that has been proposed this year by the new administration. This is our baseline, \$101 trillion of debt in 30 years at today's dollars. This is inflation-adjusted dollars, 67 percent.

Functionally, \$68 trillion of debt is just Medicare. Only about \$3 trillion is the rest of government, so it is Medicare, then Social Security.

If you believe, Mr. Speaker, like I do, that we have an absolute moral obligation to keep our promises to those folks who have paid into Social Security and Medicare, then what are we going to do to keep that promise?

The reality of it is that this is what buries us as a country. It is our demographics and the promises that are dramatically unfunded. Remember, Mr. Speaker, it is only maybe 4 years or so that the Medicare trust fund—which is only part A, which is the hospital portion—that trust fund is gone.

Part B is actually seeing a doctor. Part C is managed care. That has its own little, in some ways, financial benefits. And D is drugs. Parts B and D are 100 percent out of the general fund. They don't have trust funds.

This is absolutely critical. This will drive all government policy. If you are someone who wants money for education, if you are someone who wants money for the environment or our military, then the fact of the matter is it is Medicare that consumes us.

One of my great frustrations is when you look at the math of how much is spending, Mr. Speaker, and then the financing of that spending, you get a sense that, as Republicans, we have this bad habit. We will go and say: Well, we will balance the budget through waste and fraud.

Democrats will go and say: Well, we are going to balance it by nationalizing healthcare, Medicare for All.

None of those are real. We are not telling the truth.

Let's walk through just a couple of things that are in my craw right now. This is just one portion of the left's bill called H.R. 3. From a conceptual standpoint, it is an honest debate of what are we going to do about prescription drug costs.

The methodology, though, Mr. Speaker, if you actually read the research, in a decade, it is killing people and costing more because we are on the cusp of a time of miracles.

This is really important to get our heads around. We have all heard about this concept of mRNA. We have talked about it for 20-plus years. Years ago, I used to come to this mike and talk about this concept of bio-foundry.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, we can take a snippet of your DNA and a snippet of your cancer, your disease, or your virus, and it would take weeks. And for the CAR-T therapy for cancer, it was \$350,000 just to get you your shot, but it was curing people. We just moved up 10 years in technology.

That is one of the amazing things Operation Warp Speed. It is actually one of the few positive things I can say that came out of this pandemic is it is here.

Look up Tesla and mRNA, Mr. Speaker. You find out that all sorts of very disruptive companies are investing in these little bio-foundries.

We are on the edge of curing HIV, sickle cell anemia. We now have a cure for hemophilia. And we are also going to cure all sorts of cancers. There are some amazing things happening. The problem is they are expensive, Mr. Speaker. But they cure you.

H.R. 3 does something that I think is fairly dark and fairly sinister, and we need our brothers and sisters on the Democrat side to be honest with constituents, and that is something called reference pricing. If a quality year is bought through a drug, but it costs more than, in this case, \$37,000 in Great Britain, Mr. Speaker, you don't get it.

H.R. 3 does this where they take a basket of some of these countries and say that we are going to use their cap. So, you are prepared to turn to your constituent and say: Oh, that drug is \$40,000. Yes, it gives you that quality year, but it is over our cap, so we are not going to provide you that pharmaceutical.

By doing that, we just destroyed small, disruptive bio-foundry pharma that is curing people. We are going to subject our population to say that the misery you have today is the misery

you are going to have tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, because we are going to shut down the disruption. We are going to protect—here is the sinister thing that healthcare economists talk about. The Democrats' H.R. 3 actually protects Big Pharma because the industry now becomes you just adjust your current patent, and that is how you make a living, Mr. Speaker.

But the ones that nip their heels that cure things, it is like the hepatitis C we cure now. Those cures don't come because we have just wiped out the income stream.

We need to rethink. If Republicans and Democrats have a common goal that we need to look at pharmaceutical costs, then destroying the pipeline that cures people and that ends the misery is really dark.

Mr. Speaker, we Republicans have our sins. How many of us will get behind a microphone and talk about price transparency? Price transparency is a really good thing, but it has almost no real effect on the price of healthcare. The best academic studies we have been able to find in our office is 0.1 to 0.7 percent.

My point is really simple here. The ACA, ObamaCare, was a financing bill. It was who got subsidized and who had to pay. Our Republican alternative was a financing bill. It was who had to pay and who got subsidized. Medicare for All is a financing bill.

When are we going to have the really tougher discussion of what we pay? Let's disrupt the price of healthcare through technology.

How many of us went to Blockbuster Video last weekend? We don't because now we hit a button called Netflix and all sorts of other things. We allow disruption to happen in other parts of our healthcare, but we have built so many regulatory barriers and so many licensing barriers, crazy things that would disrupt healthcare.

One of my grand proposals—and this one needs to be Republicans and Democrats coming together—that \$68 trillion over the next 30 years in just Medicare spending, that is a substantial driver for U.S. sovereign debt. Thirty-one percent of it is just diabetes.

It turns out, Mr. Speaker, if you and I can have a revolution in ending the misery of diabetes, it is also the single biggest initiative you can have to U.S. sovereign debt.

It is time Republicans and Democrats come together and do an Operation Warp Speed on diabetes. Yes, there is really neat research that is on the cusp of almost curatives for type 1, the autoimmune pancreatic cells. But the political side is going to be really tough for all of us because we are going to have to talk about type 2, which has a substantial lifestyle component in it. It needs a discussion of what we do in nutrition support as a country and what we do in our farm bill as a country.

Mr. Speaker, if we care about people, if we really are going to come here and

give speeches about how minority communities and my Native American communities from Arizona had such horrible outcomes during COVID, are you willing to look at the comorbidities that were there before COVID? It is diabetes.

□ 1230

And it turns out, spending money on this management curative—and I really want curative—turns out to be one of the most powerful things you and I could ever do for U.S. sovereign debt going forward. It is 31 percent of just Medicare spending, and the numbers we are still working on for Medicaid and other things.

So part of my other proposal is there are things we could do almost overnight that have incredible impacts on the cost of healthcare in this country; and here is one that I beg of us to start getting in our lexicon.

Sixteen percent of the healthcare spending this year, over half a trillion dollars, just this year, will be people not taking their meds or taking them incorrectly. You have hypertension, you don't take your meds, you have a stroke. You have high cholesterol, you don't take your meds—and those things are cheap and inexpensive. Grandma is forgetful, or we get busy in our lives.

And it turns out there are things where the pill top talks to your phone. It talks to you. There are other ones where it dispenses the pharmaceuticals to you.

It turns out the technology of getting people to take their pharmaceuticals properly, if we would understand its impact, that is 16 percent of U.S. healthcare spending is just not taking our pharmaceuticals properly. That is a half a trillion dollars.

Think about what you could do with a half a trillion dollars a year—not over 10, not over 15; a year—and how much less misery you would have in this country by people having strokes, getting sick.

This is not a revolution of trying to crush pharma or go after drug prices. It is actually taking a look and using this crazy thing we call, oh, yeah, math, and a calculator, and also technology.

And, yes, it doesn't work necessarily in our political lexicon. It is a little harder to campaign on, but it happens to be factual.

The other thing I am going to beg of us—and Congressman GOHMERT, I appreciate him yielding to me. So I promise I will only do one or two more boards.

I need us to think revolutionary. Before the pandemic, a Democratic colleague, MIKE THOMPSON, from California, a good guy, has worked with me on telemedicine. It was a piece of legislation that substantially was going to go nowhere because there were lots and lots and lots and lots of lobbyists who hated it because it disrupts the money.

But when the pandemic hit, our telemedicine bill became law. It expires

when they declare the pandemic over. The expansion of reimbursement and access to telemedicine goes away. We need to fix that.

But we also now need to understand what is telemedicine. Telemedicine is the thing you can wear on your wrist; the thing you can wear on your chest; the thing you blow into.

The technology is here to crash the price of healthcare. And all the skeptics who attacked telemedicine before the pandemic, oh Grandma's not going to be able to use; they don't know how to work FaceTime; no one is going to want to make a phone call to a doctor or a healthcare professional.

Turns out they were wrong. We have the last 18 months of proof. The satisfaction rates are off the chart. A, we need to continue it, but we need to expand the definition.

And then the other things the pandemic has brought us is things we never thought of.

How about a little home kit?

These are available today. Actually, you can get them sent to your house in a day. Blow into it. It tells you if you have COVID-19.

Well, if that exists for COVID, what would happen if I turned to you and said, turns out we have the technology today where you can have a medical lab in your medicine cabinet. You blow into it, it tells you if you even have cancer cells or a virus or bacteria. It exists today.

We, as a body, need to legalize the disruptive technologies that allow us to disrupt the price of healthcare if we are going to save Medicare, save the country from the crushing debt. And, yes, we are going to annoy a lot of incumbent investors and a lot of incumbent businesses, but it is the right and moral thing to do.

We have a society that has become a country of oligopolies, and Congress has become a protection racket. We protect incumbents; not incumbent elected officials, incumbent business models.

Yet the disruption of the technology that is here today crushes the misery of so many of our brothers and sisters out there who have chronic conditions, that get sick.

We can crash the price of healthcare. We can make us healthier as a society. We can take on, in that same breath, the crushing debt that is here. And it is demographic. It is coming. No matter how many speeches we give pretending we have a way around it, the only way around it is we have got to change the actual price of healthcare.

I beg of us, we need to think differently because this place, often our policy sets, sort of sounds like it is still the 1990s.

Mr. GOHMERT. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Oh, I would love to yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. SCHWEIKERT's ongoing analyses of the way we mismanage money

around Washington, D.C. And I was reading about proposals to go after the billionaires, the mega-rich, and I recall what Ronald Reagan's economist, economic adviser, Arthur Laffer, had said. Dr. Laffer said—he told a small group of us years ago—if you want to produce money—of course, I am asking you this because I have such great respect for your monetary analyses.

If you want to go after money, you want to produce tax revenue, the one place you will never get it is going after the super-rich because they are the only people in America who have the wherewithal to avoid whatever tax you put on them.

What is your thought about that analysis?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I have actually been blessed to spend lots of time with Professor Laffer and, actually, a couple of other folks who also have Nobel Prizes in economics. They tolerate me.

Gilder, I consider a personal friend, if you really want to geek out.

First off, you have a conceptual problem and the left doesn't—we have got to work with them to first admit we tax income. Property taxes are really the only things we tax wealth. We tax your real estate wealth.

So the leaked IRS data, which is a real problem if you want confidence in a tax system that, once again, the IRS is back to being weaponized. If you want to tax wealth, that is a different tax system, and there are all sorts of games you can play with that.

You could take your wealth and say, all right, here is what I am going to do. I am not going to take an income. I am going to borrow from it.

So how do you tax it?

You have to conceptualize very, very different.

We also—we actually have the math, even though it may not happen in the fiscal year you want it to. The ultrawealthy give away most of their wealth. That has been a tradition in this country, particularly for about a century and a half.

A tax system to work—and the gentleman and I have actually had a side conversation about this. You have to find what is the most—or the least disruptive tax that maximizes revenue, but also maximizes economic expansion. So we are already seeing some data that the Democrats' proposal on capital gains tax, actually, without changing the basis, actually raises substantially less revenues.

Now how is that possible?

It is because you stop engaging in those economic activities.

So somewhere there is a sweet spot that maximizes revenues, but also then maximizes economic activity. And I have an absolute fixation that 2018, 2019 were miracle years economically for the working poor in this country. It is 2 years where, actually, income inequality genuinely shrank; the broad based nature of the working poor getting dramatically less poor.

That shouldn't be a partisan fight. It should be the bipartisan goal.

And the rich got richer, but not as fast as the poor got less poor. And that is back to, in a weird way, a long answer to your question.

We need to have an honest debate of what maximizes revenues while minimizing economic damage. And right now, just throwing out numbers, and then throwing out fake—and I am being a little brutal on that—fake models from the administration saying we are going to raise \$4 trillion, we are going to cover all of our new spending, when all of the other models—and very soon joint tax will score it and we will see what the reality is.

But everyone it is scoring right now, the Dems are only getting about half the revenues. And we have already seen the first analysis of the corporate tax hike. It unemploys 1 million Americans in the first 24 months.

Mr. GOHMERT. That would be people who would pay income tax if they didn't lose their jobs.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. That didn't lose their jobs. And the harder part of the scoring is—and this was one of the miracles of 2018 and 2019—the Democrats repeatedly attacked the tax reforms from the end of 2017 and the regulatory reforms.

But there were so many people working, and there was such vitality in the economy that Medicare part A, the trust fund, grew in years. Social Security grew in years because there were so many people paying their payroll tax.

They didn't really pay income tax because they were part of the population that had been removed from having to pay income tax because we changed—but it turns out, if you actually, truly believe we have a societal obligation to keep our promises, to keep Social Security, to keep Medicare vibrant, it turns out you need an incredibly vibrant economy for people to be working. You can do that also by a rational tax policy instead of a punishing one.

Mr. GOHMERT. I know you would have—

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I am sorry; it is a long answer, but it actually has—

Mr. GOHMERT. No, no. I appreciate my friend from Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT's excellent analysis, because we do want to have a vibrant economy. As the saying goes, it lifts all boats. And I really appreciate the analysis on where the Medicare spending is going. That is something we need to deal with.

I hear solutions of throwing money at the problem, but the real problem is we don't have the proper money to throw at it because the economy is not doing as it should.

And then I still hear our friends talk about the need to stop climate change. Unfortunately, the climate has been changing since the Earth ever appeared. And I have got a lot of friends out there. And I say friends facetiously. People on the left—I am beginning to understand that sarcasm is a tool that is appreciated by the intelligent. So the left, the alt-left, they don't get it.

But this is an article from Ethan Hunt back in August of 2019. It says: NASA admits that climate change occurs because of changes in Earth's solar orbit; not because of SUVs and fossil fuel.

Well, it really can be a combination of things. But having found out from the former NASA Director that the Moon's orbit is slightly changing and the Earth's orbit is slightly changing and, as the term was, it is becoming more squashed, well, that would mean there are times when we are closer to the Sun and we are further away from the Sun.

And I know there are some leftists at NASA that said: Oh, no, changing Earth's orbit doesn't affect our climate at all.

And I would humbly submit that you don't have to be a rocket scientist to understand that if you get closer to the Sun, or if you get further away from the Sun, it is absolutely going to affect your climate; just as more solar activity, more solar flares, they are going to affect our climate. And there is not a lot that we can do about more solar flares, solar activities, solar hot spots.

And I would sarcastically ask a question regarding the Bureau of Land Management and National Forest Service, since they were going to be spending so much time on climate change, and we had heard the Earth's orbit was changing slightly and the Moon's orbit was changing slightly.

Could they do anything about that?

□ 1245

For those who thought I was really challenging BLM, the Bureau of Land Management and the National Forest Service, like they were going to do something about the Earth's orbit, the National Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, they are not going to do anything about the Earth's orbit because they can't. That is not their job.

Although there is some professor that thinks we might could adjust our orbit, I think that is still yet to be arrived at scientifically. It is an interesting concept, but I had no belief that it was about to happen by the Bureau of Land Management and National Forest Service.

It is interesting to look back. I missed this article back in 2019. It goes into much more detail about not only the changing orbit but the changing tilt from time to time.

Then if you do more digging, you find out that actually, going back millions—some say 56 million; some say billions—that the planet was much hotter, and the planet's orbit was closer to the Sun. It has moved back some, according to some, over the millions or billions, whatever you believe, number of years.

I also want to mention this article from The Washington Times, June 16, 2021, Stephen Dinan, about "Smartphone smugglers: How social media is reshaping border crime." It is

really intriguing. The author does an amazing job of pulling these things together.

It is interesting. The drug cartels south of our border, apparently, we are informed, have workers in every city in America. Of course, we have heard before that the Border Patrol, ICE, the U.S. Government is considered to be the logistics for the multibillion-dollar drug cartels in Mexico because the drug cartels get them across illegally into the United States. And I have seen people in the middle of the night, as they are being processed by the Border Patrol, long lines of people. I have watched them comparing addresses and sometimes switching addresses.

They are the addresses that the drug cartels have given them as to where the drug cartels want them to go work in order to earn enough money, either drug trafficking, sex trafficking, or human trafficking, to pay off the rest of their debt to the drug cartels for getting them into the United States illegally. Many times, it is the U.S. Government, which means U.S. taxpayers, that end up paying to send the drug cartels' employees, or indentured servants, to the cities where the drug cartels want them.

It is incredible that we, as a U.S. Government, are helping the drug cartels in Mexico make the tens of billions of dollars that they use to keep different levels of government corrupt in Mexico, that keep the Mexican people from having the economy that would allow them to have across-the-board wonderful homes, have wonderful jobs, and be one of the top economies in the world. The corruption of the drug cartels keeps Mexico from having their true place in the top economies in the world.

They have some of the hardest-working people in the world. They have incredible natural resources, a fantastic location—actually, better than the U.S. because they are between North and South America, and they are between the Pacific and the Atlantic. Incredible location, hardworking people, great natural resources, good ports, but the corruption that the American people are funding through their U.S. Government and through the purchase of drugs that are massively coming into this country—if somebody truly has compassion for the people of Mexico and Central America, they would demand that our southern border be secured, that we continue to provide visas in greater numbers than any country in the world, but we secure the border so that we cut the tens of billions of dollars from flowing to the drug cartels that then corrupt and destroy lives, kill Americans with fentanyl and other drugs that are pouring into our country. And the Mexican people would come to the United States on vacation to spend the significant, wonderful money they had earned without fear of the drug cartels and what they will do to them if they are not subservient.

There was a time in Mexico when people who were wealthy knew the drug cartels would normally leave them alone. There was a time in Mexico when the drug cartels basically had a wink-and-nod agreement: Look, we won't have attacks in tourist attractions because we know how important that money is.

Well, all of those days are gone. If we were really a compassionate neighbor, we would secure our border. We would stop drawing off people with the potential to be the best citizens that Guatemala, Mexico, other countries have, drawing them up here because of the corruption below our border that we in the U.S. Government are helping fund.

It really needs to stop. But it is getting worse, much, much worse, as we are seeing numbers that no one has seen in many, many years.

There has been so much appropriate concern about January 6 and what happened that day. Unfortunately, we don't know all that happened that day. There are some major questions that need to be answered.

We know that the former chief of the Capitol Police testified that they got no intelligence from the FBI about potential violence on January 6. There were lots of stories about people who were here at the Capitol on January 6 that may have carried a Confederate flag, may have had red on and MAGA or Trump.

But the Capitol Police had told me the day before: Hey, we have heard there are going to be people who hate Trump that are going to be trying to blend in, and there is going to be violence, and we are concerned about it.

But the chief of the Capitol Police said they got no intel like that from the FBI.

An article a few days ago from Revolver says: "Unindicted Co-Conspirators in the January 6 Cases Raise Disturbing Questions of Federal Foreknowledge." That is June 14. I saw my friend Tucker Carlson covered this last night.

But this is really disturbing, and this is something that I know from my time here in Congress has disturbed Democrats and Republicans alike across the aisle because we don't like to see government agents stirring up trouble or find that there are criminal acts that would not likely have occurred had not the Federal Government been participating, whether they were actual agents or undercover agents or informants that were working for the Federal Government.

But this is scary stuff. This is kind of third-world stuff. This is not only third-world stuff, but this is like Putin kind of activity.

If there were Federal agents that were involved on January 6, we really need to know what the FBI knew and when they knew it. Not only that, we need to know how much participation did any of our Federal friends, either at DOJ, FBI, or any of the intel community, what kind of role were they playing.

There is information that came out about the effort to kidnap the Michigan Governor, and it has been said that there were Federal agents that were involved in that. It would seem, if you have 14 people that are involved in a conspiracy to commit a crime, and over a third of them, including people in leadership, are Federal agents, undercover agents, or people that are working for a Federal entity, that we have got some serious problems, and we have not done adequate oversight.

It disturbs me greatly that there was not more information forthcoming from our Federal law enforcement intelligence, DOJ, than was received here on Capitol Hill because, surely, if they had known the level of planning by a small group to actually commit violence and break into our U.S. Capitol, they would have been better prepared.

I know some of us have had extreme differences with the Speaker, but I just feel sure if she had known the level of violence that was being talked about and planned and monitored by DOJ and FBI, surely she would not have allowed the Sergeant at Arms to turn down National Guard support on January 6.

This article pulls from documents, legal documents, that have been filed by the Federal Government in some of these different cases. This article says: "To address the matter directly in the following three questions: In the year leading up to January 6 and during January 6 itself, to what extent were the three primary militia groups—the Oath Keepers, the Proud Boys, and the Three Percenters—that the FBI, DOJ, Pentagon, and network news have labeled most responsible for planning and executing a Capitol attack on January 6 infiltrated by agencies of the Federal Government, or informants of said agencies?"

Question 2: "Exactly how many Federal undercover agents or confidential informants were present at the Capitol or in the Capitol during the infamous 'siege,' and what roles did they play—merely passive informants or active instigators?"

And, third: "Finally, of all of the unindicted co-conspirators referenced in the charging documents," the official Federal pleadings, "of those indicted for crimes on January 6, how many worked as a confidential informant or as an undercover operative for the Federal Government—FBI, Army Counterintelligence, et cetera?"

□ 1300

"If the narrative about January 6 does not conform to the questions above, the American people will never learn the most important truth about what January 6 is, and what kind of country they're really living in.

"If it turns out the Federal Government did in fact have undercover agents or confidential informants embedded within the so-called militia groups indicted for conspiring to obstruct the Senate certification on January 6, the implications would be nothing

short of seismic. Especially if such agents or informants enjoyed extremely senior-level positions within such groups."

And the thing is, like I said, they have got documentation, the Federal pleadings that the United States Government has filed in some of these cases, that really raised serious issues. Yeah, there is no question, there were radical groups there, and those three seem to be the most prominent. But from the pleadings from the Department of Justice itself, it appears that they had significant presence and participation in what went on.

We do need to see the 14,000 hours of security video, seeing Ashli Babbitt killed by an officer standing off to the side. There were officers in front of the window, but then there were officers on the other side where Ashli was; and it appeared it was John Sullivan, a Trump hater, that told them if they will move out of the way they won't get hurt, and the officers appeared. Well, they moved out of the way, and these guys broke through the glass.

And yet with all of the people that the FBI has sought information on and put up pictures—and it appears they were probably wearing masks, but there is another 14,000 hours of video. These guys were around in the Capitol, around the Capitol. They didn't have their masks up at all times. But it doesn't appear that the FBI has asked for assistance in identifying those people that broke through the glass or that were right there, at least when Ashli was shot in the neck and killed.

And that normally means if they are not asking for help in identifying somebody that they know who they are—and maybe they are person 1, person 2, person 3, person 15—that are referred to in the pleadings of people that were working with the FBI or Federal authorities of some kind.

But this is very unsettling stuff. It was bad enough to have our Capitol attacked. As a former felony judge, I would have no problem sending people to prison that broke into this Capitol, that literally broke in or that did damage or that stole things here. There is no place for that, and they do need to be severely punished.

But were some of those people doing those things working for the FBI? Were they egged on by Federal authorities? Because it sure looks like from some of these legal documents they filed and the masking of names and referring to them as something other than their real names that we have a serious problem with some of the people that were involved that day that it appears were either working for Federal authorities or were informants for Federal authorities and had leadership positions in those groups and quite possibly, in some cases probably, helped to egg them on.

This article says in many cases the unindicted co-conspirators appear to be much more aggressive and egregious participants in the very so-called con-

spiracy, serving as the basis for charging those indicted. The question immediately arises as to why this is the case and forces us to consider whether certain individuals are being protected from indictment because they were involved in January 6 as undercover operatives or confidential informants for a Federal agency.

So another place further on in the article it points out: "This would be far worse than the already bad situation of the government knowing about the possibility of violence and doing nothing. Instead, this would imply that elements of the federal government were active instigators in the most egregious and spectacular aspects of January 6, amounting to a monumental entrapment scheme used as a pretext to imprison otherwise harmless protesters at the Capitol—and in a much larger sense used to frame the entire MAGA movement as potential domestic terrorists."

There is so much more. Let's see, further on, I guess this is page 8/26. "In one of the plot's climactic scenes, in the main van driving up to look at Governor Whitmer's vacation home"—and that is of course the plot to kidnap the Governor—"three out of the five people in the van—60 percent of the plot's senior leaders—were Federal agents and informants."

"FBI infiltrators comprised, at the very least"—talking about overall in that plot—"26 percent of the plotters. That is, at least five FBI operatives have been disclosed, against just 14 suspects indicted."

So looking at some of the pleadings by the DOJ themselves, but just to give an idea of what we are dealing with, it says, "On December 30, 2020, Watkins and Caldwell exchanged the following text messages:

"Watkins: Looks like we are green light to come to D.C. on the 6th. The rally point still at your place?"

"Caldwell: Not that I am aware. Have been contacted by no one. Typical (Person one). Here's the rub: (Person two) and I will be in a hotel within striking distance of the city starting on the 4th, so we won't even be here. There will be some stuff going on during the 5th, and we want to be a part of that whenever it shakes out."

Person one and person two were apparently working for the Federal authorities, some Federal agency.

Another place it references person two, person three, person one, and they seem to be significant leaders in what is going on.

Another place: Person three—emailed person three several maps along with the message. These maps will get you from the hotel into D.C.

I mean, person 10 checked into the Hilton Garden Inn in Vienna.

Person three, another reference.

Person 15 and person 20 are referenced.

These are people that they are covering up their names because they are working for the Federal authorities.

If you look at some of the video on January 6, there were a lot of people walking around. They had no business being in the Capitol. But it is quite concerning that people that were extremely active at all should have been or were working for Federal entities such that they have to cover up their names because of their complicity with the Federal authorities during that day.

So that is United States versus Caldwell, Crowl, and then there is one Government's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration of Detention.

They are holding some of these people still. Some with 23 hours, 24 hours a day in solitary. Some were just walking around, they did no damage. They should not have come into the Capitol, but it remains to be seen why the government has their stinger out so much for people no matter how mild their participation on January 6.

And yet the biggest damage done to the United States in protests was last summer, and those folks aren't being treated the same way that others are.

So there are some very serious questions that need to be answered. We do need the answers. We need to know how many Federal agents; how many informants had given information to Federal agencies and why in the world all of that information was not provided to people that needed to protect Capitol Hill.

So we need an investigation. We don't need one that has an entire Democrat staff. It needs to be truly bipartisan to get to the bottom of just what happened that day and who caused it to happen.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

SERVICE BEFORE SELF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

(Ms. SLOTKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about service by recognizing individuals and organizations who have stepped up when their fellow citizens needed them most. Through their actions, they have shown what it means to put others before self.

DR. SATURNINO RODRIGUEZ

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I begin by rising today to honor Dr. Saturnino Rodriguez, a good friend and devoted servant of the Latino community in Lansing.

Over the years, Dr. Rodriguez, or Nino as he is known around town, has had many titles. In each role, he has left a profound impact on the students, faculty, parents, and community residents that call greater Lansing home.

Dr. Rodriguez has spent his entire professional life working in schools—

first in Peru, then in Grand Rapids, and then Lansing, where he has worked tirelessly for the past 50 years to improve the lives of children through education. His career has taken him from being a counselor at C.W. Otto Junior High, an assistant principal at Gardner Junior High and Eastern High School, principal at Pattengill Middle School, and finally as deputy superintendent of the entire school district.

He was an innovator in the classroom, developing a clustered teaching approach that is still being used today. In addition, he led the adoption of guidelines proposed by the Youth Violence Prevention Coalition, which brought about significant positive changes in student and community relations.

Since 2009, he has been an elected member of the Lansing District Board of Education, a role that he carries out with joy because it allows him to continue his service to Lansing students.

Dr. Rodriguez' passions extend beyond education. He is an officer with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Ingham County Health Department's Board of Health. But to really know Dr. Rodriguez, you only need to read his monthly magazine *Adelante Forward*.

Published in both English and Spanish, *Adelante Forward* has been an instrumental source of information for the Lansing community, advertising new businesses and spreading word about resources from Head Start classes to COVID vaccine clinics. It has been a key way to reach Latino and Hispanic residents, bridging the language gap in order to improve community relations. And, as I am sure Dr. Rodriguez is proud to know, it is even being used by some Spanish language teachers as part of their lesson plans.

The publication wouldn't be possible without the special partners that work to put it together: Danny Layne, Allena Tapia, Patricia Briones, and Dr. George Mansour. In addition, no tribute to Dr. Rodriguez would be complete without mention of his wife of 30 years, Margarita, as well as their two daughters and two grandchildren.

It is my privilege to represent Dr. Rodriguez in Washington. I am grateful for his willingness to always speak to me about Lansing's needs. Every time we are able to connect, it is a pleasure to hear about the good work being done to improve the lives of others. I am appreciative of his commitment to serving others, and it is my honor to recognize him today in the permanent RECORD of the people's House.

□ 1315

HONORING LISA BRINKER

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Lisa Brinker, a resident of Lake Orion, who has been there for her community when it needed her most.

Ms. Brinker has faced adversity in her life. Three years ago, her husband passed away from brain cancer. Out of

that pain, she found purpose. Over the course of the last year, she has devoted her time to the New Day Foundation for Families, a local nonprofit that supports those fighting cancer and their loved ones.

The financial cost of a cancer diagnosis goes beyond just medical care, as I know well. Beyond the loss of income, the increase in expenses, and emotional distress, it is a diagnosis that can consume us entirely. And that is where the New Day Foundation for Families comes in. With an army of local volunteers like Ms. Brinker, they provide resources to give cancer patients hope through financial assistance and emotional support.

When her husband was in the hospital, Ms. Brinker was surrounded by family, friends, and churchgoers who helped lighten the load. For her, she wouldn't have known what to do without that help. And it is why she works so hard to make someone else's load a little lighter. During the pandemic, when family members of immunocompromised patients saw a trip to the grocery store as a fraught experience, Ms. Brinker was there to provide for their essential needs.

Since the program began last spring, volunteers like Lisa made more than 300 deliveries helping 125 families in total. They were a godsend during COVID, and not just for their food deliveries. By demonstrating that service doesn't stop, not even during a once-in-a-generation pandemic, Ms. Brinker was a source of inspiration and strength. With an infectious attitude that brightens the days of all she serves, we are lucky to have her in our community.

Ms. Brinker has persevered through adversity and loss, and it has magnified her service. With the powerful perspective that comes with experience, she has used it to better her Lake Orion community. As a humble spirit, she prefers that any recognition focus on making a difference. An article in the local paper ended with her asking readers to get themselves involved. And true to form, for this recognition, she indicated that credit should go to the good people of the New Day Foundation for Families.

It is a rare soul who can reduce pain and hardship in others, especially when they themselves have been in that position. For her work to honor the loving memory of her husband and her tireless service to community, it is my privilege to recognize Lisa Brinker on the House floor today.

HONORING LISA KOCAB

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize another Lisa, the ultimate champion and advocate for the disability community in Brighton, Michigan, Ms. Lisa Kocab.

Put simply, Lisa is a powerhouse. As a teacher and a mother of five, including an incredible 10-year-old boy, PJ, who has Down syndrome, she has built and created an incredible circle of support since moving back to Michigan in 2016.

At first, when she was scouting schools for PJ, she had to push through being told “no.” The family wanted to move back to be nearer to the kids’ grandparents, but the first school district that they called referred to students with special needs as “those kids.” Other schools gave similar responses when asked if PJ could be placed in general education.

That is, until she called Brighton’s special education director, who told Lisa that PJ could absolutely go to school with the other students; that if they moved to Brighton, she would work with them. So that is what Lisa and her husband did.

Now, Lisa will be the first to tell you that it wasn’t always smooth sailing. She has had to overcome plenty of challenges from PJ’s struggles with development to the hurt of hearing intolerant words and from other families.

Lisa has been tested in too many ways to count, but she has turned her pain into purpose by deciding to open Gigi’s Playhouse in Southfield, Michigan. With more than 45 locations nationwide, Gigi’s Playhouses are now “achievement centers” for individuals with Down syndrome. They are spaces that are specifically designed for kids to interact and play with each other while offering free programs to learn how to read, improve their health, develop career skills, and reach their greatest potential.

Lisa was the driving force behind fundraising, searching for a location, and pulling resources together. Now, with her dream a reality, she strives every day to realize the vision of Gigi’s Playhouses, to see a world where individuals with Down syndrome are accepted and embraced in their families, schools, and communities.

In its first year of operation, Gigi’s served 383 people with Down syndrome, more than half of whom were adults. Since then, they have expanded their offerings and, in order to help more residents, even adapting during the pandemic by switching to virtual programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am a firm believer in finding your people, those who will have your back and stay by your side through ups and downs, failures and successes. Without a doubt, Lisa Kocab has found her people in Brighton and at Gigi’s Playhouse; and the disability community in Michigan has found its person in Lisa.

She is an inspiration to us all, and I am so proud to represent her here in the Halls of Congress. It is my honor to speak these words into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that her story can inspire all who read it.

RECOGNIZING THE WONG FAMILY

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a staple of the community, the Wong family of Wong Express House in Brighton.

Before moving to Michigan, Xueqi Wong worked as a fisherman and a security officer for his town while raising his family with his wife, Mei, in Fujian province, China.

They immigrated to the U.S. in 1991, moving to Brighton 10 years later, where they have built a successful business with a loyal following for the last two decades. Mr. Wong, known as Ed around town, is known for his work ethic and attention to detail. His employees rave about the culture he brings to the team. “Extremely flexible and supportive,” “Very welcoming and inspiring,” “I feel honored to work with such excellent people” is some of what they have said.

Mr. Wong’s character truly came through in his devotion to keeping his customers and employees safe during COVID-19. At a time when restaurants and dining establishments were particularly hard hit by the public health restrictions, Mr. Wong put a plan in place to allow Wong Express House to stay afloat.

After closing for 9 weeks, they reopened on May 29, 2020, as a model for safe service. With a separate enclosed area inside the restaurant, the dining area was transformed into a contactless pickup window for customer convenience. Instead of dine-in, the restaurant trained staff to fully transition into drive-thru and carry-out only.

The changes were not easy, but the space was turned into a safe, simple, and effective process that limited customer-to-staff interaction, keeping everyone safe from infection. That ability to adapt, to work through the challenges in order to keep customers satisfied, is why I am proud to recognize Mr. Wong; his wife, Mei; their son, Jian on the floor of the House today.

Their pride in their restaurant is evident as soon as you walk in the door, and their resilience can be found in their dedication to each other and our community. During the shutdown, when Jian had to travel back to Brooklyn to support his wife and two kids, Mr. and Mrs. Wong stayed in Brighton holding down the fort to make sure that their staff would be taken care of.

It is no surprise that on their first day back in business they were so overwhelmed with support to the point that they completely sold out of food. Now, as they chart a course for the weeks and months ahead, I know that the Wong family will continue to demonstrate the toughness and grit that Michiganders are known for during uncertain times.

On behalf of a grateful community, it is my honor to recognize the leadership and staff at Wong Express House by inserting their story of resilience into the permanent RECORD so that it may last for years to come.

RECOGNIZING PECKHAM, INCORPORATED

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an organization in my district that goes above and beyond by providing job training opportunities for folks with significant disabilities and other barriers to employment.

A nonprofit based in Lansing, Peckham, Incorporated, provides a platform for people to demonstrate

their unique abilities by learning new skills and enjoying the rewards of an honest day’s work. From career planning to vocational training, to employer services, Peckham offers more than 30 different programs that create opportunities for every single individual they work with.

Named after the former rehabilitation services director of the State of Michigan, Ralf Peckham, they began serving the greater Lansing region in 1976. Today, they have grown into one of the largest community rehabilitation programs in the entire State.

With core values of compassion, community, and collaboration as a foundation, Peckham has broken the mold of what a human services agency can be. They go beyond just matching skills to places of employment. They treat each person, no matter their ability, with respect and dignity. Their holistic approach to each situation allows them to build an environment of trust, where each person they work with can thrive.

A physical, cognitive, behavioral, or socioeconomic challenge should never get in the way of someone realizing their full potential. To that end, Peckham makes our district and our State a better place to live. At a fundamental level, they help folks to earn economic and personal independence by creating, sustaining, and improving employment opportunities in our community.

Peckham is a leader of workplace culture, from how employers view mental health to how to safely reopen as we see a light at the end of the tunnel in COVID-19. For their efforts, they have been featured in Fortune Magazine’s Great Places to Work List, and recognized by the U.S. Department of Labor with the Gold Hire Vets Medalion Award.

Mr. Speaker, accessibility and diversity are cornerstones of a modern workplace. They make our economy stronger, bring our communities closer, and demonstrate what our country is all about: Equality of opportunity.

Today, I am proud to congratulate Peckham on 45 successful years harnessing the power of acceptance. They develop potential, work with purpose, and deliver results. With these remarks on the House floor, may their contributions to our Nation live on in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RECOGNIZING LIVINGSTON COUNTY MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because, in Livingston County, there is a group of retired medical professionals and volunteers that answer the call to serve by staying in action and continuing to train in the event of emergencies.

In 2006, the Livingston County Medical Reserve Corps was founded as a public health volunteer team. Today, I am proud to honor them on the House floor during their work during the COVID-19 pandemic.

As one of the 762 Medical Reserve Corps units in the Nation, they are

part of a network of locally organized groups that strive to improve the health and safety of our communities.

In Livingston County, our reserve corps is composed of 194 members, with an extra 80 volunteers, dedicating their time at the clinic. These folks are registered nurses, pharmacists, physician's assistants, nurse practitioners, paramedics, licensed professional nurses, EMTs, firefighters, veterinarians, chiropractors, social workers, teachers, public health professionals, and others with nonmedical backgrounds.

They come from all walks of life, but they are motivated to their cause, which is a healthier Livingston County. And their work during the pandemic is nothing short of heroic. They helped with mask packaging and distribution, staffing a COVID hotline, contact tracing, and vaccine support. Without the reserve corps, the county would not have been able to respond as effectively.

Since the beginning of last year, temporary staff have logged almost 7,000 hours on duty, with volunteers adding another 5,000 hours. These hours represent shots in arms, questions answered, fears put at ease, and more.

When our people need it the most, the Medical Reserve Corps stepped up. Their training designed for full-scale emergencies meant the difference when Livingston County was tested like never before.

I am so grateful for each and every member who has proudly worn the yellow vest of the Medical Reserve Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to recognize Jennifer Kramer, the Medical Reserve Corps coordinator, who has certainly personally put in incredibly long hours in service to others.

With their motto of Partner, Provide, Prepare, and Protect, the Medical Reserve Corps makes the extraordinary seem ordinary. I have seen them in action myself when I visited a vaccination clinic in January. They are organized, efficient, and wholly devoted to the cause.

It is my great honor to speak these words into the official RECORD so that future generations can read about these heroes who were there when we needed them most.

RECOGNIZING CRISTO REY COMMUNITY CENTER

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cristo Rey Community Center, a nonprofit organization that has been meeting the needs of the Lansing community since 1968.

As a comprehensive, basic-needs service center, Cristo Rey is an invaluable source for residents, no matter their station in life. The center's health clinic serves the uninsured and underinsured while offering counseling to those struggling with substance abuse and addiction. Their financial counselors help folks develop healthy spending and saving habits, and their community kitchen serves free hot breakfast and lunch Monday through Friday.

In 2018 alone, Cristo Rey served over 56,000 members of their community. They distributed over 357,000 pounds of food, and provided more than 21,000 meals to the hungry. Their family health center cared for nearly 2,800 unique patients, empowered 1,500 individuals to manage their finances, and helped families save over \$700,000 in prescription drug costs.

□ 1330

In addition to these programs, Cristo Rey served as an essential warming center during harsh winters and as a cooling center during sweltering summers for the roughly 5,000 individuals who are homeless in the Lansing area.

Every day, Cristo Rey staff live up to their motto: "Serving individuals, serving families, serving communities. Always with compassion. Always with respect."

Wherever there is a need, whether it is a basic need, a spiritual need, or a societal need, Cristo Rey is there. Yes, they offer support and care, but they also focus on self-sufficiency and honoring the dignity of every person who walks through their doors.

For the poor and vulnerable, immigrants and migrants, and all people in need, regardless of language or culture, Cristo Rey is instrumental in the work to break the cycle of poverty and lift the community up. As a trusted organization, they are crucial to building bridges between different parts of the city.

In 2019, during the search for a new police chief, Cristo Rey hosted the first community meet-and-greet for Daryl Green, who became Lansing's chief of police. When our community was rocked by COVID, Cristo Rey was one of the first to retool its programs and offerings in order to start adapting to changing times.

These days, with a grant from the Dart Foundation, the center has been able to offer vaccinations to residents, particularly in underserved and hard-to-reach communities, which is essential for bringing down the rates of infection and reopening Michigan's economy.

For their 50 years of service to Lansing, it is my great honor to recognize the men and women who truly do God's work at Cristo Rey Community Center. May they continue to live out their mission for the next 50 years and for as long as these words remain in the RECORD of the people's House.

RECOGNIZING LACASA

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize LACASA, a nonprofit in my community that has stood out as a beacon of hope for thousands of vulnerable women and children in mid-Michigan.

In 1979, LACASA was founded as the Livingston Area Council Against Spousal Abuse. With just \$40 in donations and a part-time director at a desk in a borrowed office space, the organization first relied entirely on volunteers, selfless local residents who

opened up their own homes so that survivors of domestic violence could find refuge.

Later on, as it grew, LACASA was able to rent, then buy, and finally expand to a permanent shelter where women and children can access counseling services, legal advocacy, and wraparound support.

In addition to sanctuary, LACASA offers 24-hour crisis response with trained staff who are able to intake and serve the diverse needs of survivors of child abuse, domestic abuse, and sexual assault. For so many in our community, the folks at LACASA are directly responsible for giving them the tools and strength to begin the road toward a better future.

However, pandemics don't stop abusers. In fact, when outside stressors occur, abuse historically tends to escalate. So when shelter-in-place orders took effect last year, closing LACASA and its around-the-clock facility was not an option. Record numbers of victims seeking help and refuge contacted them, and their ability to adapt is nothing short of heroic.

In 2020 alone, LACASA provided 1,170 overnight stays in hotel rooms and over 3,500 off-site meals for victims and their families. They expanded capacity to handle a 230-percent increase in child forensic interviews.

LACASA saw the number of calls to their 24/7 helpline nearly double when the number of individuals seeking personal protection orders more than tripled compared to an average year.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the chance to personally visit LACASA, touring their shelter and working with their president, CEO, and badass, Bobette Schrandt, on several occasions. I am so thankful for her leadership and for the entire organization's tireless support and work to provide a port in the storm for local residents.

They are a model for similar nonprofits, earning national accreditation from the National Children's Alliance as a children's advocacy center just last week. Bobette told me herself. It is their highest level of membership, an honor that says everything about LACASA's dedication to addressing childhood abuse in southeast Michigan.

Today, I am proud to lift up their trauma-informed procedures and practices as a shining beacon of hope in Michigan's Eighth District.

On behalf of a grateful community, thank you for the work that you do, and may you continue to lead the way.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 711. An act to amend the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016 to authorize the use of certain funds received pursuant to leases

entered into under such Act, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title.

S.475.—An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Monday, June 21, 2021.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 21, 2021, at 9 a.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION)

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Melanie A. Stansbury

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-1393. A letter from the General Counsel, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Disclosure and Reporting (RIN: 3052-AD47) received June 14, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-1394. A letter from the Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — Safety Standard for High Chairs [Docket No.: CPSC-2015-0031] received May 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1395. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Dakota; Revisions to Air Pollution Control Rules; Regional Haze [EPA-R08-OAR-2021-0002; FRL-10024-54-Region 8] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1396. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cellulose, ethyl ether; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0138; FRL-10023-34] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1397. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards Second Maintenance

Plan for the Tioga County Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2020-0321; FRL-10023-81-Region 3] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1398. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maine; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2015 Ozone Standard and Negative Declaration for the Oil and Gas Industry for the 2008 and 2015 Ozone Standards; Correction [EPA-R01-OAR-2020-0327; FRL-10024-76-Region 1] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1399. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (20-7.B) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0303; FRL-10021-85] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1400. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (20-6.B) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0251; FRL-10021-77] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1401. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (20-5.B) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0222; FRL-10018-77] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revised Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Update for the 2008 Ozone NAAQS; Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2020-0272; FRL-10024-45-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU84) received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1403. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Modification of Significant New Uses of Certain Chemical Substances (20-2.M) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0302; FRL-10022-76] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1404. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0626; EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0082; and EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0345; FRL-10022-28] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1405. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; Eastern Kern Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reclassification to Severe [EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0340; FRL-10024-58-Region 9] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1406. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Florida; Maintenance Plan Update for the Hillsborough County Lead Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2020-0185; FRL-10024-49 Region 4] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1407. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Two Revised Sulfur Dioxide Rules for Lake County [EPA-R05-OAR-2020-0369; FRL-10024-65-Region 5] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1408. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Sponsorship Identification Requirements for Foreign Government-Provided Programming [MB Docket No.: 20-299] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1409. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Auctions Division, Office of Economic and Analytics, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Certification adopted for auction of flexible-use service licenses in the 3.45-3.55 GHz band for next-generation wireless services (Auction 10) [AU Docket No.: 21-62] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1410. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Allocation of Spectrum for Non-Federal Space Launch Operations; Amendment of Part 2 of the Commission's Rules for Federal Earth Stations Communicating with Non-Federal Fixed Satellite Service Space Stations; and Federal Space Station Use of the 399.9-400.05 MHz Band [ET Docket No.: 13-115] (RM-11341) received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1411. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Policy Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Improving Public Safety Communications in the 800MHz Band [WT Docket: 02-55] (Proceeding Terminated) received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1412. A letter from the Managing Director, Office of the Managing Director, Financial Operations, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2021; Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2020 [MD Docket No.: 21-190] [MD Docket No.: 20-105] received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1413. A letter from the Executive Director, Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, transmitting the Council's interim final rule — Privacy Act

Regulations (RIN: 3219-AA03) received June 11, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-1414. A letter from the Biologist, Special Assistant, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Designating Critical Habitat for the Central America, Mexico, and Western North Pacific Distinct Population Segments of Humpback Whales [Docket No.: 210415-0080] (RIN: 0648-BI06) received June 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1415. A letter from the Agency Representative, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Representation of Others before the United States Patent and Trademark Office [Docket No.: PTO-C-2013-0042] (RIN: 0651-AC91) received June 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1416. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Office of Aviation Consumer Protection, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tarmac Delay Rule [Docket No.: DOT-OST-2019-0144] (RIN: 2105-AE47) received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1417. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Extension of Veterans' Group Life Insurance (VGLI) Application Periods in Response to the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency (RIN: 2900-AR24) received June 14, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1418. A letter from the Chief, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Safe harbor for taxpayers who relied on IRC Notice 2020-32 and/or Revenue Ruling 2020-27 [Revenue Procedure 2021-20] received May 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-1419. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Medicare Program; Modification of Limitations on Redesignation by the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board (MGCRB) [CMS-1762-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AU56) received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EC-1420. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Center for Clinical Standards and Quality, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Coverage of Innovative Technology (MCIT) and Definition of "Reasonable and Necessary"; Delay in Effective Date [CMS-3372-F2] (RIN: 0938-AT88) received June 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EC-1421. A letter from the Section Chief, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement

Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Remimazolam in Schedule IV [Docket No.: DEA-658] received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

EC-1422. A letter from the Section Chief, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Lemborexant in Schedule IV [Docket No.: DEA-600] received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

EC-1423. A letter from the Deputy Director and Acting Director of Privacy and Open Government, Office of the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act of 2017 Implementation [Docket No.: 210329-0073] (RIN: 0605-AA49) received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Reform and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2062. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriated standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. House Joint Resolution 34. Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review" (Rept. 117-64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. WATERS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1443. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses; with an amendment (Rept. 117-65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York: Committee on Oversight and Reform. H.R. 2662. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-66, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2662 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia (for herself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3960. A bill to eliminate the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, remove firearm restrictions on lawful gun owners, and provide funds to surviving families of border patrol agents killed as a result of Operation Fast and Furious; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Ms. BUSH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. MANNING, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SOTO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 3961. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a demonstration project under the Medicaid program for political subdivisions of States to provide medical assistance for the expansion population under such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DEAN (for herself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BUDD, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MOONEY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BARR, Mr. STEIL, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 3962. A bill to authorize notaries public to perform, and to establish minimum standards for, electronic notarizations and remote notarizations that occur in or affect interstate commerce, to require any Federal court to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any State, to require any State to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any other State when the notarization was performed under or relates to a public Act, record, or judicial proceeding of the notarial officer's State or when the notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 3963. A bill to expand compassionate release authority and elderly home confinement access for offenders with heightened coronavirus risk; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. GIMENEZ, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. MAST, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mrs. STEEL, Ms. TENNEY, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS):

H.R. 3964. A bill to require the United States Trade Representative to submit a report on the manner and extent to which Nicaragua is in compliance with the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLYDE (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 3965. A bill to designate Ansarallah as a foreign terrorist organization and impose certain sanctions on Ansarallah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLYDE (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MANN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 3966. A bill to prohibit the United States from rejoining the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) until the President makes certain certifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LAMB, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SABLON, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MENG, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 3967. A bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TORRES of New York (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 3968. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, the National Credit Union Administration, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the United States Department of

the Treasury to update guidance on customer identification regulations with respect to the use of identification cards issued by a municipality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 3969. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to include activities to address social determinants of health in the calculation of medical loss ratios; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 3970. A bill to require Federal agencies to timely respond to right-of-way requests for the build out of broadband service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. HERN, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 3971. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent concurrent receipt of unemployment benefits and Social Security disability insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERA (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. BACON, Mr. CASE, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 3972. A bill to support the diplomatic, economic, and physical space of Taiwan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MANN, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Ms. CHENEY):

H.R. 3973. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for improved precision in the listing, delisting, and downlisting of endangered species and potentially endangered species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KIND, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. CHU, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3974. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. CHU, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 3975. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to modify and extend the Generalized System of Preferences, to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina):

H.R. 3976. A bill to provide defense and security assistance to ensure the survival of Israel and its people from an existing or imminent military threat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3977. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit assistance to the Palestinian Authority and the Palestine Liberation Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3978. A bill to make it unlawful to send a demand letter in bad faith for a patent relating to COVID-19 related products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 3979. A bill to establish a refund effective date for rates and charges under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3980. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce and the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a study on facial recognition technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 3981. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize a national network of Statewide senior legal hotlines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 3982. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing, and distribution of traditional and premium cigars; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAWTHORN (for himself, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. HERRELL, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 3983. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue regulations with respect to the optional practical training program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 3984. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide a civil action against a foreign state for deliberate concealment or distortion of information with respect to an international public health emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROW (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BACON, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. STANTON, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. BERA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DUNN, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. LAMB, Ms. DEAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 3985. A bill to amend the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 to expedite the special immigrant visa process for certain Afghan allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 3986. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the work opportunity tax credit with respect to workforce development and foster care transition youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 3987. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BASS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3988. A bill to enhance mental health and psychosocial support within United States foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 3989. A bill to amend the consumer product safety laws to repeal of exclusion of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms from the definition of consumer product under such laws; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 3990. A bill to ban the use of intentionally added perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances in cosmetics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mrs. McCLAIN, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. CAWTHORN):

H.R. 3991. A bill to require that any person that maintains an internet website or that sells or distributes a mobile application that maintains and stores information collected from such website or application in China to disclose that such information is stored and maintained in the People's Republic of China and whether the Chinese Communist Party or a Chinese state-owned entity has access to such information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 3992. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 prohibit employers from limiting, segregating, or classifying applicants for employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TLAI, Ms. MENG, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SIRES, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 3993. A bill to ensure the humane treatment of pregnant women by reinstating

the presumption of release and prohibiting shackling, restraining, and other inhumane treatment of pregnant detainees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARL, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. STEIL):

H.R. 3994. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization period for emergency treatment in non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities under the Veterans Community Care Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio (for himself and Mrs. LURIA):

H.R. 3995. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to submit to Congress a report on the global nuclear leadership of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. BACON, Ms. SALAZAR, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mrs. AXNE):

H.R. 3996. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include an additional permissible use of amounts provided as grants under the Byrne JAG program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Mr. BACON, and Ms. ROSS):

H.R. 3997. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to enhance direct certification under the school lunch program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. JACKSON):

H.R. 3998. A bill to require the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to make video recordings of the examination and testing of firearms and ammunition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 3999. A bill to appropriately limit the size of the population required for urban areas of metropolitan statistical areas; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4000. A bill to require any person that maintains an internet website or that sells or distributes a mobile application that is owned, wholly or partially, by the Chinese Communist Party or by a non-state owned entity located in the People's Republic of China, to disclose that fact to any individual who downloads or otherwise uses such application; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4001. A bill to require online retailers to prominently disclose product country-of-

origin information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 4002. A bill to expand access to graduate education by amending the Federal Pell Grant program to include postbaccalaureate study; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ESTES, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. HERN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 4003. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate work disincentives for childhood disability beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. ROSE):

H.R. 4004. A bill to prohibit Federal funding for institutions of higher education that have partnerships with schools or other organizations funded by North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 4005. A bill to direct the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to establish a School Cybersecurity Improvement Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 4006. A bill to require original equipment manufacturers of digital electronic equipment to make available certain documentation, diagnostic, and repair information to independent repair providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TIFANY, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BUDD, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. MANN, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 4007. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure that public institutions of higher education eschew policies that improperly constrain the expressive rights of students, and to ensure that private institutions of higher education are transparent about, and responsible for, their chosen speech policies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 4008. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a virtual health pilot program to facilitate utilization of remote patient monitoring technology to maintain or expand access to health care services for individuals in

rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4009. A bill to authorize the Georgetown African American Historic Landmark Project and Tour to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 4010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include fuel cells using electromechanical processes for purposes of the energy tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. GARCIA of Illinois):

H.R. 4011. A bill to divert Federal funding away from supporting the presence of police in schools and toward evidence-based and trauma informed services that address the needs of marginalized students and improve academic outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 4012. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permanently include certain HCPCS codes as telehealth services under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. CLOUD, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee):

H.R. 4013. A bill to end the emergency increase in unemployment compensation benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 4014. A bill to provide for a new building period with respect to the cap on full-time equivalent residents for purposes of payment for graduate medical education costs under the Medicare program for certain hospitals that have established a shortage specialty program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Mr. MELJER, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 4015. A bill to amend subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act to support workers as they re-enter the labor force by providing a newly employed worker allowance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 4016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on the use of certain electric highway vehicles to fund the Highway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 4017. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2021 through 2023 to provide assistance to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras through bilateral compacts to increase protection of women and children in their homes and communities and reduce female homicides, domestic violence, and sexual assault; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NUNES, and Mrs. STEEL):

H.R. 4018. A bill to provide drought relief in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 4019. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to adjust the penalty for unjust conviction and imprisonment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. BUSH, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BOWMAN, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 4020. A bill to reform United States drug policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Oversight and Reform, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, House Administration, Armed Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mrs. LURIA):

H.R. 4021. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish the Exceptional Family Member Program Advisory Council of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Ms. BUSH, Ms. BASS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.J. Res. 53. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the use of slavery and involuntary servitude as a punishment for a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH):

H. Res. 483. A resolution recognizing the 125th Anniversary of the Indiana Veterans' Home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS (for herself, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. JORDAN, Mr.

NORMAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. MACE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. EMMER, and Ms. CHENEY):

H. Res. 484. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should not waive intellectual property rights relating to COVID-19 vaccines or treatments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 3960.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 3961.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 3962.

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

Section I, Article 8

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 3963.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 3964.

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

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CLYDE:

H.R. 3965.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CLYDE:

H.R. 3966.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3967.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I; Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 3968.

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

Article I, section 8;

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3969.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3970.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 3971.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 3972.

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

Article 1, Section 8: Powers of the Congress

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 3973.

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

Article 1.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3974.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3975.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3976.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause II. "The Congress shall have power to declar War"
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14. "The Congress shall have power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval Forces."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. "The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3977.

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

Article I section I, which includes an implied power for the Congress to regulate the conduct of the United States with respect to foreign affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3978.

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

The authority granted to Congress to regulate patent and intellectual property law is derived from Article I, Section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution, providing the legislature with the power to "promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." Further, the Necessary and Proper Clause found in Article I, Section 8, clause 18, provides Congress with the power to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof;"

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 3979.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3980.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3981.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 3982.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 3983.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 3984.

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

Article I, Section 8:

"Provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States"

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers."

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 3985.

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

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3986.

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

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 3987.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3988.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 3989.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 3990.

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

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 3991.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 gives Congress the specific power to regulate commerce with other nations. This bill seeks to regulate one small portion of commerce, namely protecting the data of American citizens from companies who might store that data in China or allow the government of the Chinese Communist Party to have access to that data.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 3992.

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

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 3993.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 3994.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio:

H.R. 3995.

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

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 3996.

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

Article 1, Section 8, clause 7

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 3997.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 3998.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . ."

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 3999.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4000.

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

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3 (Commerce Clause); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause).

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4001.

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

Article I, Sec. 8; Clause 3 (Commerce Clause); and Article I; Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 4002.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4003.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 4004.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 4005.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 4006.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 4007.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 4008.

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

Article 1, Section 9, United States Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4009.

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

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 4010.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 4011.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 4012.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 4013.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 4014.

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

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 4015.

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

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 4016.

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

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

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 4017.

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

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers; and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 4018.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying out into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 4019.

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

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 4020.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4021.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 53.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 18: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 263: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 426: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 503: Ms. BASS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 605: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 653: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 735: Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. STEEL, and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 761: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 818: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 825: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 852: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 884: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 890: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HERN, and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 933: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.

H.R. 1011: Mr. LATURNER, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 1012: Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1016: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1117: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1131: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1145: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GARBARINO, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1179: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1182: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1183: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1240: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1283: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1297: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1368: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1394: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1456: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1474: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 1577: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. COLE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1581: Ms. BUSH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. LAMB, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1582: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 1596: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1630: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 1661: Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KATKO, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1749: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1800: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1815: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1829: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 1915: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1957: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1977: Mr. BROOKS and Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 2011: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2012: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2062: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 2094: Mr. TRONE and Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 2108: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2119: Ms. ROSS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2126: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2144: Mr. SWALWELL.

H.R. 2154: Ms. MANNING and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2184: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2238: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2249: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 2255: Mr. WELCH and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2258: Mrs. MCCLAINE.

H.R. 2269: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 2307: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2325: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RESCIENTHALER.

H.R. 2328: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. Velázquez.

H.R. 2362: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 2372: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 2374: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. BACON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. COLE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MOORE of Utah, and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 2385: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2399: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 2447: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. HAGEDORN.
 H.R. 2467: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 2486: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 2502: Mr. CARSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 2503: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2517: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BACON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BOST, and Mr. EMMER.
 H.R. 2549: Mr. BROWN.
 H.R. 2573: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KUSTOFF, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CASE, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 2585: Ms. CHENEY.
 H.R. 2586: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. LAMB, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 2648: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
 H.R. 2654: Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LETLOW, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2724: Mr. BOWMAN.
 H.R. 2734: Ms. WILD and Mr. SWALWELL.
 H.R. 2748: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. STEIL, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 2759: Mr. MOORE of Utah.
 H.R. 2774: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2840: Mrs. DEMINGS.
 H.R. 2859: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 2900: Mr. CARSON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 2901: Mr. CASE and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. EVANS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 2931: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 2974: Ms. STRICKLAND and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 2991: Mr. JONES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 3044: Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 3046: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3048: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 3054: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 3076: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BACON, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 3104: Ms. LETLOW and Mr. TIFFANY.
 H.R. 3109: Mr. TIMMONS.
 H.R. 3134: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3165: Ms. PORTER.
 H.R. 3187: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 3222: Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 3246: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 3247: Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 3256: Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. KELLER.
 H.R. 3294: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. OMAR, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 3335: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3341: Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 3355: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SIREs, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WILD, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MACE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 3369: Mr. EMMER.
 H.R. 3377: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
 H.R. 3408: Mr. SIREs.
 H.R. 3435: Mrs. MCCLAIN.
 H.R. 3440: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 3443: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 3446: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 3488: Ms. WILD and Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 3491: Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 3515: Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. PENCE.
 H.R. 3537: Mr. STAUBER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MANN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 3541: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 3554: Mr. COMER.
 H.R. 3622: Ms. STRICKLAND and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3630: Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. MACE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CRIST, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
 H.R. 3648: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 3703: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 3732: Mr. KAHELE.
 H.R. 3778: Mr. POCAN and Ms. JACOBS of California.
 H.R. 3780: Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 3790: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 3791: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3796: Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 3800: Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, and Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 3807: Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. FALLONE, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 3811: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 3820: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 3823: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3829: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3834: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 3843: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 3867: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3875: Mrs. KIM of California.
 H.R. 3901: Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 3926: Mr. TIMMONS.
 H.R. 3959: Ms. NORTON.
 H.J. Res. 29: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.J. Res. 50: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Mrs. LESKO.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mrs. TRAHAN.
 H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
 H. Res. 47: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H. Res. 117: Mr. ALLRED.
 H. Res. 118: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 121: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. BROWN.
 H. Res. 225: Ms. SLOTKIN.
 H. Res. 413: Mr. RASKIN.
 H. Res. 469: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H. Res. 471: Ms. STEFANIK.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mrs. CAMMACK on House Resolution 274: Mr. Crenshaw.

Petition 2 by Mr. ROY on House Resolution 216: Mr. Rouzer, Ms. Herrera Beutler, Mr. Guthrie.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2021

No. 106

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, although we cannot see You with our eyes or touch You with our hands, we have experienced the reality of Your might and majesty. Every time we hear a newborn baby cry or touch a leaf or see the sky, we know why we believe.

Lord, send Your spirit to fill the hearts of our Senators. As they journey toward eternity, may they walk, Lord, this day on the path You have provided. Give them a passion to glorify You in their thoughts, words, and deeds. Provide them with the wisdom to embrace truth, honor, gentleness, and humility.

We pray in Your righteous 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, June 17, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. ROSEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, ever since Democrats passed the Affordable Care Act, expanding health coverage and access to tens of millions of Americans, we have had to fight tooth and nail to preserve the law from partisan Republican attacks.

For more than a decade, the assault on our healthcare law was relentless from Republicans in Congress, from the executive branch itself and from Republican attorneys general in the courts. In a landmark vote, we in the Senate prevented the Republicans from repealing the ACA in 2017.

Each time, in each arena, the Affordable Care Act has prevailed, and once again today, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a 7-to-2 ruling, upheld the Affordable Care Act in the face of another legal challenge. So let me say definitively: The Affordable Care Act has won. The Supreme Court has just ruled. The ACA is here to stay.

And now we are going to try to make it bigger and better—establish once and for all affordable healthcare as a basic right of every American citizen.

What a day.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on another issue, infrastructure, despite a consensus in Washington that America needs more investment in our infrastructure, it has been decades since Congress passed a stand-alone bill to address the issue. This Congress is working hard to remedy that fact.

As I have repeated, discussions about infrastructure are moving forward along two tracks. One is bipartisan, and the second deals with components of the American jobs and families plan, which we will consider even if it lacks bipartisan support—though, I would note that a recent poll showed that President Biden's infrastructure and family plan is broadly popular. Nearly 70 percent of Americans support President Biden's infrastructure plan. More than 60 percent support additional support for American families.

Now, despite some overdramatized punditry, the truth is both tracks are moving forward very well, and both tracks need each other. So we want to work with our Republican colleagues on infrastructure where we have common ground, and Democrats believe we have other priorities that the Senate must consider above and beyond a bipartisan infrastructure bill, not the least of which is addressing the urgent challenge of climate change.

Yesterday, I convened all 11 Members of the Senate Budget Committee to discuss the reconciliation track. And today, I will convene the group of Democrats negotiating with Republicans to discuss the bipartisan track. We set up the two tracks about a month ago. Each is proceeding along, and the two tracks are parallel, working in concert, progressing well.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on voting rights, now we are here on the precipice of a momentous debate here in the Senate. Last night, I began 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.

S4599

process to consider voting rights legislation here on the floor of the Senate next week. The process I used will allow the Senate to consider S. 1 or compromise legislation that is currently being discussed. In either case, our goal remains crystal clear: protect the right to vote, strengthen our democracy, and put a stop to the tide of voter suppression flooding across our country. We will not consider legislation that does not achieve those objectives. The issue is too important.

Republican State legislatures are conducting the most sweeping attack on the right to vote since the beginning of Jim Crow. What is their stated reason for vicious assaults on voting rights? They say it is election integrity.

But listen to these policies and tell me if you think they are about election integrity:

Reducing polling hours and polling places. What does that have to do with election integrity?

Mandating that every precinct, no matter how large or how small, have the same number of ballot drop boxes. What does that have to do with election integrity?

It is saying urban areas should have less ability to vote than rural areas.

No after-hours voting, no 24-hours voting, no drive-through voting.

Requiring absentee ballots to be approved by a notary public.

Making it a crime to give food and water to voters waiting in long lines at the polls.

Allowing a judge or panel of judges to overturn an election.

Allowing a partisan State election board to replace a duly elected county election board if they are "underperforming."

Removing student IDs from the list of valid forms of ID.

Moving the hours of Sunday voting into the evening—which, coincidentally, makes it harder for Black churches to sponsor voter drives after services.

Are any of these policies—I would ask a single Republican on this Senate floor to get up and say any of these policies are dealing with election integrity.

We know what they are doing. They are making it harder for people to vote. And if this so-called voter fraud—election fraud—which we have seen none of in 2020, if they cared about that across the board, why did they aim almost all of their proposals at people of color, at poor people, at young people, at urban people?

We know why. This is not about voter fraud. It is about suppressing the vote, particularly of Democratic-leaning voters. It is despicable. It is anti-democratic. It is what they do in dictatorships—manipulate the vote, instead of counting it accurately.

Georgia, Iowa, Montana, Florida, Alabama, Utah, Arizona, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Indiana, Kentucky, Arkansas—this is where some of these poli-

cies that I just mentioned are now law. They would also be in effect in Texas had Democratic lawmakers not walked out of the chamber in protest. Since the beginning of the year, 14 States have enacted 22 laws—22 laws—to make it harder to vote.

Now, I know what the Republicans are saying. They are saying: Oh, well, we are making it easier to vote but harder to cheat.

But when you look at what they are actually doing, it is perfectly clear that Republicans across the country are making it harder to vote and making it easier to steal an election. They are targeting all the ways that poorer, younger, non-White and typically Democratic voters access the ballot, and they are giving new tools to partisan election boards and unelected judges to interfere with the results of a democratic election—interfere with the results of a democratic election. Does that sound like a democracy? No, it sounds like an autocracy, a dictatorship.

When you lose an election, you are supposed to try to win over more voters, not try to stop the other side from voting. These laws are un-American, autocratic, and against the very, very grain of our grand democracy, which, for immediate partisan advantage, our Republican friends are trying to undermine.

So the Senate is going to debate what to do about these laws at the Federal level next week. In an ideal world, this debate would be bipartisan. Voting rights shouldn't be a Democratic issue or a Republican issue, and in the early days of the second-half of the last century, that is just what it was—bipartisan. But, unfortunately, now it has become totally partisan.

Donald Trump and his Big Lie have enveloped the Republican Party, and they run away from truth and honesty and fairness to just appease someone with authoritarian instincts, Donald J. Trump.

And for all the shame that Republican State legislators have brought upon themselves, Washington Republicans have not covered themselves in glory either. Here in Washington, Republicans have failed to forcefully and repeatedly stand up to the Big Lie that the last election was stolen from Donald Trump. That same Big Lie is fueling these voter suppression laws from one end of the country to the other. House Republicans are comparing January 6 to a tourist visit.

I was within 20 feet of these awful insurrectionists. They were not tourists. They were brandishing sticks and guns and this and that.

House Republicans also fired Congresswoman CHENEY. For what? Telling the truth that Joe Biden is President.

Just yesterday, 21 House Republicans voted against awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to the police officers who withstood the attack on the 6th. Are Republicans becoming antipolice? Some of the same Republicans who

falsely accuse Democrats of wanting to defund the police are actively refusing to defend the police.

I wish I could say the Senate was totally different than the House—the Republican House—but here we have a Senate Republican saying that it really wasn't a violent insurrection. We have Senate Republicans refusing to include any mention of the causes for January 6 in committee reports, and the Republican minority mounted a partisan filibuster against an independent, bipartisan Commission.

That is what is happening in the present-day Republican Party: a hornet's nest of conspiracy theories and voter suppression in the States and a Washington Republican establishment that is too afraid of Donald Trump to stand up for our democracy with conviction.

So look, we Democrats wish the voting bill would be bipartisan. By all rights, it should be. But the actions in State legislatures like Georgia, Iowa, and Florida were totally partisan. None of these voter suppression laws were passed with bipartisan support—not one. Washington Republicans seem dead set against all remedies, whether it is S. 1, some modified version, or the John Lewis Voting Rights Act, which Senator MCCONNELL has recently opposed. So the idea that we can have some kind of bipartisan solution to this partisan attack on democracy befuddles me. Regrettably, the Democratic Party is the only party standing up for democracy right now.

Next week, the Senate will have this debate. Democrats will bring forward legislation to protect voting rights and safeguard our democracy, and we are going to see where everyone stands—everyone.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2093

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2093) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in order to place the bill on the calendar

under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, next week, as the Democratic leader has indicated, the Senate will finally get the opportunity to vote on the bill that House and Senate Democrats have both made their No. 1 priority for the entire Congress. S. 1 is a bad bill filled with bad ideas, and I have been crystal clear about opposing it from the very beginning.

But for Democrats themselves, coming up with a compelling rationale for this unprecedented political power grab has been a long and winding road. It started back in 2019. Then, our friends on the left were still trying to wrap their heads around a stunning defeat in the 2016 Presidential election, so the Speaker of the House billed H.R. 1 as a major overhaul for what her party concluded was a profoundly broken democracy.

Then, 2020 changed everything. A Democrat actually won the White House. I guess our democracy wasn't broken after all. This time, apparently, Federal authorities just needed urgent protection from State legislatures running their own elections.

So we are talking about fundamentally the very same bill. And one thing is for certain: Major overhaul doesn't even begin—begin—to describe it. The awful guts are all in there.

There is the plan to forcibly rewrite large portions of the 50 States' respective election laws and the plan to create new, publicly funded accounts not for building roads or bridges, expanding rural broadband, or fighting the opioid epidemic, but just piles of Federal dollars going to yard signs, balloons, and TV ads for candidates at least half of Americans disagree with.

There is the plan to trash a decades-old, bipartisan consensus on the right way to call balls and strikes on elections and turn the even split of the Federal Election Commission into a partisan majority and the one to give that majority new and broader tools

for chilling the rights of citizens to engage in political speech it doesn't like.

It is such a radical proposal that even prominent voices on the left have urged caution. Lawyers from ACLU, no less, have sounded the alarm on its proposed encroachment on free speech. One liberal expert went further, saying that if Democrats think their bill is "essential to secure democracy, they are self-deceived or deceitful." And voters themselves are hardly convinced. When asked about election policies like voter ID, large—large—majorities consistently come down on the opposite side of Washington Democrats. The bill is so transparently opportunistic, the Democrats' spin has failed to even unite their own party here in the Senate. It is a massive takeover of our election system with a fill-in-the-blank rationale. Nobody is fooled, and next week, the Senate will reject it.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on another matter entirely, the House of Representatives will vote today on a bill from Representative BARBARA LEE to repeal one of the key authorities behind nearly two decades of U.S. efforts to fight terrorism: the 2002 authorization for the use of military force. House Democrats claim this vote is an urgent act of congressional oversight, and the Democratic leader has indicated the Senate will take it up with similar zeal.

The right way to address ongoing terrorist threats is a debate certainly worth having. I would have welcomed that debate before the Biden administration began its hasty retreat from Afghanistan without a plan to sustain counterterror missions or support our friends. It is one we should have before we vote to repeal these authorities. Reality is more complicated, more dangerous, and less politically convenient than its supporters actually believe.

The fact is, the legal and practical application of the 2002 AUMF extends far beyond the defeat of Saddam Hussein's regime, and tossing it aside without answering real questions about our ongoing efforts in the region is reckless.

So let's clear up some facts. The 2002 AUMF has been understood for years—years—to apply to a variety of threats emanating from Iraq. Administrations of both parties have cited it as an important legal foundation of our fight against ISIS. It has been used precisely because the ISIS caliphate that stretched into Syria emanated from Iraq after President Obama's withdrawal in 2011.

The 2002 AUMF is important in Iraq today because it provides authority for U.S. forces there to defend themselves from a variety of real, exigent threats. It is arguably even more important in Syria, where our personnel are present against the wishes of the brutal Assad regime, supporting local Kurdish and

Arab forces and conducting strikes against ISIS. And because ISIS and al-Qaida have sometimes diverged, legal analysts have suggested that the 2001 AUMF alone may be insufficient to authorize operations against ISIS.

Do supporters of this repeal fully understand the ways it might limit counterterrorism missions? How about cyber ops? How about support for Kurdish and Arab forces in Syria? How do they propose we respond to growing attacks against our forces and interests in Iraq?

What about the prospects for robust congressional oversight if the President is left to rely on unilateral article II authorities or even less transparent ones? We are learning a lesson in real time about withdrawing from Afghanistan without a plan. We shouldn't make the same mistake here. So I suspect this isn't really about reasserting congressional oversight. After all, when the last administration announced plans to withdraw from Syria and Afghanistan in 2019, two dozen Democrats joined my amendment opposing the decision and reasserting our role in foreign policy. But now, many of our colleagues no longer want to talk about what we should be doing to confront these ongoing threats.

A lot can happen in 2 years, I guess. The political winds have certainly changed. But one thing hasn't changed: The grave threats posed by ISIS, al-Qaida, and other terrorist groups are as real as they have ever been, and repealing AUMFs without agreeing on a set of new authorities up front will only lead to more uncertainty about what we are going to do about them.

For years, U.S. forces have been carefully handing more of the primary responsibilities for counterterrorism to brave local partners. Under the last administration, this allowed our military footprint in Iraq and Syria to shrink dramatically. But the only reason that worked is because our partners have been able to trust that the U.S. military is still authorized to back them up. Today, House Democrats intend to rip out one of the key authorities underpinning that trust.

As I understand it, Democrats don't even intend to stop there. They are also planning to take aim at the 2001 authorities that allow us to keep some of the most dangerous terrorists alive from taking more innocent American lives. The administration says it is looking into how best to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, that houses the absolute—absolute—worst of the worst, including Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, the mastermind of the September 11 attack. But thus far, the administration is rather short on details. How does the President plan to do this? Does he intend to break the law and bring terrorists to the United States? Give them expanded legal rights? Further radicalize our prison population? Talk about domestic violent extremism. Or does the President intend to send KSM and his

terrorist cronies to Pakistan or Saudi Arabia before they have faced justice?

Closing Guantanamo Bay will not make Americans safer. It will not bring solace to the victims of terrorism. It will not make America more respected in the world. It won't solve the terrorist threat any more than repealing AUMFs will end their war against us.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JOHN K. TIEN

Mr. CARPER. Thank you, Madam President. I hope you are well today. Good to see you and our staff.

I rise this morning to applaud the nomination of COL John Tien. He has been selected by our President to serve as the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, a very big job and an important job.

I have the honor of currently serving as the senior member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, which is responsible for, among other things, overseeing the operations of the Department of Homeland Security.

REMEMBERING MADELEINE A. PETERS

Madam President, very sadly, my colleague GARY PETERS, who is the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, lost his mom this week, and he cannot be with us today. Normally, he would be here speaking on behalf of the nomination of Colonel Tien.

His mother, whom I know and personally and dearly—I have known her ever since Gary first joined us—she is a huge Detroit Tigers baseball fan, as am I. I had the pleasure of going with her to baseball games and considered her a kindred spirit.

I just want to, literally, as we think about Senator PETERS and his family this morning—I just want to ask, maybe, for a moment of silence to remember her and the Peters family.

Thank you.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Moment of silence.)

NOMINATION OF JOHN K. TIEN

Madam President, as many of our colleagues know, the Department of Homeland Security is still a fairly young Agency, created in response to the attacks on September 11, 2001.

I vividly remember the tragic events of that day, a day as beautiful as today—sunshine, blue skies—and then the whole world changed, literally, while I was riding the train from Wilmington to Washington, DC. I recall also, vividly, how the Members of this body pulled together that day and our country pulled together that day. We, with the U.S. House of Representatives, we, with the President George W. Bush, set aside partisan politics, and we created the 9/11 Commission and adopted the great majority of its recommendations.

My recollection was the cochairs of the 9/11 Commission, former Governor of New Jersey, Tom Kean, a Republican, highly regarded, my neighbor across the river, and Lee Hamilton, Congressman from Indiana, who was chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, one of my mentors—he was a Congressman years ago—they led a group, the 9/11 Commission. I think they came to agreement unanimously on 42 recommendations, passed them off to what would become the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. We adopted almost every one of them unanimously, and it did a lot of good for our country and provided a lot of protection for our country, for our homeland.

Among the recommendations that he made was the creation of the Department of Homeland Security and the expansion of our committee's jurisdiction to include homeland security. Before that, we were the Committee on Governmental Affairs, which is important. It was an oversight committee. But with the addition of the Department of Homeland Security, that responsibility grew enormously.

But since then, our committee has taken on a very different purpose. I am proud of the work that we have done that has made Americans safer today.

As someone who was very much involved in helping to stand up and assemble the Department of Homeland Security, I am proud of the way it has grown and matured over the last 20 years. I remain convinced that it is, in large part, the leadership provided by the nominees we confirm in this Chamber that enables the Department of Homeland Security to carry out successfully as its many missions.

The Department of Homeland Security is an Agency with a budget of over

\$50 billion and a staff of almost a quarter million men and women who are collectively responsible for protecting our Nation from many of the threats that we face. From the clear and present threats of both foreign and domestic terrorism to responding to cyber attacks on our critical infrastructure, to helping distribute relief and assistance in the face of natural disasters, there is no shortage of work to be done by that Agency and the men and women who work there every single day.

I often say that leadership is the most important ingredient to the success of almost any organization on this planet. In sports, in business, in government, our leaders set the tone at the top. They lead by their example, and they are the ones who guide their team to accomplish its mission, or, in the case of the Department of Homeland Security, its many missions. That is why it is crucial that the Department of Homeland Security have Senate-confirmed, qualified leadership at its helm.

After years in multiple administrations leaving key Senate-confirmed posts vacant or held on an "Acting" capacity for far too long, this Department needs qualified leaders now more than ever.

It has been without a Senate-confirmed Deputy Secretary for over 3 years. Let me repeat that. This vital Agency has been without a Senate-confirmed Deputy Secretary for more than 3 years. That has to change. With the confirmation of COL John Tien to serve, this body can do something about it, and we can do it today.

The responsibilities of the Deputy Secretary are daunting. Serving as a chief operating officer, the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security is responsible for the day-to-day business of the Agency and the management of its operations and 250,000 men and women.

Colonel Tien is a proven leader and dedicated public servant. He is a retired U.S. Army colonel, whose 24-year career includes three combat tours in Iraq and national security roles in the Clinton, the George W. Bush, and the Obama White Houses. He has worked hand in glove with people from different perspectives and commands the respect of Republicans and Democrats alike.

For the past decade, COL Tien has been a leader in the private sector, where he has held senior executive roles in our Nation's financial sector and managed complex organizations and operations.

His nomination has drawn bipartisan support. Dozens of national security leaders and experts, including several former military and civilian government officials who served under Democratic and Republican Presidents, have expressed their strong support for Colonel Tien's nomination.

Just a week ago, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, on which I serve, advanced his

nomination by a wide margin—by a wide margin, bipartisan support. Given Colonel Tien's past leadership experiences, I am hopeful that the Department will finally get the Senate-confirmed leader it needs and deserves in this critical post.

The American people are counting on seasoned leadership at the Department of Homeland Security after too many years of vacancies. I describe those vacancies as Swiss cheese, executive branch Swiss cheese, and that needs to end.

I applaud President Biden for nominating Colonel Tien. I encourage my colleagues to confirm him.

Let me say on a personal note to Colonel Tien and his wife Tracy—and they have a couple of daughters, Amanda and Rebecca—when you serve, as he did in the military for 24 years, rising to the rank of colonel, you don't just serve that as an individual. It is not just the officer or enlisted person who is serving. If they have a family—and we almost all do—the family serves as well. If they have a spouse, they have children, they serve as well. And we don't often acknowledge that, not often enough, at least.

I just want to take a moment to say to Colonel Tien's wife Tracy, to their daughters, Amanda and Rebecca, we are grateful for your service as well. And we are honored and privileged that you would share a good man in this new role for our country.

And to Colonel Tien, whose mother recently passed away, I understand, just a few months ago, from COVID-19, let me say that I know your mom must be looking down from on high today and feeling very proud of her son on this day and every day.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). 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.

CENSORSHIP

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, at the end of May, Facebook announced that it would no longer censor claims that the coronavirus was man-made. The mainstream media, which had savaged the story during the previous administration, suddenly started backpedaling, and the Biden White House, which had reportedly canceled the previous administration's investigation into whether the novel coronavirus originated in a Wuhan lab, announced a 90-day inquiry into the virus's origins.

The occasion for all this backpedaling was apparently a report in the Wall Street Journal that three researchers who worked at Wuhan Institute of Virology "sought hospital care" in late 2019 for symptoms consistent with the coronavirus. In the wake of

that report, it became impossible for the President or the mainstream media or Facebook to deny what had always been a plausible theory: that the virus came from the virology lab in Wuhan.

Journalists moved to explain their previous rejection of this theory, and some of them openly admitted what had been obvious: that they rejected the theory not because of flaws in the theory itself but because of those who had advanced this hypothesis.

We don't know what these revived investigations will ultimately show, but the Wuhan reversal illustrates multiple issues. One, of course, is the need to remember that our social media experience is heavily curated. The posts and ads we see are selected for us by complex algorithms that analyze the data social media companies have collected on each of us and curate our experience accordingly.

On top of that, as the past year or two has illustrated, social media companies actively censor certain material, meaning that there are posts we will never see.

As chairman and now ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee's Communications and Tech Subcommittee, I have pushed for transparency requirements for social media companies, and I have introduced two bipartisan bills that would increase internet transparency while preserving the light-touch approach to regulation that has allowed the internet to flourish.

My Filter Bubble Transparency Act would allow social media users to opt out of the filter bubble—in other words, to opt out of the filtered experience tailored for them by opaque algorithms—and instead see an unfiltered social media feed or search results.

The Platform Accountability and Transparency Act, which I introduced with Senator SCHATZ, would increase transparency and accountability around content moderation. Sites would be required to provide an easily digestible disclosure of their content moderation practices for users, and, importantly, they would be required to explain their decisions to remove material to consumers.

Under the PACT Act, if a site chose to remove your post, it would have to tell you why it decided to remove your post. The PACT Act would also require sites to have an appeals process. So if Facebook, for example, removed one of your posts, it would not only have to tell you why, but it would have to provide a way for you to appeal that decision.

Let me be clear. Private entities are free to have their own opinions and viewpoints and should not be compelled by the government to publish alternative views, but that is not what we are talking about with these large social media platforms. Most strongly deny that they are publishers and instead hold themselves forth as neutral platforms for the free exchange of ideas from all corners. That is the promise they make to consumers.

The Wuhan reversal is more than a reminder that our social media experience is actually a heavily curated one. It also raises serious questions about censorship and the maintenance of the marketplace of ideas that is a hallmark of a free society. There is no free society without the free exchange of ideas. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom to speak in the public square—all of these are essential elements of a free society. The more a government or other entities crack down on freedom of speech and the free exchange of ideas, the more we move away from a free society and toward tyranny.

I say "or other entities" because the responsibility for protecting the free exchange of ideas extends beyond the government. Government, of course, has an absolute obligation to defend our fundamental freedoms, but other institutions in society also have a role. You can't have a free society without free institutions. I am thinking here particularly of the press, universities, and in this day and age, social media companies.

If the press or social media companies only sanction one narrative—the narrative preferred by the government or by social elites or by any other group—the marketplace of ideas shrinks substantially. If multiple groups that should be fostering the free exchange of ideas combine to limit or advance a particular narrative, they start to control public opinion instead of allowing individuals to form their own opinions based on a free flow of information.

Unfortunately, as the Wuhan story illustrates, today we are seeing a real movement to restrict the free flow of ideas. Whether we are talking about speech codes or social media censorship, more and more, we are seeing a preferred narrative being advanced and opinions outside of that preferred narrative being censored or marginalized.

We see it in government with bills like S. 1, which would, among other things, allow the IRS to consider an organization's views before deciding whether or not to grant it tax-exempt status, or the Equality Act, which would crack down on freedom of speech and freedom of religion in unprecedented ways. We see it outside government when media outlets engage in selective reporting to highlight an accepted narrative instead of reporting the news and the facts, whatever they are, or when social media censors legitimate theories or stories or when universities crack down on free speech.

In the wake of the Wuhan lab story, we saw widespread censorship across government, social media, and the press for political reasons. President Biden seemingly shut down the former President's investigation into the virus's origin because it was the former President's investigation. Democrats in Congress pressured social media companies to censor information that contradicted the narrative that they

were embracing. The mainstream media savaged the lab origin story. Social media sites censored it. And all of this happened because of the political affiliation of the people advancing this reasonable hypothesis.

You can only have a marketplace of ideas if ideas actually get out there, which is why censorship, as I have said, is antithetical to a free society. It is also important to note—and this is a critical, critical point—that having a free marketplace of ideas means allowing some ideas that might be wrong, that might seem offensive, that might seem silly. We are not talking about content that, for example, promotes violence but ideas that are provocative, debatable, or out of the mainstream. The alternative is allowing the government or some other entity to decide what information we see and what we believe.

It is important to remember that sometimes ideas that seem silly or wrong initially turn out to be right. More than one widely accepted scientific theory started out as a fringe position. A prevailing opinion may turn out to be wrong, and political or social power doesn't necessarily equal truth.

I hope that their abrupt reversal on COVID's possible origins makes media organizations and social media platforms think twice the next time they consider censoring a story. I hope it reminds them of the dangers of restricting the free flow of ideas and of their obligation to separate their politics from their jobs.

In a speech he delivered in 1967, Ronald Reagan, marveling at our government by the people, said this:

Perhaps you and I have lived too long with this miracle to properly be appreciative. Freedom is a fragile thing, and it's never more than one generation away from extinction. It is not ours by way of inheritance; it must be fought for and defended constantly by each generation, for it comes only once to a people.

I fear that long acquaintance with the blessings of liberty—with the blessings of a free press and freedom of speech and freedom of religion—has sometimes made us careless about the preservation of these freedoms. We are used to them, and we assume that they will always be with us. But, as Ronald Reagan pointed out, freedom has to be actively safeguarded, or it will be lost.

I have seen too many instances lately where our cherished First Amendment freedoms are subordinated to a political and social agenda, and I hope, I hope that the Wuhan story reminds us of the responsibility that each one of us has to safeguard these freedoms, lest they slip away from us.

BROADBAND

Mr. President, on Tuesday, the Commerce subcommittee of which I am the ranking member, the Subcommittee on Communications, Media, and Broadband, will hold a hearing on building resilient broadband networks. My hope is that this hearing will help

inform discussions of broadband funding in any infrastructure legislation.

I am particularly looking forward to hearing from Denny Law, the CEO of Golden West Telecommunications in South Dakota, who will speak on the challenges of deploying reliable and resilient broadband in rural areas.

The pandemic provided the most significant test to date of the resiliency of our broadband networks. Overnight, quite literally, our networks faced huge new demands. As the Nation locked down, demand for broadband shot up. Our phones and tablets and laptops became our main way of communicating with friends and family and, for many of us, our main way of doing our jobs. Video conferencing exploded—staff meetings, strategy meetings, virtual happy hours, telemedicine.

How did our networks stand up to the demand? Well, they exceeded expectations and vindicated the light-touch regulatory approach of the United States to broadband policy. While networks in Europe and elsewhere slowed streaming speeds in order to keep their networks up and running, U.S. networks maintained both their speed and quality. It was a real American success story.

The success of American networks during the pandemic was the result of sustained investment by U.S. telecommunications companies, which have made network reliability a priority. Congress should continue to encourage this kind of private investment and maintain a regulatory regime that allows companies to make the kinds of choices and investments that have resulted in strong and resilient U.S. networks.

Going forward, one of our priorities here in Congress has to be supporting the continued development of 5G. U.S. companies are already building out 5G networks, but there is more work to be done. We need to remove regulatory and permitting hurdles to deployment and ensure that companies have access to the spectrum they need to build strong networks.

Increasing spectrum availability will spur 5G deployments, and we need to build on previous efforts to make spectrum available, like my MOBILE NOW Act, legislation that we passed a few years ago. I have also repeatedly introduced legislation called the STREAMLINE Small Cell Deployment Act to address another key part of the 5G equation, and that is infrastructure.

Mr. President, 5G technology requires not just traditional cell phone towers but small antennas called “small cells” that can often be attached to existing infrastructure, like utility poles or buildings. The Federal Communications Commission, under Chairman Pai, modernized its regulations for the approval of small cells, but more work can be done to expedite small cell deployment.

The STREAMLINE Act focuses on updating current law to better reflect

emerging technology and to speed up permitting while respecting the role of State and local governments in making deployment decisions.

Adequate spectrum and the ability to efficiently deploy infrastructure are essential for building out strong U.S. 5G networks. But there is another key part of the equation, and that is having a sufficient workforce to meet the demands of 5G deployment and, later, 5G maintenance. That is why I have introduced the Telecommunications Skilled Workforce Act. My bill would help increase the number of workers enrolled in 5G training programs and identify ways to grow the telecommunications workforce to meet the demands of 5G.

As the resident of a rural State, expanding broadband access in rural areas has long been a priority of mine here in the U.S. Senate. We have made a lot of progress in recent years, but there is more work to be done.

I recently introduced the Rural Connectivity Advancement Program Act, along with Senators HASSAN, MORAN, and CORTEZ MASTO. Our legislation would set aside proceeds from spectrum auctions conducted by the FCC to build out broadband in unserved areas. It is essential that we expedite the deployment of fixed broadband in rural areas because this technology is necessary groundwork for 5G deployment. Without reliable broadband, rural areas will be excluded from access to 5G.

Reliable, fast internet is an essential element of our Nation's infrastructure. Like roads and bridges and railways and airports, strong internet networks keep our economy strong, and any infrastructure package should make an investment in broadband and 5G, as well as including regulatory relief, like that in my STREAMLINE Act, to expedite 5G deployment. However, we need to make sure that any Federal money is allocated in the most efficient manner possible and distributed responsibly, with coordination by expert Agencies like the Federal Communications Commission, to prevent waste.

We don't want another situation like what happened in the wake of the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which provided more than \$7 billion to multiple Agencies for rural broadband deployment, a majority of which was wasted, resulting in just a fraction of the access that was promised.

I am looking forward to Tuesday's hearing, and I will continue to work to advance nationwide 5G deployment and ensure that our rural communities receive the full benefits of the 5G revolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1652

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the city of Chicago, which I am proud to represent, there is an organization called Life Span. This is an incredible group of people who dedicate their

lives to providing comprehensive services for the survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Every day they respond to horrifying cases of abuse. They help thousands of women and children access the support they need to address trauma and to rebuild their lives.

For example, Life Span recently assisted a woman after her teenage daughter was sexually assaulted by the woman's husband. Life Span was able to help the mother and daughter navigate the overwhelming challenges of pursuing justice against the abuser and offer support to the daughter throughout this horrible process.

When the mother pursued a divorce from the abuser, Life Span filed a petition and is representing the mother as she navigates issues of child support and allocation of custody.

The three Life Span staffers that the mother and daughter have interacted with all provided critical bilingual and bicultural support. They have provided this crucial service for this family during an incredibly traumatic experience. And all three of these staffers are funded by assistance provided through the Victims of Crime Act, or VOCA. Life Span told me that without VOCA funding, "none of these personnel . . . would be able to have done this job."

Congress passed the Victims of Crime Act in 1984 to establish the Crime Victims Fund. This fund provides grants to State victim compensation and assistance programs, which assist victims with expenses like medical bills, funeral expenses, and the loss of wages during recovery.

How often I have heard Members of Congress come to the floor and in committee speak about the plight of the victims of crime. This is an effort—an overt effort by Congress—to make sure that we are there when they desperately need us.

The fund also provides funds to thousands of victims service providers, like Life Span, across the Nation. These providers offer programs serving victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, trafficking, and drunk driving.

The Crime Victims Fund doesn't receive a dime of taxpayer dollars. How about that? It is funded through criminal fines, penalties, forfeited bail bonds, and special assessments collected by the Federal Government.

Historically, most of the money in the fund comes from those criminal fines. But in recent years, deposits into the fund have dropped significantly, as the Justice Department began relying more on deferred prosecutions and non-prosecution agreements.

Monetary penalties from these deferred prosecutions and nonprosecution agreements are currently deposited into the general Treasury instead of this fund, and, as a result, this shift has had a devastating impact on the fund and the services available to crime victims in America.

That is why a bipartisan, bicameral coalition of Members of Congress

worked with the advocacy organizations on a fix to the VOCA law to sustain the Crime Victims Fund.

Our bill would stabilize the depleted fund by redirecting monetary penalties from deferred prosecutions and non-prosecution agreements to the victims and service providers that desperately need help.

The reduced deposits into the fund have already had a devastating impact. Victim assistance grants have been reduced by more than \$600 million in 2021, and more cuts are looming if we don't do something.

The executive director of Life Span in Chicago told me that VOCA funds 44 percent of the agency's services—about \$1.6 million annually. A substantial loss in VOCA funds would mean that they would have to cut back staff who provide legal services, affecting an estimated 880 clients.

Life Span is not alone. Advocates across the State of Illinois and across the country have reached out and shared what these cuts would mean for their agencies and the victims they serve.

The Center for Prevention of Abuse in Peoria, IL, noted:

We never want to be in a position where we are made to turn away people who need [our] specialized services and whole-hearted, dedicated care. Our teams are already stretched thin as they live the promise of our mission day in and day out. Fewer VOCA dollars means less staff and a lessened ability to help those who need to find safety, food, shelter, empowerment, freedom, and peace.

There is no time to waste. Every day that goes by, we miss an opportunity to help replenish this fund. In 2021, the fund has already missed out on approximately \$400 million in deposits. We are not even halfway through the year. Imagine how much more money the fund may lose if we don't do something.

That is why it is imperative that the Senate immediately pass this bill. The House already did it in March, with broad bipartisan support, and here in the Senate we have a bipartisan coalition of 56 Senators—36 Democrats and 20 Republicans—cosponsoring the legislation. We could send this bill to the President's desk today. We should have sent it to him weeks ago. Unfortunately, there is an objection that has prevented us from moving forward.

In a recent letter to Leader SCHUMER, victims' rights and law enforcement organizations said that, "The objectors are, in effect, holding victim services hostage in an ideological quest to overhaul the Appropriations process by eliminating budgetary offsets."

What a target to choose if you want to change the procedure of the committee—crime victims?

I agree with the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence and so many other groups. More than 1,700 that are begging us to do something and stop holding this critical legislation.

The passage of this legislation today would ensure that victims are able to

maintain these critical services. Don't we owe it to them after the promise of help to come through?

At this point, I would like to turn to my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI.

And I ask unanimous consent that Senators MURKOWSKI, TOOMEY, and I be able to complete our remarks prior to the vote.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge and thank my colleague and friend from Illinois for his leadership on this issue. He has outlined well the situation in front of us with regard to the status of the Crime Victims Fund.

Again, this is a nontaxpayer source of funding, which is designed to help the millions of victims of crimes—those who have been violated, those who are extraordinarily vulnerable. And we are at a place where, as he has indicated, we have a proposal here that could help address how this fund is replenished to, again, ensure that those who have been made victims can receive some level of compensation.

We are kind of stuck here this morning, which is extraordinarily unfortunate. Folks back home in Alaska are just starting their day, and they are looking with anticipation and hope and, quite honestly, prayers that today might be the day that they get good news on this.

Right now, I have about 30 organizations in Alaska, including our domestic violence shelters, our child advocacy centers, our victim advocacy organizations—they have all been notified that they are going to expect a 35-percent cut to their funding, effective the 1st of July, so just in a couple of weeks here.

And because of this broken VOCA deposit issue, this cut is set to affect their funds for not only this year but for next year going forward.

So think about it. You are the shelter in Kodiak, where I was just 6, 8 weeks or so ago. When you are told you have a 35-percent cut to your budget coming and you have a small community, where are you going to find those resources? Because, believe you, me, the individuals who still require those services are not staying at home and saying: Well, I guess we didn't have the services here on this big island of Kodiak; so I am just going to stay put.

The need is still there. In fact, the need is more enhanced or exacerbated than ever before. We have seen this as a follow-on from COVID. We have seen those aftereffects, that aftershock, when you have been in an isolated situation where you have been forced to kind of shelter in place, if you will, but your home is not a safe shelter. It is not a shelter in that sense of the word. But you don't have services. And so where do you go? You stay with your abuser. You stay in the situation that is unsound, unsafe, because you don't have anyplace to turn. So the need out there is considerable.

We had a situation last summer of devastating loss, with five village residents in different villages who had died in domestic violence murders over a course of 10 days. These are small villages where everybody knows everybody, and the loss of one person—an elder, a child, or a victim—is extraordinary. And so we looked at that, and we said: Well, that is exacerbated by COVID and what has happened.

But, no, this has been a situation for us long prior to COVID, in terms of, unfortunately, the levels that we see of domestic violence, sexual assault, the victimization that we see—so being there to provide funding for services to help prevent these deaths, the trauma that children experience when they are in the room, the murders that affect families for generations. There is a story in the news just today—a domestic situation, the husband and the wife. The husband took the wife's life and then took his own, and it was a 6-year-old with an iPad who notified the authorities.

I think about the reality of what a 35-percent cut means, what it means when you say your service providers are faced with \$6 million less in funding for victims services. The shelters are calling out to us for help. One domestic violence shelter in the State is facing the reality of laying off six full-time jobs within their organization. This is unacceptable.

I understand that there are concerns. Senator TOOMEY is going to speak to them. But this legislation doesn't change how Federal tax money is spent. It provides a technical fix by directing additional nontaxpayer dollars from criminal monetary penalties into this fund. So we are sitting at a point where the longer that Congress delays this fix, the larger the cuts that victims services in my State and all around the country will face.

This has been a hard time for us, and I think we recognize it, but for those who are trying to serve victims, for those who are trying to serve the most vulnerable at an exceptionally vulnerable time in their lives, it makes it 10 times harder. Our providers are exhausted, they are burned out, and now they are faced with massive cuts. We simply cannot fail them.

I would urge us to look past the politics on this. This is what these victims' advocates are saying: Please don't use us as the political lever here. So I join not only with Senator DURBIN but with the many in this body who would urge that we pass this technical fix to VOCA.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Alaska for her heartfelt remarks.

There are innocent people who are victims of domestic violence whose fate depends on what we do right here and now. This is an important budgetary debate that the Senator from Pennsylvania is raising. I ask, please don't use these people in this desperate situation as a pressure point. Let's try

to reconcile this on a rational basis without jeopardizing them.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1652, which was received from the House and is at the desk; further, 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 (Mr. OSSOFF). Is there objection?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, let me say I think I agree with 98, 99 percent of what I just heard from my colleagues.

In the 11 years I have been in the Senate, I have lost track of how many rape crisis centers and how many child advocacy centers I have visited. They have expanded the number, fortunately, because they have gotten additional resources from Congress. They do some of the most important work I know of—incredibly painful work—in helping a child through an appalling, traumatic experience when there is a law enforcement need to get information that can further traumatize a child. I mean, the work these folks do is amazing, it is essential, and the Senator from Alaska is exactly right in that there is a real need here.

The good news is that there is a real, very clear, and easy path forward here. The legislation that the Senator from Illinois is proposing creates a new source of money for the Crime Victims Fund. It is a new category, it is substantial, and it is going to be new resources for the advocates for crime victims to better be able to continue to do their very, very important work, and I fully support that.

So where do we disagree? Here is where we disagree: The legislation does require a lot of money—new money—to go into the Crime Victims Fund. The Senator from Illinois is exactly correct in that it is not taxpayer money; it is money from the settlements for criminal and civil penalties. I fully support that. What their legislation doesn't do, however, is require a dime of that money to actually get to the advocates of crime. It is very nice to put a lot of money into an account that has a name on it that is the Crime Victims Fund. That is very nice, and I support that, but I would like to take one more step and make sure the money actually gets to the victims of crime and their advocates.

Now, there is a little bit of budgetary information that explains why, if we don't adopt my approach here, this money will not get to the victims of crime and their advocates. You see, the appropriations process, the spending process around here, always operates under some limit. It could be a statutory limit or a limit passed by a budget resolution, but there is a limit. There is no limit as to how much people want to spend around here, but there is a limit as to how much they actually can.

We have a very perverse budgetary rule, and that rule says that, in any given year, if there is money in this Crime Victims Fund—mind you, not tax dollars, but if there is money in it—and Congress doesn't give it to the crime victims as it is supposed to, you can pretend that it is a savings, and it allows you to spend more than you would otherwise be able to spend on any number of other things, on anything—tanks, buildings, roads, whatever. That is the dynamic. That is what happens here. It actually creates an incentive, however perverse this is, for Congress not to allocate this money to the victims of crime and to their advocates. By not doing so, they get to claim a savings which isn't real—but that is the way the budget rules work—and spend that money elsewhere.

Now, you might say: Well, who would do a thing like that? Oh. Ha. Well, it used to happen all the time. In 2014, there was \$9 billion available in the Crime Victims Fund, but in order to spend more money elsewhere, less than \$1 billion was actually allocated to victims of crime and their advocates, so they got \$8 billion of difference that they could spend on whatever else they wanted, and they did. In 2013, it was the same story.

This was going on routinely until 2015 when I and some of my colleagues said: Wait a minute. This isn't right. This money is supposed to be going to crime victims, and it is not.

That is the first and most objectionable problem. It is also dishonest because there is no savings of taxpayer money here; this is just not giving crime victims the money from criminals that they are supposed to get. It is outrageous.

For a while, we got some cooperation, and they did less of this. In other words, more of the money that was supposed to go to crime victims for a while did, in fact, go there. But I am very concerned—and I have been concerned since 2015—that, at any point in time, we will go back to this process. So I introduced legislation called the Fairness for Crime Victims Act. I introduced it in 2015. What it does is it just requires that the money going into the fund actually go to the victims of crime and their advocates, and there are various mechanisms for doing it. The bill was reported out of the Senate Budget Committee in 2015, and it was unanimously adopted by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019.

I have been working as closely as I can with the appropriators to address this so that we will actually send to crime victims the money that is supposed to go to them. Since 2000, over \$82 billion of money has not been allocated to crime victims, as it should have been, precisely because of this mechanism.

Some might say: Well, hasn't it gotten better? Yes. The answer is that it has. But how do I know it is going to get worse? How do I know we are going to go right back to this? I will tell you

how I know. All I have to do is read the President's budget.

President Biden's budget, if you look at table S-8, explicitly calls for withholding money from victims of crime and advocates for those victims from the Crime Victims Fund and also the Children's Health Insurance Program so as to spend more money in other areas. It is right here: "changes in mandatory program offsets: \$26 billion." It says the limitation enacted will come from the Crime Victims Fund program and cancellations in the Children's Health Insurance Program. This is not like wild speculation; this is President Biden's budget, saying: Oh, here is what I want to spend, and part of how I will spend it—part of how we will get there—is by withholding money that should be going to victims of crime.

So I am fully in support of this new allocation of money into the account, but money in the account doesn't solve the problem. We need one more step, that is all—the step that says we are actually going to send it to victims of crime instead of whatever spending people in this town decide they prefer. That is what this is about. That is what the difference is.

We have developed a process. We have worked with people on both sides of the aisle, and we have passed legislation in committee to do it. We want to simply require the money that is meant for victims of crime and their advocates to get to them, and we are being told it won't all get to them under the status quo.

There is a simple solution here. There is a simple path forward. I think there is a genuine, sincere agreement, among everybody who has spoken, about the need for this service. All I am asking is that we actually have a mechanism to get them the money rather than to do what we all know is coming: Pretend they are going to get all of this money when, in fact, it is going to be diverted to other purposes.

Therefore, I ask that the Senator modify his request to include my amendment, which is at the desk; that it be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the modification?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I am disappointed that the Senator from Pennsylvania is adamant in his position, even though we are dealing with victims of crime, victims of domestic violence, and victims of child abuse. Like Illinois, Pennsylvania has experienced a nearly 70-percent cut in VOCA funding since 2018, and more cuts are on the horizon because of his strategy.

Here is what it boils down to: If you listen carefully to what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, he is not suggesting that the money is being

spent for other purposes but is suggesting that it could be. In fact, there is a conscious effort by the Appropriations subcommittee to make sure, if all of the money is not spent in 1 year, that enough will be maintained to stabilize the fund for future years. That is thoughtful, and that is what we like to hear, but we are in a desperate moment now wherein we need the money and need it at this moment.

I understand my colleague's concern about the scorekeeping in the budget. It is an important issue, even though it is esoteric. But to do it in relation to the Crime Victims Fund seems entirely misplaced. While this adjustment does not, in fact, transfer money from the fund to other priorities, it is just a budgeting gimmick that he is suggesting.

This is not the right place or time to do this when thousands of people across the United States are in desperate need of shelter to get out of an abusive home; of help for their children who have witnessed murders; and of dealing with court proceedings that may be unintelligible to the average person to try to protect their families and themselves. To think that we are engaged in this high-level budget debate at this moment at their expense is just not right.

I urge my colleague to withdraw his amendment and allow the legislation to proceed. We can debate the budget within the budget resolution and the appropriations process but not at the expense of crime victims across America. If he will not withdraw his amendment, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modification.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I will just say briefly that, clearly and certainly, this is not a scorekeeping debate, and this is not about budgets. This is about whether victims of crime and their advocates will actually get the money that we say they are going to get. It is not about what could be; it is about what has been. This money was routinely raided for other purposes until we brought a stop to it recently, and it is about what will be because the Biden administration is telling us it intends to do this.

In order to ensure that crime victims and their advocates actually get the money that we say they are going to get, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

VOTE ON BEAUDREAU NOMINATION

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Beaudreau nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Baldwin	Grassley	Portman
Barrasso	Hagerty	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Risch
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Sinema
Casey	Lankford	Smith
Cassidy	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Lujan	Tester
Coons	Lummis	Thune
Cornyn	Manchin	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Markey	Toomey
Cotton	Marshall	Van Hollen
Crapo	McConnell	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Warnock
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Fischer	Murray	Young
Gillibrand	Ossoff	
Graham	Padilla	

NAYS—9

Cruz	Lee	Shelby
Hawley	Paul	Sullivan
Kennedy	Sanders	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Cramer	Peters
--------	--------	--------

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.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 157, John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Ben Ray Lujan, Michael F. Bennet, Jeanne Shaheen, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Debbie Stabenow, Christopher A. Coons, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Brian Schatz, Tammy Baldwin, Mark Kelly, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeff Merkley.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, 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 New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 240 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Heinrich	Romney
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rounds
Blunt	Johnson	Rubio
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Scott (SC)
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Lujan	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cornyn	Menendez	Tester
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tillis
Duckworth	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warnock
Fischer	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Graham	Portman	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	Young

NAYS—33

Barrasso	Grassley	McConnell
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Booker	Moran
Cramer	Peters

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 63, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks prior to the recess.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1520

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise again to call for this entire body to vote and consider the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Preven-

tion Act. This commonsense reform would ensure that people in the U.S. military who have been subjected to sexual assault and other serious crimes get the justice that they deserve.

I began calling for the full floor vote on this bill on May 24. That was 24 days ago. Since then, an estimated 1,344 servicemembers will have been raped or sexually assaulted. Two in three of those survivors will not even report it because they know that they are more likely to face retaliation than receive justice.

This is a scourge that we have been looking at for over 8 years. We have passed nearly 250 measures to address sexual assault in the military, to address retaliation, to address prevention, and none of them have dented the numbers. In fact, our estimated cases are at about 20,000 cases, and among those, only about 200 have gone to courts-martial and ended in conviction. It is not enough. We aren't moving the numbers in the right direction. They are, in fact, going in the wrong direction.

We also have a reform that we have looked at for 8 years. It creates a bright line at all serious crimes to handle two issues: one, the bias we see in sexual assault in the military; that if you are a servicemember who reports sexual assault, it is unlikely that you will get justice, and it is likely that you will be retaliated against.

And after we have made retaliation a crime three times in a row, we have only seen one court-martial for retaliation. That is outrageous.

And so now is the time that we bring this measure to the floor. It does not cost a lot of money. It is something that uses the existing infrastructure, the existing lawyers, the existing infrastructure around the lawyers.

Two, it does not take a long time to implement because, in fact, after the military police complete their investigation and have their recommendation, basically, they send that recommendation to the prosecutor, as opposed to the commander. So after the review by the prosecutor, it goes right back to the commander if that prosecutor declines to prosecute.

So, ultimately, it changes the system in a very small but powerful way, and the reason why this change is recommended by all military experts is three reasons: One, the bright line creates a justice system for all plaintiffs and all defendants. And since we have bias with regard to women in the military and we have bias with regard to Black and Brown servicemembers, this change will remove bias and professionalize the system for everyone.

Second, our allies have done this. Our allies have done it—UK, Israel, Germany, Australia, Netherlands. They have done it over the last 40 years for defendants' rights, to make sure we have a system that is fair to everyone. When they put this change in place, they reported to our panel that, No. 1, they saw no diminution in command

control; and, No. 2, they saw no undermining of good order and discipline. So for those reasons, that is why we need to pursue this legislation, a bright line.

And then, last is the question that the chairman always raises, that this must go through the committee. The committee has been looking at this for 8 years. We have had multiple hearings on this topic. We have had the data. We have talked about it with every service Secretary for the last decade I have been on the committee. We have talked about it with each of the services for the last decade that I have been on the committee, and we have tried to get a vote on this measure, unsuccessfully, for the past 5 years. We have been denied a vote every time in the last 5 years.

So to say now that only the committee can have jurisdiction is not true. They have had their chance, and they have passed close to 250 measures. Those measures have not moved the needle. Those measures are ones that the DOD was comfortable with. They have never wanted this measure. Now we have agreement by the chairman, by this panel, by many of the service Secretaries that, OK, fine, we are with you; we will take sexual assault out of the chain of command.

While that is good, it is not enough because it will create two systems of justice, and you should not privilege just one set of plaintiffs to have a positive, professional, unbiased system.

And given all of the data we have about race and bias against Black servicemembers and Brown servicemembers being punished up to 2.5 times more than White servicemembers, you need to fix the system for everybody.

So back to the argument of our allies, that is why they did their bright line at serious crimes—the equivalent of felonies—so that they could have a justice system that is worthy of the sacrifices that the men and women in our armed services make.

So I ask once again that we can have a vote on this floor. We now have 66 cosponsors of this legislation, widely bipartisan. How many bills in this Chamber are supported by LIZ WARREN and TED CRUZ at the same time? How many pieces of legislation have been voted on by both CHUCK SCHUMER and MITCH MCCONNELL? Very few. But the reason we have such bipartisan support is we have two female command veterans in this body. One is a Republican, JONI ERNST. One is a Democrat, TAMMY DUCKWORTH. They are both on this legislation. They have served as commanders, and they understand the importance of the commander's roles. But they also have seen that nothing has gotten better. They saw the report from Fort Hood that said the command climate was so toxic that it was permissible for sexual assault and sexual harassment. And so they have said enough is enough.

And so when you have so many former commanders and sexual assault survivors from this Chamber supporting this legislation, it is time that

it does not need to go through the committee. More than half of our committee supports this. But when we take issues like this to the committee, they have been taken out in conference.

Despite winning the vote in the Senate, despite winning the vote in the House, our bill in 2019 to make sure that a servicemember could come forward and not be prosecuted for minor related offenses, like drinking or being off base—that bill passed in the Senate, passed in the House, and was taken out in conference because the DOD didn't like it.

So I promise you, if we pass this bill in our committee, in the House and the Senate—I promise you—it would be narrowed just down to sexual assault because that is what the DOD will agree to.

I am tired of doing only what the DOD will agree to. It is not our job to defer to the DOD. It is our job as U.S. Senators to provide oversight and accountability over the administration and over the entire Department of Defense.

When we abdicate that responsibility, what we have is what we had for the last 10 years, failure—failure in the committee because we only put forward items the DOD was comfortable with.

I just don't know how much longer we want survivors to have to wait. We have considered this legislation together. We have, every year, sat down, discussed it—pros, cons. Are other reforms working?

I have done that with every one of the 100 Senators in this Chamber every year for the last 10 years. It has been intensely considered, and I spend an extra amount of time with committee members because they are interested.

So this is not new. It doesn't need to go through the committee. We have been denied a vote and filibustered a vote for 8 years and denied a vote for the last 5 years. So I don't know why the committee gets sole jurisdiction. I don't understand.

And, again, how many measures does this Chamber have that have 66 cosponsors?

It is also a generational shift. And when you have something of such import, it comes to the floor. We repealed don't ask, don't tell on the floor. We had two floor votes. The majority leader at the time gave us those votes, and it passed on the floor. It did not go through the committee.

It is time to bring a justice system that is worthy of the sacrifice that the men and women make every day. And you need to have that bright line so it is a justice system that works for women and servicemembers of color because right now we have data and evidence that there is bias against those individuals.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate Committee

on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of S. 1520 and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that there be 2 hours of debate, equally divided in the usual form; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Is there objection?

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, once again, I object to the request from the Senator from New York for the reasons I previously stated. I will repeat again: I support removing prosecution of sexual assault and related crimes from the chain of command, but we must take care that we do it thoughtfully, in a manner that does not stress the military justice system or distort it in a way that would affect the efficiency and operation of the military. The best way to do that, in my view, is to consider these matters in the context of the annual Defense bill, which we will be marking up in a month.

Mr. President, I would also point out that this week, Jeh Johnson, who served under President Obama as the Department of Defense general counsel, and then Secretary of Homeland Security, wrote an article addressing the scope of Senator GILLIBRAND's bill, urging caution that we focus on legislative solutions tailored to address the problem we are trying to solve. And to remind my colleagues, as the DOD general counsel, Secretary Johnson oversaw all legal services performed within the Department of Defense. He advised the Secretary and all government officials on military justice matters and oversaw the annual review of the Manual for Courts-Martial. He is an informed and expert voice on these matters.

During his tenure as DOD general counsel, he was no stranger to momentous change, leading the implementation of the repeal of don't ask, don't tell. As he states in his article, he has long supported moving charging decisions over sex offenses out of the chain of command.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article.

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

[From LAWFARE, June 16, 2021]

THE MILITARY JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT AND INCREASING PREVENTION ACT: ARE THE SOLUTIONS COMMENSURATE WITH THE PROBLEM?

(By Jeh Johnson)

The Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act of 2021 is legislation pending in Congress to reshape the manner in which the U.S. military prosecutes sexual assault within its ranks. This is reform that is much needed and long overdue. Notably, however, the bill in its current form reshapes military justice far beyond the context of sexual assault. Congress should take care to fashion a solution commensurate with the problem at hand, and not go too far.

Senator Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY), the principal sponsor of the bill, S. 1520, deserves

credit for her heroic and persistent campaign over the years to highlight the problem of sexual assault in the military. Few others in Congress today could have assembled such a broad bipartisan coalition of 64 co-sponsors behind such an important, substantive piece of legislation, while moving (or, to put it more appropriately, dragging) the top brass at the Pentagon to the same place. From my experience 10 years ago preparing the military for the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, I know how resistant to change that community can be.

I support Senator Gillibrand's effort to move charging decisions for sex offenses in the military to an independent, trained group of military lawyers. I said as much publicly in 2013. Likewise, almost all retired general and flag officers I speak with today agree that the male-dominated chain of command has failed the victims of sexual assault in the military. They accept the need for change.

But, in its current form, the changes contemplated by S. 1520 are not limited to sex-related offenses. The bill would create an independent body of lawyers, outside the chain of command, to make charging decisions for a broad range of offenses punishable by more than a year's confinement. These include murder, manslaughter, child endangerment, larceny, robbery, fraudulent use of a credit card, kidnapping, arson, housebreaking, extortion, bribery, perjury, subornation of perjury and obstruction of justice. (Notably, other offenses such as receipt of stolen property, forgery and conduct unbecoming an officer are excluded from the bill's reach, but the logic for the distinction is unclear.) In all, if enacted, the legislation would constitute the largest change to military justice since the enactment of the Uniform Code of Military Justice in 1950.

Why are offenses ranging from murder, arson to perjury included in the bill's reach? What is the justification for so large an overhaul? Where is the congressional finding that, when it comes to the broader range of offenses, the chain of command in the U.S. military has failed in its duty to carry out military justice?

Supporters of the bill argue that, once Congress goes down the road of creating an independent body to make charging decisions for sex crimes, it cannot stop; that to limit the creation of an independent body for sex crimes would also create the stigma of "pink courts" that appear to exist for the benefit of women. In my view, the exception is warranted, perceptions can be addressed, and the exception should not swallow the rule. In both civilian and military life, the reality is the sex offenses are different, in the manner in which they are reported, investigated, and prosecuted. It should also be noted that victims of sexual assault are both men and women.

Here are several other considerations:

First, as written the bill appears to require a whole new bureaucracy to implement and execute the changes contemplated. No one should be under the illusion that the broad mission contemplated by the bill can be carried by a small band of elite JAGs in a suite someplace in northern Virginia. The bill would require that an independent group of lawyers make charging decisions for a vast range

Mr. REED. I think given the wise comments of not only Mr. JOHNSON but also the pending recommendations by the Department of Defense concerning this issue, again, the best place to have a thorough, lively debate and amendments, by the way, which are precluded in this unanimous consent, would be in the Armed Services Committee in the

context of the annual defense authorization bill. That is where we have confronted and decided these issues historically.

And with that, I would reiterate my objection to the Senator from New York's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, two issues: First, the op-ed by Jeh Johnson was not in reference to my legislation. In fact, he conflated my legislation with recommendations from the IRC. He mentioned lawyers in Virginia having to make the decisions. That is not what my bill says. It has never said that, and it is not how it is organized. In fact, my bill is organized by services to adjudicate these cases, as they are doing today.

Right now, prosecutors prosecute these cases, and the decision making of whether to proceed to trial would be given to them in the first instance. If they decline to prosecute, it goes right back to the commander. So, for example, if there wasn't enough evidence to prosecute the case, it would go back to the commander, who could then use a special court-martial or he could use nonjudicial punishment for related or lesser offenses. That is typically what the commanders do in these cases.

So very little changes. But what does change is the perception of the victim who is asking for unbiased review by someone who is highly trained to do that review. It also gives assurance to defendants' rights that the person making the decision is unbiased and is highly and professionally trained.

Those changes change everything. It changes the perception that our military justice is blind, fair, and professional. And that is not the impression of servicemembers today. Both women and men and survivors of sexual assault do not believe that justice is possible for them, and Black and Brown servicemembers do not believe the justice system is fair to them either.

This solution makes sense, and I do not think that we should defer again our responsibility to one op-ed by one former SecDef. That is not our job, and that is not how we should be responding.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 1:45 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:15 p.m., recessed until 1:45 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KING).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Tien nomination?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. 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 New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE.)

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 241 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Blunt	Johnson	Rounds
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Scott (SC)
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Lujan	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Feinstein	Murphy	Warnock
Fischer	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Portman	Young

NAYS—34

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Lummis	Tuberville
Daines	Marshall	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	
Grassley	Paul	

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Cramer	Peters
Burr	Moran	Thune

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). 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 actions.

The Senator from Maryland.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CARDIN. 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.

HELSINKI COMMISSION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time as the Chair of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, better known as the Helsinki Commission, as we celebrate our 45th anniversary.

The Helsinki Commission is the vehicle for U.S. participation in the Organi-

zation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, representing 57 states that have come together under the OSCE, all the countries of Europe, all the countries of the former Soviet Union, including those located in Central Asia, the United States, and Canada.

Mr. President, this is a unique body in that it represents both the executive and legislative branches of government. The executive branch has representatives on the Helsinki Commission, and both the House and Senate have Senators and Representatives that serve on the Helsinki Commission.

I am very pleased to have as my co-leader Senator WICKER from Mississippi as the Republican leader in the Senate on the Helsinki Commission.

The Helsinki Commission has been responsible for elevating our moral dimension to U.S. foreign policy. Its principles point out very clearly that you cannot have security without dealing with good governance and human rights; you cannot have economic progress unless you have governance that respects the rights of all its citizens.

That is why I was so pleased when President Biden announced that his foreign policy would be value-based, that as we participate in our foreign policy challenges, it will always be wrapped in our values, and his recent trip to Europe underscored that important lesson. And then he issued, not 2 weeks ago, the statement that corruption is a core national security threat and that we have a responsibility to fight corruption in order to protect our national security.

I am so pleased of the accomplishments of the Helsinki Commission, particularly from the human rights and human dimension. I go back to my early days in the House of Representatives, when the Soviet Union still existed and the challenges of Soviet Jews trying to emigrate from the Soviet Union. It was the Helsinki Commission that was one of the leading voices to help deal with Soviet Jews.

I think about trafficking in persons, modern-day slavery, and the efforts that the United States did in leading that effort, including passing landmark legislation in trafficking in persons and establishing a rating system where every country in the world is rated on how well they are dealing with fighting trafficking. Now this has become the model, and so many countries have acted. It was the U.S. Helsinki Commission that led the effort for what Congress was able to pass and the international effort in order to fight trafficking in persons.

I think about the perpetrators of war crimes and crimes against humanity and genocide, and recognize that it was the Helsinki Commission that pushed to hold those who were responsible for these atrocities accountable, particularly as it related to the Balkan conflict.

Then I think about the landmark legislation that was passed in the Congress that deals with sanctions against

human rights violators, first the Magnitsky sanctions and then the Global Magnitsky sanctions. It came out of hearings from the Helsinki Commission and legislation that we authored. It is not only the standard here in the United States. It has been adopted as the standard in Europe, in Canada, and in other countries, to make it clear that human rights violators will not be able to hide their illicit funds in our banking system or visit our country.

Perhaps our strongest contribution is the oversight hearings that we hold. We also passed the Elie Wiesel Atrocities Prevention Act. But just last week we had a hearing in the Helsinki Commission on how we can prevent atrocities from occurring in the first place. So I am very proud of the accomplishments of the Commission.

Part of the responsibilities of every member state of the OSCE is that we have the right to challenge any state's compliance with the Helsinki Final Act Accords. So it is our responsibility to challenge when Russia violates those provisions or we see violations in Turkey—any member state you can challenge.

But we also have to do our own self-evaluation. As chairman of the Commission, I have been using that opportunity to question conduct in our own country when it does not match the responsibilities that we should have. We saw that in the past in regard to the torture issues in Guantanamo Bay.

My participation in the Helsinki Commission goes back to my early days in the House of Representatives and some of my proudest moments of representing our country on the international stage. Let me just give you a few examples.

In February 1991, I joined a fact-finding mission to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. That is when the Soviet tanks were in Vilnius. That is when the Soviet Union was demonstrating oppression against the people of the Baltic States. It was a very sad moment of oppression, and we went there to stand up for the people of the region, to let them know that the United States never recognized the Soviet's occupation of the Baltic States, and that we stood with the people and their independence.

It was very interesting. We went from there to Moscow, and Mikhail Gorbachev didn't want to have anything to do with us. He wouldn't have a meeting with us, and he wouldn't acknowledge that we were there. But we had a meeting with Boris Yeltsin, who at that time was the chair of the parliament, and we got great visibility. And Yeltsin supported our efforts to condemn the Russian use of force.

I have been to Germany several times. My first trip on behalf of the Helsinki Commission was when it was a divided country, and we went to East Berlin. We were the voices for those oppressed people whose voices could not otherwise be heard, and we gave them hope that one day they would see freedom.

I then returned when we were literally taking down the Berlin Wall, and I joined in taking down part of the Berlin Wall. I have part of that as a prized possession in my home.

I have returned to Germany as a united country and see what a democratic Germany means and the work of our Commission to bring down the Iron Curtain. Germany is now a leading democratic state and a great ally of the United States.

I have been to Kiev, Ukraine, on several occasions. I was there during the Maidan protests, where the people demanded democracy. And then I had a chance to return and monitor the elections in Ukraine with Senator PORTMAN—again, a country that has been able to rid itself of the oppression of the Soviet Union.

I have been very active in the Helsinki Commission in regards to the Parliamentary Assembly. I chaired one of their three standing committees. I had a chance to become vice president at the Parliamentary Assembly.

Today, I acknowledge Senator WICKER, who is vice president. It points out the bipartisan nature of the Helsinki Commission and our work on the international platform.

TRIBUTE TO ERIKA SCHLAGER

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we could not have accomplished any of these achievements without an incredible dedicated staff to the mission of the Helsinki Commission, and I want to just acknowledge one individual who recently announced that she is retiring, Erika Schlager, after 34 years of service to the Commission and to the global community.

Erika received her bachelor's degree from the University of North Carolina in Greensboro, where she graduated magna cum laude and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. She earned her A.M. degree from Harvard University in Soviet Union studies and her juris doctor degree with honors from the George Washington University Law School. She studied at Warsaw University as a Fulbright fellow and received a diploma from the International Institute of Human Rights in Strasbourg, France. Quite a record.

She used that academic preparation to make a difference in the world—and what a difference she made. Erika has been an unfailing professional in her dedication to doing whatever is necessary to ensure that the Commission meets its mandate and defends human rights abroad. Her deep expertise, which she has honed over decades of work, is renowned both among policy professionals in the United States and in the countries of Central Europe that she followed for the Commission.

Erika is one of our Nation's top experts on Europe's most vulnerable communities. She is a leading voice on Roma rights—Europe's largest minority, with significant populations also in the United States.

I have joined Erika in the crusade to speak up for the Roma population, a group that has been denied citizenship in so much of Europe. What a difference she has made in their lives.

Erika has worked with Members of Congress, the Department of State and the OSCE to address issues ranging from the enslavement and sterilization of Roma to a permanent memorial in Berlin dedicated to the Sinti and Roma victims of the Nazi regime, to annual recognition of International Roma Day.

She has brought to my attention the candidacy of Ethel Brooks to be the first Roma board member of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. I know that Erika will continue to bring Roma perspective and history on the Holocaust to further the tolerance, education, and human rights work of the museum.

I have the honor of representing the Senate on the Holocaust Memorial Museum board, and I can tell you that Erika is so deeply respected by the professionals at that museum for the work she has done in furthering the goal of that institution to prevent atrocities against any groups of people.

Erika has long been one of my top advisers on the Holocaust restitution and Europe's Jewish community. She has worked closely with me over the years to raise concerns about the rise of Holocaust revisionism in countries like Hungary and Poland; to foster implementation of the Terezin Declaration on Holocaust Era Assets measures to right the economic wrongs that accompanied the Holocaust; and to hold accountable a French railway that transported thousands of Holocaust victims to their deaths. She worked on all of these issues and made significant progress.

Erika has been instrumental in ensuring that the Helsinki Commission works to hold the United States accountable for our own human rights record, examining U.S. policies and conduct concerning Guantanamo Bay detention camps and U.S. policy regarding torture.

Erika's counsel greatly assisted me in my role as the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE's Special Representative on Anti-Semitism, Racism, and Intolerance, where I was focused on human rights and justice here at home and across the expanse of the 57 participating states of the OSCE.

From the plight of African Americans and Muslims to migrants and refugees, Erika has been integral to the Helsinki Commission's mandate of upholding the myriad of human rights commitments defined in the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent OSCE agreements.

In addition to her many professional milestones and achievements, Erika retires from the Commission having left a deeply personal mark on those she worked with, from diplomats and civil servants to the staff of the Helsinki Commission. She is a natural teacher

with a gift of taking a complex issue and distilling it in a way that makes it both relevant and accessible.

Erika has taught our diplomats at the Foreign Service Institute and spoken at international meetings and at universities across the Nation and around the world. She displayed her exceptional teaching ability at the Department of State's annual training program on Roma rights, and she has ensured that Roma civil society groups could also participate.

She has actively sought out dialogue and collaboration with new colleagues to help deepen their understanding of the Helsinki Commission's role, of the challenges the Commission could usefully seek to address abroad, and of the unique tools at its disposal to do just that.

Erika is always quick to ask about a colleague's well-being or inquire after a family member's well-being. She has fostered collegiality among the Commission's staff through her unfailing kindness and good nature. In so doing, she has repeatedly demonstrated how deeply she cares, not just for the work she has dedicated her career to but also for the people whose great privilege it is to call her a colleague and a friend.

I will say on a personal basis that I have benefited so much from her friendship, from her understanding, from her strategic thinking, from where we can make a difference. We know there are a lot of problems around the world. We know we can't settle all the issues. But Erika helped us focus on areas where we can make a difference, and thanks to her input, we have made a difference.

I know I speak on behalf of all Helsinki Commission members and staff and scores of other individuals—many who may not know her name—and groups concerned about advancing human rights around the globe and here at home when I say how we will miss Erika.

Henry David Thoreau said: "Aim above morality. Be not simply good; be good for something." Erika has embodied that maxim in her professional career and in her life. She has made an enormous difference, and she will continue to do so.

I wish her all the best with respect to her future endeavors. I know we will continue to hear from her.

Thank you, Erika, for the way you served the Commission, our country, and the global community.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LOUISIANA

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, June marks the start of the Atlantic hurri-

cane season, and 2021 is on us, but my constituents are still suffering from the storms of 2020. There are a lot of folks in Louisiana who are still hurting. If you were to fly over Lake Charles, LA, you would still see blue tarps on roofs of homes damaged a year ago.

I took to the Senate floor last month stressing the need for disaster supplemental while Lake Charles and Baton Rouge at that time were getting hit by heavy rains and severe flooding. At the time, Lake Charles ended up with 8 to 15 inches of rain in less than 12 hours. It is heartbreaking to see them affected once more by a natural disaster. Baton Rouge got more than 13 inches of rain overnight, with 15,000 homes and businesses without power the next morning. All this comes on the heels of Hurricanes Laura and Delta and winter storms which had catastrophic damage to livestock, crops, and structures for Louisiana farmers.

For those who need a refresher, 2020 set a record for the most named storms—30 in 1 season and 5 of those named storms hitting Louisiana, which is also a record. Hurricane Laura, a category 4 hurricane, hit Lake Charles, devastated it, and then almost the exact same place that Laura hit, Delta hit—category 2—6 weeks later. It is unprecedented to have one hurricane followed by another.

NOAA calculates the damage from Hurricane Laura at about \$19 billion and Delta at \$2.9 billion. Laura wreaked havoc through devastating winds, which reached 150 miles per hour at landfall—the strongest hurricane to hit my State since 1856. Delta was just rain. In LeBleu Settlement, just northeast of Lake Charles, they received almost 18 inches.

I may sound like a broken record, but I need to just play this broken record once more. We cannot allow the impact of an entire year's worth of natural disasters to go unaddressed.

Just a few weeks ago, I was in Lake Charles, and I heard incredible frustration about rebuilding in the aftermath of these storms—a church still with its roof ripped off; homes, as I mentioned, covered with tarps—and stories from members of the community who are not back in their homes and, frankly, may not even be back in their city because there are no homes and there is no housing for them to return to.

The people in Lake Charles have an incredible resilience and an incredible we-can-do spirit. So you go there, and people are laughing and they are smiling, but then you see that blue tarp, and you know that this community will not recover at the way things are going. I would argue that the weather events were tragic, but the lack of action upon recovery is making a tragedy worse.

In March, my colleague from Oregon, Senator JEFF MERKLEY, and I urged the Biden administration to support a supplemental disaster appropriation to urgently address and direct Federal re-

sources to communities throughout America struggling to recover from hurricanes, floods, wildfires, and other 2020 natural disasters.

President Biden came to Louisiana. Once more, he heard from Mayor Nic Hunter, Governor Edwards, and myself that we could hopefully have some relief. We need programs like community development block grants, disaster recovery, mitigation funding, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineer funding for southwest coastal Louisiana hurricane and storm damage risk reduction. We need emergency solutions grants and social services block grants to provide assistance to the thousands of families who have lost their homes due to hurricanes like those I have been describing.

We are past due moving quickly. If it happened tomorrow, it still would have not happened quickly, and we have gone into another year which could have similar storms. We need to help the people of Southwest Louisiana. The region has been pounded. My job is to do all I can to help them get back on their feet.

Once more, I call on my colleagues in the House and the Senate with a simple message: Let's get a disaster supplemental done.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. 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 Senator from Michigan.

EXCELLENCE IN MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION TREATMENT ACT OF 2021

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I am here today and soon on the floor my good friend Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri will be here as well to talk about an issue that we both care very, very passionately about. In fact, on October 31, 2013, which I guess it is amazing how time flies, but in 2013, Senator BLUNT and I stood here on the Senate floor together to mark a very important anniversary. It was 50 years to the day after President Kennedy signed into law the Community Mental Health Act—50 years to the day. And, tragically, it was the last piece of legislation he ever signed, and it was one of the most important.

The Community Mental Health Act was groundbreaking; its goal, to provide full funding for comprehensive mental health services in the community. How important. Unfortunately, that has yet to fully happen. Instead, behavioral health is funded primarily through grants that start and then the grant stops. You would never say to someone who is having a heart attack: We would love to help you, but we are so sorry the grant ran out. Can you

come back in 6 months? And yet that is what we say to people with mental illness or a substance abuse disorder. Every day, multiple times a day, that is what people hear.

These people who need help aren't abstractions, they are our moms and dads and brothers and sisters and sons and daughters and friends and, in fact, us. I am so grateful to Members who have shared their own mental health stories; that includes my friend, Senator TINA SMITH, who bravely shared her own struggle with depression that so, so many of us have had throughout our lives.

We know that with the right support, people who live with some kind of a mental health challenge can thrive. They do. I have often told the story of growing up in Clare, MI, a little rural town, where my dad had struggles and was misdiagnosed for years and finally, finally, finally, correctly diagnosed as being bipolar and getting the support and help with medication he needed, and he was able to thrive after that. And that is what I want to have for every person in Michigan, every family in Michigan, every family across the country.

Unfortunately, far too many people still struggle to get the support that they need. We certainly have seen that during the COVID-19 pandemic, and it has gotten much, much worse, unfortunately, with everything everybody has had to go through.

One CDC report found that last June, twice as many people as usual said they were experiencing symptoms of anxiety and depression—not surprising—and 11 percent of Americans have reported having serious thoughts of suicide in the past 30 days—in the past 30 days. And, tragically, 200 Americans are dying every day due to opioid overdoses, according to the CDC. And that is up 34 percent since the pandemic started—34 percent. Clearly, we need to do more to get people the mental health care and the substance abuse treatment that they need and that they deserve.

The good news is, we are well on our way to ensuring that healthcare above the neck will be treated like healthcare below the neck. This is an effort that Senator BLUNT and I have now been working on since that day we came to the floor in 2013. We are well on the way to finally seeing President Kennedy's vision become a reality.

Not long ago, Senator BLUNT and I, as I mentioned before, after that floor speech, introduced something called the Excellence in Mental Health Act. It was signed into law in 2014. It created certified community behavioral health clinics, which are funded just like federally qualified health centers. You have high standards, the clinic meets the standards, and then they get fully funded through the healthcare system.

It requires these clinics to provide a comprehensive set of services to everyone who walks through the door, including 24/7, 365 days a year crisis serv-

ices, outpatient mental health and substance abuse treatment, and immediate screenings, risk assessments, and diagnosis. And just as important, it requires care coordination, including partnerships with emergency rooms and law enforcement and veterans organizations.

Ten States, including Missouri and Michigan, have been selected for full participation in the program. And startup grants have been extended now to a number of clinics across the country—40 States, plus the District of Columbia, 300 community clinics being funded to get things started so far, and we have more coming because of the American Rescue Plan. These clinics are already making a huge difference.

We just had a hearing in the Finance Committee this week from those speaking strongly about this model, this being the model for care in the community. Just as community health centers are the model of care for physical healthcare, certified community behavioral health clinics are now the model for mental health and addiction services.

More than half of these clinics provide same-day services. Now, that may not seem like much, but the truth of the matter is—and this has been true for years in Michigan because of lack of funding—they only are able to help people with the most severe problems. So if you want to walk in and connect with somebody and express a concern, you are probably not going to get any services—certainly, not that day—under the old system. Now, more than half of these clinics provide same-day services. Nearly all of them offer treatment within a week. Think about someone with a substance abuse issue, as well as a mental illness. Time is everything. And if someone is reaching out for help, they need to get that help right away.

Ninety-five percent of these clinics have been engaged in one or more innovative practices with law enforcement. It has actually been incredible to hear what is being done with local law enforcement. So when the police officers are called to the scene, and it is clearly an issue that may involve mental illness or substance abuse, they are able to immediately connect up with those who can provide those services instead of having to take somebody to jail when they shouldn't be in jail. And we know that many, many people in many cases around the country, the majority of people who are in the jail are people who actually need mental health help or substance abuse help. And so there is wonderful collaboration now through these clinics going on.

Statistics from the Department of Health and Human Services show that people who have received services at clinics—it is amazing numbers. I will just mention three: sixty-three percent fewer emergency room visits. I have heard from so many police officers talking about they are called to the scene, they take someone into custody

who really just needs help, and then they go to the emergency rooms or other services, and the officer, then, sits there all day or longer with them or family members waiting, waiting, waiting because there are not the services that they need. So with the certified behavioral health centers, we have 63 percent fewer visits to emergency rooms for people who have a substance abuse problem or mental illness.

Sixty percent less time in jail. We are debating a lot these days about the role of law enforcement and more calls, as we definitely need, to have support services in the community. Through the work of certified community behavioral health clinics in the communities where they exist, there has been a 60-percent reduction in folks going to jail. Instead, they are getting the help they need.

And we have seen almost a 41-percent decrease in homelessness—another major way that people end up on the street or in a shelter when what they need is help.

Currently, about 1.5 million people are accessing these services, and it is a start. We did it originally as a demonstration to show that this could actually work and make a significant difference and actually save community resources, in addition to providing people the help that they need and deserve. But we need to do more, and that is why we are speaking today.

President Kennedy believed that these services should be available to everyone who needs them, and Senator BLUNT and I agree. That is why this week we introduced our Excellence in Mental Health and Addiction Treatment Act of 2021. This legislation will expand these high-quality mental health and addiction treatment services across the country. This is the next step for States and communities across the country to be able to have the healthcare funding to provide high-quality services that we know work.

This is going to give every State the opportunity to create certified community behavioral health clinics in their communities. Just imagine what that could mean for a veteran who is living with post-traumatic stress or a young mom who recently had a baby and is struggling with postpartum depression or a college student who is working to overcome his substance use disorder, stay in school, and earn a degree but just needs some help and support to be able to make that happen.

Right now, only about 11 percent of people with substance use disorders get help in any given year. Think about that, 11 percent; about 11 percent of those struggling with an addiction are able to get help in any given year. Well, Senator BLUNT and I aren't going to stop until 100 percent of people with substance abuse disorders and other mental illnesses are able to access the care that they need to thrive.

This is really an important moment because we, over the last several years, have designed working with various administrations now, designed quality

standards. We have demonstrated that providing these services makes a difference. We have strong support from law enforcement. We have strong support from the healthcare community, from the mental health and substance abuse community in a broad way.

It is exciting to see this be something that really is bipartisan. I am so thrilled we have colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are supporting this effort signing on. We have more people signing on every day. That is because we believe in these clinics. We believe in the services and this way of providing services. We have seen it for ourselves, how it can change people's lives and give people the opportunity to be able to thrive.

When we introduced our original legislation, I spoke with Malkia Newman, whom I have known for many years. She lived for over 30 years with undiagnosed and untreated bipolar disorder. She finally got the treatment she needed through the community mental health system. And what she has done is truly amazing. We had Malkia come and speak as a witness for our healthcare subcommittee hearing in Finance that Senator DAINES and I did a few weeks ago, and she was amazing.

Malkia is team supervisor for the CNS Healthcare Anti-Stigma Program in Waterford, MI. She is a peer educator. She is developing and leading programming in Michigan and sharing her expertise all across the country. She is an ordained minister, and she is a board member of the Oakland Community Health Network, where she has served several terms as board chair and vice chair.

Last month, when she testified at our Senate Finance Health Subcommittee hearing, she said: I am living proof. I am living proof. I am an advocate, and I am proud to speak on behalf of those who have not yet found their voice.

Malkia found her voice. It is time to make sure that everyone in our communities has the support they need to do the same.

I am looking forward to working with my friend Senator BLUNT and all of our colleagues who have already signed on as original cosponsors, and we welcome everyone in this body to join us in moving forward legislation that we have demonstrated makes a difference—saving money, saving lives. It is now time to make these services available across the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I just wanted to let my friend Senator BLUNT, whom I have been talking about now on the floor—I just wanted to say, with him here—and I knew he was going to be here shortly, but I just want to say again what a real pleasure and honor it has been to partner with my friend Senator BLUNT in this really major movement to transform the way we fund community mental health and addiction services.

And our Presiding Officer has also been a leader in this. I want to thank her for that as well. But I just want to thank my partner, as I was indicating before we came down, on the 50th anniversary of President Kennedy's signing his last bill.

And I am pleased we have been able to pick up the torch, and we are going to get it over the finish line and make sure these wonderful services are available across the country.

Mr. BLUNT. Thank you. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

EXCELLENCE IN MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION TREATMENT ACT

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, let me say, our times got changed today a little bit, and I was trying to finish another thing to get over here and hear in person what Senator STABENOW had to say. She has been an incredible leader in this effort, a great partner.

As she mentioned, we came to the floor the last day of October 2013, which was the 50th anniversary of President Kennedy's signing the Community Mental Health Act. Well-intended, but an awful lot of it just didn't get done. Facilities were closed that maybe were well overdue to be closed, but the opportunities weren't put in place to replace them as that act had hoped they would be.

I think we have been in the process of making big strides toward doing that. That was 2013. In 2014, we were able to get the first pilot project for Excellence in Mental Health put into place, an eight-State pilot project, where we were looking not only at the impact on those individuals and families who needed to have their behavioral health issue treated like all other health issues but also, frankly, looking to see what impact it had on all their other health issues when your behavioral health issue is being treated as it should be.

One of the great costs in healthcare is missed appointments. You have got to believe that almost 20 percent of the population that has a behavioral health issue is more likely to miss an appointment than everybody else, and, of course, that costs the whole system, but it particularly costs them.

If you are going to the doctor when you need to, taking the medicine you are supposed to take for any kind of health issue, eating better, sleeping better, feeling better about yourself, your health issues are dealt with in a different way.

Nearly one in five Americans, according to the NIH, has a behavioral health problem, but only a fraction of those Americans get the care they need. The NIH says they have a diagnosable—almost one out of five Americans has a diagnosable and almost always treatable behavioral health problem. But, certainly, one out of five Americans who have that problem don't get the

care they need to deal with that problem.

The COVID pandemic added to many of those challenges, and, realistically, it would, if you think about it. If you have got a behavioral health issue, that is not normally going to be helped by isolation, by worrying about healthcare for yourself or somebody you care about, wondering whether you are going to lose your job or someone in your family is going to lose their job. None of those things are going to be helpful.

The other area that comes into play there is an addiction issue of any kind. If you don't have a behavioral health issue before you have an opioid dependency or some other addiction issue, you certainly have one after that addiction takes over.

So all of those things were exacerbated by the pandemic. The percentage of Americans with symptoms of anxiety or depression grew by more than 40 percent. Drug overdose deaths increased by 20 percent between October of 2019 and 2020. It was 30 percent. I think I may have said 20–30 percent.

That was after 3 years of having drug overdose deaths headed in a dramatically different direction, but suddenly 2020 was the highest year ever for drug overdose deaths.

So the challenges of that are great. We now have 10 States, including both Missouri and Michigan, that went through a competitive process and became part of the original Excellence in Mental Health States.

In all of those States, we have certified community behavioral health clinics that have to meet standards. They have to meet standards of who staffs that clinic; they have to be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, with crisis management as a possibility. They can do preventive screenings. They can determine appropriate care coordination with other providers, like emergency room departments or veterans services.

All of those things make a dramatic difference in people's lives. People getting help through the clinics often have access to primary care treatment as well. I have visited a lot of those clinics in our State. I have seen what happens with these demonstration projects. They are enabling more people to get the complete healthcare they need—and, again, including mental healthcare and addictive treatment—quicker, closer to home.

In new data from the National Council for Mental Wellbeing, 84 percent of those clinics, the CCBHCs they are calling them—84 percent of them were able to see clients within the first week. I think 100 percent of them were able to see a client who needed to be seen that day, that day. I certainly hope that is the goal. I hope nobody goes to a clinic, if professionals believe you need help right now, who doesn't get help right now.

But 84 percent of the people who show up get an appointment within the

first week. That definitely was not the case 10 years ago, and it is not the case now in States that haven't become part of this program.

Ninety-five percent of those clinics are involved with law enforcement activities and nursing and criminal justice centers. In my hometown of Springfield, MO, every patrol officer who has been trained in crisis intervention has an iPad with them that they can connect anybody they are talking to with a 24/7 Burrell community health center.

And they do. I have seen that happen. I have traveled with officers who have done that. And, by the way, I am sure they didn't have me with an officer who wasn't really good, but you could see, no matter how good that officer was, the individual, when they were talking to somebody at the clinic who was a professional dealing with this all the time, you could see that conversation took on a totally different tone.

We have seen more and more efforts to try to help with substance abuse. We have been able to fund the federally qualifying clinics in new ways because of that.

So 10 States are totally in this program. Forty States, under an amendment we made a couple of years after we got started, have been able to take county units or other units that they can qualify into the Excellence in Mental Health Program.

So what we are working on now with our colleagues is an effort to, once again, make this available to the entire country. I think we have had enough proof in the last 7 years or so to show it makes a big difference.

Again, let me say, everybody has always known that this is the right thing to do, and they have always known it is the thing that even was financially smart in the long run. I think we are also showing here how, in the immediate healthcare context, it makes a financially smart investment to help somebody with their behavioral health challenges as you are working with all of their other health challenges.

Behavioral health, mental health needs to be treated like all other health. This Congress, this year, hopefully starting in this Senate, has the ability to say: OK. We are ready to open the door now to every State that wants to participate in a program that would treat mental health like all other health.

I know Senator STABENOW and I are going to be working hard together, and you are going to be helping us as we work to get this done.

Thank you for the time today. I look forward to the further debate of these issues. I think we have come a long way within the last 8 years. We can see the full opportunity here right on the horizon.

The Congressional Budget Office, every time they look at this, thinks it costs less than they thought the time before because they are seeing the overall impact in ways that we thought these pilots would prove.

So let's get this done this year. I look forward to working hard to do it and look forward to a full debate and vote on this issue on the Senate floor.

I would yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, next week looks like a busy week. That is fine. We have a lot of things we need to be able to cover and to be able to walk through as the Senate.

Next week will be particularly divisive, though, in some of the issues that are coming up. Let me give you two examples that I hear are on the docket for next week. One of them deals with how we vote in America.

In Oklahoma, we know how we vote. Each State determines its own structure of how they vote. In Oklahoma, you can do absentee mail-in voting, with no excuses. If for any reason you want to be able to mail in a ballot, you can do that. You can do in-person voting early. In fact, this year, our State legislature met, and they added another day of in-person voting. So there are lots of days of in-person voting in Oklahoma. You could actually go to the poll the day of the election and be able to vote then. It is up to you.

We have very straightforward voter ID laws. We have a system set up that if you do early voting or absentee voting, all the disputes on those are handled before election day itself, so that on election day, when the polls close at 7 p.m., we then finish all the voting—or the counting, I should say, on early absentee, on early in-person, and then we are counting the day of. Usually by about 10:30 at night on election day, we are done voting and everyone is watching all the final results in from the entire State.

It is a pretty straightforward, clean process that we have seen that is exceptionally reliable. In fact, it is so tough, in 2016, when the Russians were probing different systems to try to get into it, our State was one of the States the Russians tried to get into, couldn't get into our system, and they moved on to other States to try to get into those.

We have a secure system. We have a reliable system. But that is apparently not enough because S. 1 that is coming to the floor next week would say: Oklahoma, we are going to completely change your system. People in Washington, DC, don't like how you vote, don't like your clean, reliable efficiency. Regardless of complaints, we think we want to change it here in Washington, DC.

Interestingly enough, we have a system that can also verify if someone voted twice. In fact, in this past election, 57 people in Oklahoma voted twice. We could verify that after the fact based on all the records, and we can go back and be able to actually prosecute those individuals who chose to vote twice because that is not legal.

Here is what happens when S. 1 comes to the floor. The debate here on S. 1 will begin with no voter ID. Take away your voter ID in Oklahoma. Change the way you do early voting. In fact, change the way the ballots are actually collected entirely. No longer in Oklahoma will we know the winner of our election at 10:30 on election night. S. 1 changes that and said that ballots have to be able to be allowed to trickle in for 10 more days after the election is over. So we won't know at 10:30 at night on election night; we will know 2 weeks later who actually won the elections.

As far as a reliable system that we can all verify and check—oh, no, it changes that dramatically. It now opens up what is called ballot harvesting. Ballot harvesting would allow political operatives to go door-to-door to be able to engage with people who had mail-in ballots and to say to them "Have you mailed your ballot in?" If they say "No," they can say "Well, let's just fill it out right here on the porch, and then you can hand it to me, and I will take it in."

So on election day, what happens is, political operatives show up with boxes full of ballots and turn in boxes full of ballots with the words "Trust me; these are all good."

I would tell you, in Oklahoma, we like it better when the postman carries that ballot or when you actually turn it in to that county or precinct official so we know where it has been, that there has been an accurate chain of custody, not someone showing up with a box full of ballots saying "Trust me; I collected all of these" because when that happens and someone is just collecting ballots, you have no idea if the person voting voted for one person and left the rest of them blank and the person carrying them just filled out the rest of the ballot for them. You have no chain of custody at all on it. That is why I say S. 1 makes voting easy, cheating easy, and verifying elections impossible.

This is not the direction we should go. If we want to build trust in our election system in America, let's let each State build trust in their election system for each State, like we do in Oklahoma, where we work together to make sure we can make it as easy as possible for every person to be able to vote and to encourage every person to vote, but when it is over, to verify that election and to be able to know that we can check it all off and to go, regardless of the outcome, we can trust the outcome because we know we can verify it.

Let's make it easy to vote, hard to cheat, and easy to verify—not having Washington, DC, folks here say DC is righteous and States are wrong. I think there are lots of great people all over the country who want to do their elections right and who aren't Republicans or Democrats; they are just people protecting democracies in the States. Let's keep that system.

That is the first of two divisive bills that are coming up next week, which will absolutely fail in this body and should fail in this body. There is a second bill that I understand is coming up next week, as well, and it is called the Equality Act.

Now, I will tell you that it is a great name, and I don't know of anyone on my side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle who opposes equality. I will state frankly that no person should be discriminated against in America—no person. It is a basic constitutional principle: We are all equal under the law—all of us. We have different ideas about music and food. We have different ideas about sexuality. We have different ideas about occupations. We have different skin colors. We have different faiths. We are a tapestry, and that is one of the things that makes us strong in such a perfect way as to build a more perfect Union. I believe that every person should be protected from discrimination in America, but that does mean every person.

Today, the Supreme Court ruled 9 to 0—9 to 0 in the Supreme Court—that Catholic Social Services in Philadelphia was being discriminated against by the city of Philadelphia because the city of Philadelphia said to Catholic Social Services: You cannot practice your Catholic faith in foster services.

Now, what is the story?

There have been Catholic services in Philadelphia since the 1700s. For the last 50 years, Catholic Social Services in Philadelphia, this particular organization, has served the neediest children in that area by providing foster services and placement for them. They are a religious organization, a faith-based organization—a Catholic organization—and they believe that God created man and woman and that this is God's design for marriage. So, in their placement of foster children, they place children in homes where there is a man and a woman who are present in marriage because of their profound belief.

There are 20 other foster services in Philadelphia that place foster children in any family situation: husband and wife or two men or two women. There are 20 of those services in Philadelphia, but the city of Philadelphia went to Catholic Social Services and said: You have to be like the other 20. You cannot practice your faith.

Even though, literally, Catholic Social Services had never had a gay family reach out to them for an adoption placement—they had gone to other places—the city of Philadelphia said: No, you have to change your practice.

Unfortunately, Catholic Social Services had to argue for their religious freedom all the way to the Supreme Court, and, today, they ruled 9 to 0 that a faith-based institution cannot be discriminated against because of their faith. They should be able to live out the tenets of their faith and be able to practice them. To me, that is a great decision to make—to say: Why

can't we coexist? Why can't we honor everyone in their differences of opinion?

Even the Supreme Court stated today, in its opinion, that there was no work from Catholic Social Services to stop gay marriages in Philadelphia or to stop couples from fostering children who are gay couples there. They just chose not to do it based on their faith. So they were not working against individuals. They were practicing their faith.

Now comes the Equality Act vote next week. The Equality Act would, for the first time ever in this Congress, take away the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in statute—it would remove it—and say there could be no protection for religious institutions. This is a direct shot against the Supreme Court, in its 9 to 0 decision today, which said: No, religious institutions have to be protected in their decisions.

Why can't both exist? Why do we have to get into a situation, as the Equality Act does, that says, if you don't agree with one particular expression, then you have to be canceled? that you have to be silenced? Why has it come to this in America?

The way the Equality Act is written is, with regard to any faith-based institution, if they did any public, outward-facing work at all—if they fed the homeless, which many do; if they provided clothing; if they took care of individuals with food who needed it—that was considered to be of public accommodation, their labor laws, even if they were religious institutions, had to be exactly like large corporate labor rules as well. It literally imposes on religious institutions that you can be a private entity and be inward facing, but if you are going to do your mission to actually serve the needy, then you have to actually shift to be like corporate America. That is not providing opportunities for people of faith to live their faiths.

I have to tell you that I honor people of faith—people of different faiths, people of faiths that I disagree with. The nature of religious liberty in our country is to be able to honor people of different faiths. That is also what the Supreme Court reaffirmed today directly in contradiction to the Equality Act. Clearly, if this were to pass—and I do not believe it will—the Supreme Court would hear it immediately, would align with this case from today, and would say: We have already ruled on these issues 9 to 0—that is, against not allowing people to be able to live their faiths.

Unfortunately, there are some in this body who not only vehemently disagree with the Supreme Court and with the opportunity for people to be able to live their faiths, but they are willing to do it in the most pejorative of terms.

When I spoke against the Equality Act in the Judiciary Committee, just weeks ago, and shared the issues that I had that were pragmatic labor issues and set those in front of it and also did

a challenge on a religious liberty issue and said, "Here are the obvious issues of religious liberty where I think it is unconstitutional," the response I got from a member of the Judiciary Committee was, This reminds me of the Ku Klux Klan, who burned crosses and used religious symbols to hide behind their bigotry.

The Supreme Court disagreed with that today and said: We are the United States of America. We honor people of faith to be able to live their faiths. We honor people who don't have faith or have differences in their faiths and choose to be able to live that out. This body should not try to cancel out every group of faith in the country that disagrees with people in this body who say: You cannot practice your faith if we tell you no. That is not who we are.

The Equality Act is not about equality. It is about imposing and prohibiting disagreements. We are Americans. We can respect each other and disagree. We can live next-door to each other and disagree. Let's prove it in this body by not passing the poorly named Equality Act but by actually demonstrating what this act says it wants to demonstrate. Let's treat each other with respect in our differences and honor us in that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 149, Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Tina Smith, Martin Heinrich, Jacky Rosen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Sherrod Brown, Edward J. Markey, Brian Schatz, Ron Wyden, Elizabeth Warren, Mark R. Warner, Raphael Warnock, Benjamin L. Cardin.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 107.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kiran Arjandas Ahuja, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 107, Kiran Arjandas Ahuja, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

Charles E. Schumer, Tammy Baldwin, Tina Smith, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin, Angus S. King, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, John Hickenlooper, Thomas R. Carper, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher Murphy, Jacky Rosen, Robert Menendez, Martin Heinrich, Edward J. Markey.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021—
MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to proceed to Calendar No. 77, S. 2093.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 77, S. 2093.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 77, S. 2093, a bill to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-

corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 77, S. 2093, a bill to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Jeff Merkley, Amy Klobuchar, Jacky Rosen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin, Jon Ossoff, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Brian Schatz, Sherrod Brown, Ron Wyden, Elizabeth Warren, Raphael Warnock, Benjamin L. Cardin, Edward J. Markey, Bernard Sanders.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, June 17, be waived.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 180, 183, 153, 155, and 177.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Pamela A. Melroy, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Richard W. Spinrad, of Oregon, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere; Matthew T. Quinn, of Montana, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Memorial Affairs; Tanya Marie Trujillo, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and Chris Inglis, of Maryland, to be National Cyber Director (New Position).

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote en bloc on the nominations without intervening action or debate and that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements

related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Melroy, Spinrad, Quinn, Trujillo, and Inglis nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 178, 179, 181, 184, and 185; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard, and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 305:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Michael F. McAllister

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard, and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 305:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Paul F. Thomas

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment as Vice Commandant in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated pursuant to the authority of title 14, U.S.C., section 304:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Linda L. Fagan

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Coast Guard to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 2101(A)(2):

To be lieutenant commander

Charles J. Clark
Nicholas G. Derenzo
Katherine R. Peet
Luke P. Strittmatter

The following named officers for appointment in the grade indicated in the United States Coast Guard as a member of the Coast Guard permanent commissioned teaching staff under title 14, U.S.C., section 1943:

To be lieutenant commander

Lisa M. Thompson

To be lieutenant

Tara E. Larkin

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

AMENDING TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REDEFINE THE EASTERN AND MIDDLE JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 1340 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1340) to amend title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1340) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1340

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

SECTION 1. JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF NORTH CAROLINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 113 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “and Wilson and” and inserting “Wilson, those portions of Hoke, Moore, Scotland, and Richmond counties encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall, and”;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) MIDDLE DISTRICT.—The Middle District comprises the counties of Alamance, Cabarrus, Caswell, Chatham, Davidson, Davie, Durham (excluding that portion of Durham County encompassing the Federal Correctional Institution, Butner, North Carolina), Forsyth, Guilford, Hoke (excluding that portion of Hoke County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Lee, Montgomery, Moore (excluding that portion of Moore County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Orange, Person, Randolph, Richmond (excluding that portion of Richmond County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Rowan, Scotland (excluding that portion of Scotland County encompassing the Fort Bragg Military Reservation and Camp Mackall), Stanly, Stokes, Surry, and Yadkin.”

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply to any action commenced or pending in any judicial district of North Carolina before the date of enactment of this Act.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA GATORS FOR WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I MEN'S TENNIS CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 276, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 276) congratulating the University of Florida Gators for winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Tennis Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 276) 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 MISSISSIPPI REBELS WOMEN'S GOLF TEAM ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I WOMEN'S GOLF CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 277, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 277) congratulating the University of Mississippi Rebels women's golf team on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's golf championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 277) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED SPINAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 278 submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 278) recognizing the 75th anniversary of United Spinal Association, a leading national advocacy organization that is dedicated to promoting the independence and enhancing the quality of life of all people living with spinal cord injuries and neurological disorders, including veterans, and providing support and information to their loved ones, care providers, and personal support networks.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 278) was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that 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 preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2118

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2118) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for increased investment in clean energy, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mr. PETERS. Madam President, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to attend today's vote on Executive Calendar #123—Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted “aye” on confirmation.

Madam President, due to a family medical emergency, I was unable to attend today's votes on motion to invoke cloture and confirmation of Executive Calendar #157, John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security. Had I been able to attend, I would have voted “aye” on the motion and “aye” on confirmation. ●

JUNETEENTH

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President. I rise today to recognize the annual commemoration of Juneteenth, the date on which the news of the end of slavery reached the enslaved peoples in the Southwestern States. On June 19, 1865, MG Gordon Granger and Union soldiers communicated the news of liberation to one of the last remaining confederate outposts in Galveston, TX. Over 2 years after President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, the enslaved individuals there had yet to hear the good news.

Over the years, African-American communities nationwide and in Maryland have developed rich traditions around this historically significant date. For all Americans, Juneteenth offers an opportunity to reflect upon and to educate ourselves further about the terrible history of slavery and its enduring legacy. The story of Juneteenth also reminds me of the gap between the values and principles that we espouse and the realities of life for everyday Americans, in particular the most vulnerable.

I have long supported legislation to add Juneteenth National Independence Day to the list of legal Federal public holidays. After many years, I am pleased that the Senate has finally passed it and hope that the House will act swiftly to send this bill to President Biden's desk.

In commemoration of this year's holiday, I want to take the opportunity to reflect in more depth on a couple of ways that we continue to see the clear impact of slavery today. One of the most apparent legacies is access—or should I say lack of access—to the ballot box. Study after study and the lived experiences of so many individuals tell us that Black Americans still experience greater barriers to voting than White Americans. One of the most important tenets of our comprehensive legislation to protect democracy, the For the People Act, S. 1, is enacting a Federal floor when it comes to voting rights standards.

Spreading false or misleading information intended to suppress voting and intimidate the electorate remains one of the most effective methods used to keep individuals, particularly Black Americans and other racial minorities, from voting. Advancements in our means of communication, including the rise of social media platforms, have made it easier for bad actors to use these strategies. During the 2020 election cycle, robocalls targeting communities of color in Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and New York contained false information about how the recipients' data would be shared if they voted by mail. I have introduced legislation, along with Senator KLOBUCHAR, to address these problems by prohibiting individuals from knowingly deceiving others about the time, place, eligibility, or procedures of participating in a Federal election. Our bill to ban deceptive practices, S. 1840, would

also prohibit individuals from intentionally hindering, interfering with, or preventing another person from voting, registering to vote, or aiding another person to vote or register to vote in a Federal election.

In 2020, more than 5 million individuals and as many as one in five African Americans in some States were disenfranchised because of voter suppression laws.

Many voter disenfranchisement laws today come from post-Civil War efforts to stifle the 14th and 15th Amendments. Between 1865 and 1880, at least 13 States enacted or expanded their felony disenfranchisement laws. One of the primary goals of these laws was to prevent Black Americans from voting. At least 11 of those States still bar individuals on felony probation or parole from voting. Under our Constitution, there is no legitimate justification for denying people from having a voice in our democracy. Disenfranchising citizens who are living and working in the community serves no compelling State interest and hinders their rehabilitation and reintegration into society. My Democracy Restoration Act, S. 481, would restore Federal voting rights for all individuals immediately upon release from incarceration.

I am proud that both my Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Act and my Democracy Restoration Act are included within the For the People Act.

Finally, I want to end by commending my home State of Maryland for bipartisan restorative justice work over the past several years. The Maryland General Assembly voted nearly unanimously in 2019 to investigate the more than 40 documented racial terror lynchings that took place in Maryland between 1854 and 1933, to hold public hearings in communities where racial terror lynchings occurred, and to develop recommendations that are rooted in restorative justice for addressing, engaging, and reconciling those communities. The commission the State established has received supplemental funding from the U.S. Department of Justice's Emmett Till Cold Case Investigations Program for its efforts. Because of this work, Governor Hogan issued posthumous pardons last month for 34 victims of racial lynchings in Maryland.

This Juneteenth, I encourage all Americans to recognize Juneteenth as an opportunity to reflect upon our Nation's shared history, to recognize the enduring effects of slavery on our society, and to commit to being involved in the redemptive work toward a more just and perfect Union.

NATIONAL SEERSUCKER DAY

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, today I rise in recognition of seersucker manufacturers and enthusiasts across the United States. I wish everyone a happy National Seersucker Day. This uniquely American fashion has a

storied history dating back to 1909. The first seersucker suit was designed by Joseph Haspel at his Broad Street facility in New Orleans, LA. Louisiana is proud to have played an important part in introducing the country to seersucker apparel.

This lightweight cotton fabric, known for its signature pucker, has been worn and enjoyed by Americans across the country during the hot summer months. Mr. Haspel said it best: "Hot is hot, no matter what you do for a living."

In the 1990s, Seersucker Day was established by Members of this Chamber to honor this unique American fashion. I proudly resumed this tradition in 2014 in the U.S. House of Representatives and continued this tradition in the U.S. Senate. This year, I wish to designate Thursday, June 17, as the eighth annual National Seersucker Day. I encourage everyone to wear seersucker on this day to commemorate this traditionally American clothing.

TRIBUTE TO MAX ENGLISH

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, SGM Max English served the Nation honorably for over 28 years in the U.S. Army. He fought in combat operations throughout World War II and bravely led 36 men as a platoon sergeant in the Battle of the Bulge. His extraordinary service continued to the Pacific theater in the waning months of the war. Only a few years later, he returned to the Pacific to fight in the Korean war.

During his service in the Second World War, Sergeant Major English was injured in Germany and was awarded the Purple Heart. During the Battle of Bulge, Sergeant Major English fought and repelled repeated Nazi attacks and ultimately helped break the back of Hitler's forces. After sustained combat operations in Europe, Sergeant Major English served in the Southern Pacific theater and pursued the treacherous mission of rooting out irreconciled Japanese Imperial Army forces after their country's unconditional surrender.

A member of "the greatest generation", Sergeant Major English again answered the call of duty when he was deployed to the Korean war. There, his unit was tasked with repatriating Americans formerly held as prisoners of war during the conflict. The heroic actions of Sergeant Major English's unit directly contributed to the implementation of an armistice to stop the fighting on the Korean Peninsula.

Sergeant Major English is a man of exceptional character and commitment to the United States who embodies the American spirit and serves as an inspiration for today's fighting men and women. I join all grateful Americans in congratulating him for his outstanding service and patriotism and thank him for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO JANET PIRAINO

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I rise today to honor the service of Janet Piraino, my State director, who will retire from my office and the U.S. Senate on July 19, 2021.

Janet has spent her professional career dedicated to serving Wisconsinites. A graduate of the University of Wisconsin—Madison, Janet forged a path in public service early in her career. Her first job was as a field organizer for a race for Wisconsin Governor, followed by nearly 10 years as a legislative policy advisor to Wisconsin legislators in the State Capitol.

Janet quickly earned recognition as a valued staff member and committed leader. Her experiences working with both legislators and constituents led to her assuming positions in a variety of roles, both at the local and Federal government level.

Over the past 30-plus years, Janet has served in a variety of capacities with many Wisconsin elected officials, including 7 years as State director for U.S. Senator Russ Feingold; 2 years as chief of staff for Congressman Tom Barrett; 8 years as chief of staff for Madison Mayor Dave Cieslewicz; and 2 years as district director for U.S. Congressman MARK POCAN. Outside of her roles in government, Janet has also worked as a special assistant for State relations at the University of Wisconsin System and as vice president for advancement at the Overture Center Foundation in Madison, where she led the charge to help transition this legacy performing arts venue from a city-run venue to a privately owned facility.

Janet is also an active member of many community organizations, including Madison's Downtown Rotary. She spends considerable time engaged in meeting with others interested in pursuing a career in public service and has mentored countless Wisconsinites over these many years.

Outside of the office, Janet enjoys spending time with her partner of 20 years, J.R. Sims, their grandbaby, Titan Cairo Sims, and their enthusiastic pandemic puppy, Sadie. Janet also enjoys traveling and participating in organized bike rides, including the Door County Century and the Best Dam Bike Tour on her Wisconsin made Trek Madone. She is a devoted fan of the Milwaukee Bucks, especially Giannis Antetokounmpo, and is always eager to host friends and colleagues on her roof deck overlooking the Madison skyline.

I knew of Janet's can-do reputation and energetic commitment to public service long before she joined my Senate office in 2015, and I am delighted that she has become a valued member of our team. Along with my entire U.S. Senate staff, I wish her all the best as she begins a new chapter with her well-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL DAVID W. TROTTER

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I rise to pay tribute to COL David W. Trotter, who has selflessly served our great country as a U.S. Army intelligence officer. He is a fellow alumnus of the Iowa State University Cyclone Battalion and a dear friend of mine.

Colonel Trotter will retire on November 30, 2021, after a successful 30-year military career as an accomplished leader, infantry, and intelligence officer. Dave's leadership abilities were evident early on. I met Dave early in my days at Iowa State, where he served as a personal mentor and driving factor to my own service to this great Nation. From those early days, he grew even more as a leader and soldier, ultimately completing a storied career at home and abroad, in peace and in war. It is fitting that we recognize his service to this great Nation.

Colonel Trotter was commissioned in 1992 upon graduating from Iowa State University as a distinguished military graduate with a bachelor in business. Dave served as an infantry platoon leader in Korea and a company executive officer at Fort Carson, CO. He then was selected as a company commander for 18 months with Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 5th Battalion, 20th Infantry Regiment in Fort Lewis, WA. After command, he served as an operations officer for the Des Moines, IA, Recruiting Battalion before being selected for the prestigious 75th Ranger Regiment.

Upon arrival at the 75th Ranger Regiment in Fort Benning, GA, Dave served as an assistant intelligence officer. He then was selected again for command, where he served as the military intelligence detachment commander. Throughout his time in the 75th Ranger Regiment, Dave deployed in support of Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

As a field-grade officer, Dave served as an operations officer in the XVIII Airborne Corps, G2 section at Fort Bragg, NC. He then served as an operations officer and executive officer within the 525th Battlefield Surveillance Brigade, where he also deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. He then served again as an operations officer for the Intelligence and Security Command at Fort Belvoir, VA, before being selected for command of the Army Geospatial Intelligence Battalion at Springfield, VA.

After various staff positions, Dave served as the chief of staff, Afghanistan Ministry of Interior Advisory Group, where he deployed again to Afghanistan in support of Operations Enduring Freedom and Freedom Sentinel. After a brief year on staff at Fort Huachuca, AZ, Dave deployed again in support of Operation Inherent Resolve in Iraq, where he served as the III Corps G2. After redeployment, he was chosen to serve as the Army North senior intel-

ligence officer. He then would transfer once more to Joint Base San Antonio, Fort Sam Houston, TX, where he served as the executive officer to the commanding general of Army North, Fifth Army.

As his final assignment in uniform, COL David W. Trotter was selected to serve as the deputy commander for Joint Base San Antonio and the vice commander of the 502d Air Base Wing.

A highly decorated officer, Dave earned several service awards, including the Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster and the Bronze Star with oak leaf cluster, for his service. He also earned the Ranger Tab, the Master Parachutist Badge, the Pathfinder Badge, and the Air Assault Badge.

Dave has deployed in support of combat operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria. He has served at every level and commanded with distinction at the company through brigade levels within the conventional force and within the Army's premier Special Operations Command. He and his family have sacrificed so much to ensure America can be what it is today.

David, congratulations on your successful career and well-deserved retirement. I want to thank you and your family for the sacrifices you have made over the past 30 years. I join my colleagues in Congress and all Americans as we express our deepest appreciation for your service, acknowledge you and your family's many accomplishments and sacrifices, and wish the very best for you, your wife Tami, and your son Ty in the future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO NADIA HEDAYAT

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Nadia for her hard work as an intern in the Senate Republican Conference. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Nadia is a native of Maryland. She is a student at American University, where she studies psychology and communication: film and media arts. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Nadia for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey. •

TRIBUTE TO DR. SOPHIA L. THOMAS

• Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, it is with great pride that I recognize a constituent of mine, Sophia L. Thomas, DNP, APRN, FNP-BC, PPCNP-BC,

FNAP, FAANP, of New Orleans, LA for her service over the last 2 years as president of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners, AANP.

Dr. Thomas has an exemplary career of service as a certified family and pediatric nurse practitioner and has been providing health care for over 25 years to medically underserved populations in the greater New Orleans, LA, region. Dr. Thomas practices at a federally qualified health center in New Orleans and is a clinical preceptor. As a primary care provider, Dr. Thomas provides her patients with access to cost-effective, patient-centered healthcare. Dr. Thomas has continued to work on the frontlines throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, including educating the public, diagnosing and treating patients, and going door to door to vaccinate residents in New Orleans.

She holds a doctoral degree in nursing practice from Loyola University New Orleans, where she was honored with the Post-Master's DNP Nightingale Award, and she has a master's in nursing from Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center. She was inducted as fellow of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners in 2012. In 2020, Dr. Thomas was chosen as one of Modern Healthcare's 100 Most Influential People in Healthcare.

The American Association of Nurse Practitioners is the largest national professional membership organization for nurse practitioners. Under Dr. Thomas's tenure, AANP membership has grown to more than 118,000 members. Dr. Thomas has helped lead nurse practitioners in transforming patient-centered healthcare and has made tremendous strides in ensuring that policymakers and the public understand the care that nurse practitioners provide to millions of Americans each year.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Sophia L. Thomas on a successful term as president of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners and in thanking her for the excellent health care she has and continues to provide to her patients as well as her leadership to the nurse practitioner profession.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As 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.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2021, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 16, 2021, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 475. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 10:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 475. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

H.R. 711. An act to amend the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016 to authorize the use of certain funds received pursuant to leases entered into under such Act, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill, S. 475, was subsequently signed by the Vice President.

The enrolled bill, H.R. 711, was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 12:11 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 256. An act to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002.

H.R. 1187. An act to provide for disclosure of additional material information about public companies and establish a Sustainable Finance Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 256. An act to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1187. An act to provide for disclosure of additional material information about public companies and establish a Sustainable Finance Advisory Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2093. A bill to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2118. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for increased investment in clean energy, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 17, 2021, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 475. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

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-1224. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order that elaborates upon measures to address the national emergency with respect to the information and communications technology and services supply chain that was declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-20. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to take such actions as are necessary to rename the Department of Veterans Affairs' Lafayette Community Based Outpatient Clinic in honor of Rodney C. Hamilton Sr.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 46

Whereas, Rodney Carroll Hamilton Sr. was born in Fort Worth, Texas, on March 24, 1932, and his family moved to Lafayette, Louisiana, in the summer of 1948; and

Whereas, God, family, country, and community were his strong interests; and

Whereas, in 1949, he joined the Marine Reserve at age seventeen while attending Lafayette High School at the urging of his football coach, Lou Campbell; and

Whereas, Rodney served our country during the Korean War, was wounded in combat in September 1951, and was awarded the Purple Heart; and

Whereas, he loved the United States Marine Corps and was proud of all Marines who served their country; and

Whereas, his military involvement included being a member of the Marine Corps League, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Veteran's Action Coalition of Southwest Louisiana where he served as Founder and Chairman Emeritus; and

Whereas, he served as a full-time elected official in the Lafayette city government from 1968 through 1972 as a Trustee of Public Property; and

Whereas, Rodney made numerous contributions to help make Lafayette a better place

including leading efforts to secure and build the United States Department of Veterans Affairs' Lafayette Community Based Outpatient Clinic, which opened in 2016; and

Whereas, due to Rodney's dedication in realizing the veterans clinic in Lafayette, the street there was named in his honor and now bears signs saying, "Veterans Way, Honorary Rodney Hamilton"; and

Whereas, Rodney Carroll Hamilton Sr. passed away at the age of eighty-eight on November 30, 2020. Therefore, be it

Resolved that the Legislature of Louisiana hereby memorializes the Louisiana congressional delegation and the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to rename the United States Department of Veterans Affairs' Lafayette Community Based Outpatient Clinic in honor of Rodney C. Hamilton Sr., and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-21. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia urging the United States Congress to extend federal tax incentives to participants in Jumpstart Savings programs that are similar to those that are currently provided to participants in College Savings plans; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

Whereas, The economy of the United States is experiencing increased demands for highly trained, skilled tradespeople to fill jobs in the construction, welding, and other vocational sectors; and

Whereas, In the United States, there are nearly half a million more jobs available in the skilled trades than workers with the skills to fill them; and

Whereas, The number of available jobs in the skilled trades is anticipated to rise to two million over the next decade; and

Whereas, A traditional college education is one path to success, but not the only path, especially in light of the increasing costs of a traditional four-year college degree and the growing demand for skilled labor; and

Whereas, Encouraging students and their families to invest in alternative forms of postsecondary skills could help reshape our nation's future workforce; and

Whereas, Providing the next generation the ability to save money for the future costs of tools, equipment, and business expenses will make it easier to enter a vocation, trade, or start a small business in the skilled trades industry; and

Whereas, The West Virginia Legislature has adopted legislation authorizing the West Virginia Jumpstart Savings Program, which creates several tax incentives to help program participants save money, by allowing an income tax deduction for contributions to a Jumpstart Savings account, by providing businesses with a non-refundable state tax credit for matching an employee's own contribution to his or her account each year; and

Whereas, The Jumpstart Savings Program will allow individuals to roll 529 College Savings plan funds over to a Jumpstart Savings account without facing state income tax penalties; and

Whereas, West Virginia's Jumpstart Savings Program could be a model for other states to invest in the future entrepreneurship and small business trade industries in our nation, and Congress should extend federal tax benefits to such programs; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia:

That Congress is urged to provide tax benefits to participants in Jumpstart Savings programs that are similar to those currently provided to participants in College Savings plans pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 529; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution, along with a copy of the Jumpstart Savings Act, to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to members of West Virginia's congressional delegation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN for the Committee on the Judiciary. Tiffany P. Cunningham, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit. Anne Milgram, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement. Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2094. A bill to provide for a new building period with respect to the cap on full-time equivalent residents for purposes of payment for graduate medical education costs under the Medicare program for certain hospitals that have established a shortage specialty program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 2095. A bill to expand compassionate release authority and elderly home confinement access for offenders with heightened coronavirus risk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2096. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize admission of Canadian retirees as long-term visitors for pleasure described in section 101(a)(15)(B) of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the permissible first-dollar coverage of telehealth services for purposes of health savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 2098. A bill to prevent States from using or distributing resources during the COVID-19 national emergency in accordance with a State policy that discriminates on the basis of disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 2099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals who are not enrolled in a high deductible health plan to have access to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2100. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for contributions to the Alzheimer's Research and Caregiving Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2102. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide mammography screening for veterans who served in locations associated with toxic exposure; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 2103. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to hold certain public employers liable in civil actions for deprivation of rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2104. A bill to support global labor rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2105. A bill to enhance mental health and psychological support within United States foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. 2106. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize a national network of Statewide senior legal hotlines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 2107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the semiconductor manufacturing investment credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CASIDY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2108. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate work disincentives for childhood disability beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2109. A bill to prohibit allocations of Special Drawing Rights at the International Monetary Fund for perpetrators of genocide and state sponsors of terrorism without congressional authorization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2110. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a virtual health pilot program to facilitate utilization of remote patient monitoring technology to maintain or expand access to health care services for individuals in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2111. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the waiver of certain telehealth requirements to permit reimbursement for audio-only telehealth services under the Medicare program during emergency declarations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2112. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act to provide for Medicare and Medicaid mental and behavioral health treatment through telehealth; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 2113. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand permissible distributions from an employee's health flexible spending account or health reimbursement arrangement to their health savings account; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2114. A bill to expand the definition of qualified persons for purposes of the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act to include health professional students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2115. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the exclusion of individuals from service on a Federal jury on account of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2116. A bill to prevent mail, telemarketing, and internet fraud targeting seniors in the United States, to promote efforts to increase public awareness of the enormous impact that mail, telemarketing, and internet fraud have on seniors, to educate the public, seniors, their families, and their caregivers about how to identify and combat fraudulent activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2117. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to ensure that voters in elections for Federal office do not wait in long lines in order to vote; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2118. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for increased investment in clean energy, and for other purposes; read the first time.

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

S. 2119. A bill to provide for nonpreemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in certain boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel or persons doing business in Israel or Israeli-controlled territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. ROSEN, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2120. A bill to establish the United States-Israel Artificial Intelligence Center to improve artificial intelligence research and development cooperation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2121. A bill to develop best practice guidelines for the use of dogs in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 2122. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to regulate the use of cell-site simulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2123. A bill to establish the Federal Clearinghouse on Safety and Security Best Practices for Faith-Based Organizations and

Houses of Worship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2124. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2125. A bill to divert Federal funding away from supporting the presence of police in schools and toward evidence-based and trauma informed services that address the needs of marginalized students and improve academic outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2126. A bill to designate the Federal Office Building located at 308 W. 21st Street in Cheyenne, Wyoming, as the "Louisa Swain Federal Office Building"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2127. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require that Federal children's programs be separately displayed and analyzed in the President's budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 2128. A bill to ensure the humane treatment of pregnant women by reinstating the presumption of release and prohibiting shackling, restraining, and other inhumane treatment of pregnant detainees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 2129. A bill to promote freedom of information and counter censorship and surveillance in North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COONS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KAINÉ, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2130. A bill to modify the disposition of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues and to open Federal financial sharing to heighten opportunities for renewable energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 2131. A bill to require a review of the effects of FHA mortgage insurance policies, practices, and products on small-dollar mortgage lending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 2132. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the use of taxpayer funded union time for employees of the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2133. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for studies and reports relating to the impact of legislation on spending on children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2134. A bill to establish the Data Protection Agency; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2135. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Chief Operating Officer of each agency to compile a list of unnecessary programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2136. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the implementation of curricula for training students, teachers, parents, and school and youth development personnel to understand, recognize, prevent, and respond to signs of human trafficking and exploitation in children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2137. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish an Office of Rural Investment, to ensure that rural communities and regions are equitably represented in Federal decision-making for transportation policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2138. A bill to respond to international trafficking of Cuban medical professionals by the Government of Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. DURBIN):

S.J. Res. 21. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the use of slavery and involuntary servitude as a punishment for a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. HOEVES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. Res. 274. A resolution designating July 24, 2021, as "National Day of the American Cowboy"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAINÉ (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 275. A resolution acknowledging and apologizing for the mistreatment of, and discrimination against, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals who served

the United States in the Armed Forces, the Foreign Service, and the Federal civil service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. Res. 276. A resolution congratulating the University of Florida Gators for winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Tennis Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. Res. 277. A resolution congratulating the University of Mississippi Rebels women's golf team on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's golf championship; considered and agreed to.

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

S. Res. 278. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of United Spinal Association, a leading national advocacy organization that is dedicated to promoting the independence and enhancing the quality of life of all people living with spinal cord injuries and neurological disorders, including veterans, and providing support and information to their loved ones, care providers, and personal support networks; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 279. A resolution designating June 21, 2021 through June 25, 2021, as "National Cybersecurity Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 280. A resolution supporting a stable Colombia and opposing any threat to democracy in Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 75

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 75, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination by abortion against an unborn child on the basis of Down syndrome.

S. 204

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to establish the Office of Press Freedom, to create press freedom curriculum at the National Foreign Affairs Training Center, and for other purposes.

S. 267

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 267, a bill to increase the Federal share of operating costs for certain projects that receive grants under the Formula Grants to Rural Areas Program of the Federal Transit Administration.

S. 346

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to end preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States and close disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes.

S. 450

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SUL-LIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 450, a bill to award posthumously the Congressional Gold Medal to Emmett Till and Mamie Till-Mobley.

S. 611

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 611, a bill to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 613

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy and to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary to provide service dogs to veterans with mental illnesses who do not have mobility impairments.

S. 697

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the Bicentennial of Harriet Tubman's birth.

S. 1368

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1368, a bill to make housing more affordable, and for other purposes.

S. 1488

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to establish a basic needs allowance for low-income regular members of the Armed Forces.

S. 1544

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1544, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers across State lines, and for other purposes.

S. 1548

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1548, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diversity of participants in research on Alzheimer's disease, and for other purposes.

S. 1591

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1591, a bill to counter efforts by foreign governments to pursue, harass, or otherwise persecute individuals for polit-

ical and other unlawful motives overseas, and for other purposes.

S. 1596

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1596, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

S. 1848

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1848, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and marital status in the administration and provision of child welfare services, to improve safety, well-being, and permanency for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning foster youth, and for other purposes.

S. 1872

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1872, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1891

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1891, a bill to transfer and limit Executive Branch authority to suspend or restrict the entry of a class of aliens.

S. 1909

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1909, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform requirements with respect to direct and indirect remuneration under Medicare part D, and for other purposes.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, a bill to provide for the long-term improvement of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and for other purposes.

S. 1986

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1986, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and

the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to expand and expedite access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1997

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1997, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain contributions by government entities are treated as contributions to capital.

S. 2058

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2058, a bill to improve the safety and security of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2085, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas and criteria air pollutant emission fees, provide rebates to low and middle income Americans, invest in fossil fuel communities and workers, invest in environmental justice communities, and for other purposes.

S. 2087

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2087, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the membership of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans to include veterans who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, gender diverse, gender non-conforming, intersex, or queer.

S. 2088

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2088, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the process by which a member of the Armed Forces may be referred for a mental health evaluation.

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) 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. 67

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 67, a resolution calling for the immediate release of Trevor Reed, a United States citizen who was unjustly found guilty and sentenced to 9 years in a Russian prison.

S. RES. 240

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 240, a resolution affirming the role of the United States in improving access to quality, inclusive public education and improved learning outcomes for children and adolescents, particularly for girls, in the poorest countries through the Global Partnership for Education.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2100. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce bipartisan legislation with Senator COLLINS today to improve safety standards on products that affect every single American household. Most people assume that the personal care products they use every day are safe, whether it is shampoo or shaving cream, lotion or makeup, hair dye or deodorant.

In reality, however, these products are not approved by the Food and Drug Administration for safety before being sold, and the FDA's authority to regulate these products are sorely outdated. In fact, it's been more than eighty years since the law has changed on how oversight is conducted for these products. It is time to finally bring the FDA into the 21st century.

For the better part of a decade, Senator COLLINS and I have worked with a wide variety of stakeholders that represent industry, consumers, and health groups. Together, we introduce this Personal Care Products Safety bill with the support and input of these groups to implement commonsense and feasible measures.

One of the most critical components of this legislation is providing FDA with mandatory recall authority over these products. Without this authority, the agency has few options to ensure consumer safety.

For example, in 2019, the FDA discovered asbestos in makeup marketed to children and teens at a popular chain store. After the FDA requested that these products stop being sold, the company refused to comply with the request. Lacking the authority to mandate a recall, FDA was left with the only option of warning consumers not to use these products. This is simply unacceptable.

Under our bill, the FDA could remove these harmful products from the marketplace—whether at your local pharmacy or mall, or online. Perhaps even more importantly, our bill would set forth regulations to outline good manufacturing practices for personal care products and prevent harmful products from ever being sold.

Our bill would also require companies to register with the FDA so that the agency knows who is manufacturing

personal care products and where they are being made before arriving in stores. Companies would also be required to disclose their list of ingredients, attest that they have safety records for their products, and report serious adverse events, such as infections that required medical treatment, to FDA within 15 days after being notified that one occurred.

This bill would also require the FDA to evaluate at least five ingredients per year for safety and whether they should be used in personal care products. There would be opportunities for companies, scientists, consumer groups, medical professionals, and other members of the public to weigh in not only on the safety of particular ingredients but also which ingredients should be a priority for review.

As I've said before, the "Personal Care Products Safety Act" is the result of many diverse groups working together to ensure businesses are able to provide the safest products possible to consumers. As such, this legislation also recognizes the needs of small businesses and provides flexibility to ensure they are able to comply with these new regulations while also upholding strong safety standards that protect consumers.

I am pleased that this legislation has the support of a broad coalition, including the Environmental Working Group, Beautycounter, Estee Lauder, Unilever, Johnson & Johnson, Revlon, L'Oreal USA, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, the Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs, the Endocrine Society, March of Dimes, National Alliance for Hispanic Health, the National Women's Health Network, Au Naturale Cosmetics, Burt's Bees Company, The Clorox Company, the Handcrafted Soap and Cosmetic Guild, and Procter & Gamble.

I want to thank Senator COLLINS for her support as well as her staff for their hard work on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to join us in modernizing our outdated regulatory system for personal care products, and I hope the Senate will finally pass this long overdue legislation this year.

Thank you Madam President. I yield the Floor.

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 2103. A bill to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States to hold certain public employers liable in civil actions for deprivation of rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the "Accountability for Federal Law Enforcement Act."

This legislation recognizes the need to hold bad actors accountable—period.

In order to build trust in our system of justice, we must allow individuals the right to sue Federal law enforcement agencies when the actions of

their officers lead to a violation of rights.

This legislation would provide a right of action for an individual to sue a Federal law enforcement officer and agency for harm resulting from a violation of their civil and constitutional rights.

42 USC §1983 currently provides this right of action for state and local law enforcement officers who violate a person's rights. However, there is currently no statutory equivalent that extends this right to incidents involving federal law enforcement officers and agencies.

Because Americans lack this right, there is a gap in accountability that urgently needs to be filled. This legislation fills that gap by allowing individuals to sue federal officers, just as they can sue state and local officers. It would also allow individuals to sue federal law enforcement agencies. The United States Supreme Court has recognized that the federal government will not be liable in suit unless it waives its immunity and consents. This legislation recognizes the need for such a waiver.

While extending this right will not automatically end all cases of abuse by certain law enforcement officers, it will give the American people an important tool to fight against injustice while also demonstrating that the time is now to address police brutality.

While the United States Supreme Court has addressed the absence of a right of action against Federal officers before, the scope of the provided "remedy" has been kept extremely narrow. Without a statute in place, this right will continue to be under-utilized and could disappear whenever the Court sees fit.

Americans deserve better. We all deserve to have our constitutional rights respected, and we deserve a system that will hold bad actors accountable. This is too urgent a need to go unaddressed.

Public safety is a two-way street. We, as citizens, honor our officers and trust law enforcement to keep our streets safe and peaceful. In return, we expect officers to be held to account for bad behavior. Anything less undermines public safety.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the "Accountability for Federal Law Enforcement Act" as quickly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2108. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate work disincentives for childhood disability beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, one topic there is much agreement on is the benefits of work, and our laws

should support those who want to work. The bill I am introducing today will change Social Security so that parents and their children will know that working will never disadvantage them in the future.

Let me explain the problem. Under current law, a child with a disability that began before age 22 may receive a Social Security benefit based on the work of a disabled, retired or deceased parent. Often the child receives this benefit for the rest of their life. Social Security provides the benefit because the child is usually dependent on their parents for financial support. The problem is that the law regards earnings by the child above \$1,310 a month as ending that dependency—even if the child is no longer able to maintain that level of work in the future. When that dependency ends, the child ceases to be eligible for the benefit from the parent. Instead, the child would receive a benefit based on their work. The benefit from the parent's work is often significantly larger than the child's own benefit. Because of this policy, parents of children with disabilities may prevent their child from working at their full potential, fearing that the work will cause the child to lose out on the larger benefit. We need to change Social Security to ensure parents and their children that working will not cause them to be worse off in the future.

To provide that assurance, I am introducing the Work Without Worry Act. The bill ensures that any individual with a disability that began before age 22 will receive the larger of the benefit from either their parent's work or the benefit from their own work. Any earnings from work—no matter how much—will not prevent the child from receiving a Social Security benefit from their parent's work as long as the child is eligible for disability insurance by the same impairment from before age 22. This legislation would give parents the assurance that their child with a disability can work without having to worry that the child will lose out on the full protections that Social Security provides.

I want to thank Kathy Holmquist, President of Pathways to Independence, Inc. in Portland, Oregon, who has been a leader in my state helping people with disabilities live and work with dignity. Kathy contacted me about the need for this legislation and I appreciate her advocacy and support. Additional thanks to The Arc for the technical assistance and endorsement of the bill. The bill is also endorsed by the American Network of Community Options and Resources (ANCOR), Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) Social Security Task Force, National Down Syndrome Congress, and The Association of University Centers on Disabilities. I am grateful that Social Security Subcommittee Chairman JOHN LARSON is introducing the companion bill in the House of Representatives. The Senate bill is cosponsored by Senators CASSIDY, BROWN, KLOBUCHAR, SANDERS, LEAHY, MERKLEY and CASEY.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

So ordered.

S. 2108

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 "Work Without Worry Act".

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF WORK DISINCENTIVE FOR CHILDHOOD DISABILITY BENEFICIARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), by striking "is under a disability (as defined in section 223(d)) which began before he attained the age of 22, and" and inserting the following: "is under a disability (as defined in section 223(d)), and—

"(I) the physical or mental impairment (or combination of impairments) that is the basis for the finding of disability began before the child attained the age of 22 (or is of such a type that can reasonably be presumed to have begun before the child attained the age of 22, as determined by the Commissioner), and

"(II) the impairment or combination of impairments could have been the basis for a finding of disability (without regard to whether the child was actually engaged in substantial gainful activity) before the child attained age 22, and"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(11)(A) In the case of a child described in subparagraph (B)(ii) of paragraph (1) who—

"(i) has not attained early retirement age (as defined in section 216(1)(2));

"(ii) has filed an application for child's insurance benefits; and

"(iii) is insured for disability benefits (as determined under section 223(c)(1)) at the time of such filing; such application shall be deemed to be an application for both child's insurance benefits under this subsection and disability insurance benefits under section 223.

"(B) In the case of a child described in subparagraph (B)(ii) of paragraph (1) who—

"(i) has attained early retirement age (as defined in section 216(1)(2));

"(ii) has filed an application for child's insurance benefits; and

"(iii) is a fully insured individual (as defined in section 214(a)) at the time of such filing;

such application shall be deemed to be an application for both child's insurance benefits under this subsection and old-age insurance benefits under section 202(a).

"(C) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in the case of a child described in subparagraph (A) or (B), if, at the time of filing an application for child's insurance benefits, the amount of the monthly old-age or disability insurance benefit to which the child would be entitled is greater than the amount of the monthly child's insurance benefit to which the child would be entitled, the child shall not be entitled to a child's insurance benefit based on such application.

"(D) For purposes of subparagraph (C), the amount of the monthly old-age or disability benefit to which the child would be entitled shall be determined—

"(i) without regard to the primary insurance amount calculation described section 215(a)(7); and

"(ii) before application of section 224.

"(12) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), a child shall not be required to be continuously under a disability during the period between the date that the disability began and

the date that the application for child's insurance benefits is filed.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to applications filed on or after the date that is 24 months after the date of the enactment of this section.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2124. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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. 2124

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 “American Business for American Companies Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON AWARDING CONTRACTS TO INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 4715. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

“(a) PROHIBITION.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an executive agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

“(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

“(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is held by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

“(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of \$10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

“(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

“(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

“(B) **PENALTIES.**—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

“(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

“(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

“(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes on or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(2) **EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—**

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

“(B) **SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on January 18, 2017.

“(3) **SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—**

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

“(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

“(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

“(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

“(B) **DETERMINATION.**—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on January 18, 2017, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate)

may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(c) WAIVER.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an executive agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is—

“(A) required in the interest of national security; or

“(B) necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or federally funded—

“(i) programs that provide health benefits to individuals; or

“(ii) public health programs.

“(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The head of an executive agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the relevant authorizing committees of Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) **TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.**—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

“(3) **SCOPE.**—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms ‘expanded affiliated group’, ‘foreign incorporated entity’, ‘person’, ‘domestic’, and ‘foreign’ have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

“(2) **SPECIAL RULES.**—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4714 the following new item:

“4715. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.”.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2339d. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

“(a) PROHIBITION.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

“(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

“(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is owned by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

“(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of \$10,000,000, other than a

contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

“(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

“(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

“(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

“(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

“(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

“(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes on or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

“(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on January 18, 2017.

“(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

“(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

“(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

“(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

“(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on January 18, 2017, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(c) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security or is necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or federally funded programs that provide health benefits to individuals.

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the congressional defense committees.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

“(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘expanded affiliated group’, ‘foreign incorporated entity’, ‘person’, ‘domestic’, and ‘foreign’ have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

“(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2339c the following new item:

“2339d. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.”.

(3) FUTURE TRANSFER.—

(A) TRANSFER AND REDESIGNATION.—Section 2339d of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), is transferred to

chapter 364 of such title, inserted after section 4660, as added by section 1862(b) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283), and redesignated as section 4661.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(i) TARGET CHAPTER TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 364 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 1862(a) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283), is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4660 the following new item:

“Sec. 4661. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.”.

(ii) ORIGIN CHAPTER TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (2), is amended by striking the item relating to section 2339d.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall take effect on January 1, 2022.

(D) REFERENCES; SAVINGS PROVISIONS; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Sections 1883 through 1885 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283) shall apply with respect to the amendments made under this paragraph as if such amendments were made under title XVIII of such Act.

(c) REGULATIONS REGARDING MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall, for purposes of section 4714(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 41, United States Code, and section 2339d(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsections (a) and (b), respectively, prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(2) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2137. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish an Office of Rural Investment, to ensure that rural communities and regions are equitably represented in Federal decision-making for transportation policy, and for other purposes; 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. 2137

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Rural Transportation Equity Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. RURAL INVESTMENT.

(a) OFFICE OF RURAL INVESTMENT.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 102 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting “(referred to in this section as the ‘Department’)” after “Department of Transportation”;

(B) in subsection (b), in the first sentence, by inserting “(referred to in this section as the ‘Secretary’)” after “Secretary of Transportation”;

(C) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “Department of Transportation” each place it appears and inserting “Department”;

(D) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(E) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) OFFICE OF RURAL INVESTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Department, within the Office of the Secretary, an Office of Rural Investment (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Office’).

“(2) LEADERSHIP.—The Office shall be headed by a Director for Rural Investment (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Director’) who shall be appointed by, and report directly to, the Secretary.

“(3) MISSION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The mission of the Office shall be to coordinate with other offices and agencies within the Department and with other Federal agencies to further the goals and objectives described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) GOALS AND OBJECTIVES DESCRIBED.—The goals and objectives referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

“(i) to ensure that the unique needs and attributes of rural transportation, involving all modes, are fully addressed and prioritized during the development and implementation of transportation policies, programs, and activities within the Department;

“(ii) to improve coordination of Federal transportation policies, programs, and activities within the Department in a manner that expands economic development in rural communities and regions, and to provide recommendations for improvement, including additional internal realignments;

“(iii) to expand Federal transportation infrastructure investment in rural communities and regions, including by providing recommendations for changes in existing funding distribution patterns;

“(iv) to use innovation to resolve local and regional transportation challenges faced by rural communities and regions;

“(v) to promote and improve planning and coordination among rural communities and regions to maximize the unique competitive advantage in those locations while avoiding duplicative Federal, State and local investments; and

“(vi) to ensure that all rural communities and regions lacking resources receive proactive outreach, education, and technical assistance to improve access to Federal transportation programs.

“(4) DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR.—The Director shall—

“(A) be responsible for engaging in activities to carry out the mission described in paragraph (3);

“(B) organize, guide, and lead activities within the Department to address disparities in rural transportation infrastructure to improve safety, economic development, and

quality of life in rural communities and regions;

“(C) provide information and outreach to rural communities and regions concerning the availability and eligibility requirements of participating in programs of the Department;

“(D) help rural communities and regions—

“(i) identify competitive economic advantages and transportation investments that ensure continued economic growth; and

“(ii) avoid duplicative transportation investments;

“(E) serve as a resource for assisting rural communities and regions with respect to Federal transportation programs;

“(F) identify—

“(i) Federal statutes, regulations, and policies that may impede the Department from supporting effective rural infrastructure projects that address national transportation goals; and

“(ii) potential measures to solve or mitigate those issues;

“(G) identify improved, simplified, and streamlined internal processes to help limited-resource rural communities and regions access transportation investments;

“(H) recommend changes and initiatives for the Secretary to consider;

“(I) ensure and coordinate a routine rural consultation on the development of policies, programs, and activities of the Department;

“(J) serve as an advocate within the Department on behalf of rural communities and regions; and

“(K) work in coordination with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Commerce, the Federal Communications Commission, and other Federal agencies, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, in carrying out the duties described in subparagraphs (A) through (J).

“(5) CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS.—For the purpose of carrying out the mission of the Office under paragraph (3), the Secretary may enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, and other agreements as necessary, including with research centers, institutions of higher education, States, units of local government, nonprofit organizations, or a combination of any of those entities—

“(A) to conduct research on transportation investments that promote rural economic development;

“(B) to solicit information in the development of policy, programs, and activities of the Department that can improve infrastructure investment and economic development in rural communities and regions;

“(C) to develop educational and outreach materials, including the conduct of workshops, courses, and certified training for rural communities and regions that can further the mission and goals of the Office and the Department; and

“(D) to carry out any other activities, as determined by the Secretary to be appropriate.

“(6) GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director may award competitive grants to an entity described in subparagraph (B) to support expanded education, outreach, and technical assistance to rural communities and regions.

“(B) ENTITY DESCRIBED.—An entity referred to in subparagraph (A) is a nonprofit organization or an institution of higher education that has not less than 3 years of experience providing meaningful transportation technical assistance or advocacy services to rural communities and regions.

“(7) EMPLOYEES.—The Secretary shall ensure that not more than 4 full-time equivalent employees are assigned to the Office.

“(8) COORDINATION WITHIN AND AMONG OTHER OFFICES AND AGENCIES OF THE DEPARTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate not fewer than 1 representative from each office or agency of the Department described in subparagraph (B) who shall be responsible for leading the efforts within that office or agency to further the goals and objectives described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3).

“(B) OFFICES AND AGENCIES DESCRIBED.—The offices and agencies of the Department referred to in subparagraph (A) are each of the following:

“(i) The Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

“(ii) The Office of the General Counsel.

“(iii) The Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.

“(iv) The Federal Aviation Administration.

“(v) The Federal Highway Administration.

“(vi) The Federal Railroad Administration.

“(vii) The Federal Transit Administration.

“(viii) The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.

“(ix) The Office of Public Affairs.

“(x) Any other office or agency of the Department that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

“(C) DUTIES.—The Chief Infrastructure Funding Officer of the Department and the representatives designated under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) shall—

“(I) meet bimonthly; and

“(II) recommend initiatives to the Office; and

“(ii) may participate in all meetings and relevant activities of the Office to provide input and guidance relevant to rural transportation infrastructure projects and issues.

“(9) ADDITIONAL INPUT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall seek input from the offices and agencies of the Department described in subparagraph (B) to further the goals and objectives described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3).

“(B) OFFICES AND AGENCIES DESCRIBED.—The offices and agencies of the Department referred to in subparagraph (A) are each of the following:

“(i) The Maritime Administration.

“(ii) The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

“(iii) The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

“(10) REPORT.—Each year, the Office shall submit to the Secretary a report describing—

“(A) the objectives of the Office for the coming year; and

“(B) how the objectives of the Office were accomplished in the previous year.

“(11) APPLICABILITY.—In carrying out the mission of the Office under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall consider as rural any area considered to be a rural area under a Federal transportation program of the Department.”.

(2) COUNCIL ON CREDIT AND FINANCE.—Section 117(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(I) The Director for Rural Investment.”.

(b) RURAL TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The term “advisory council” means the rural transportation advisory council established under paragraph (2).

(B) RELEVANT COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “relevant committees of Congress” means—

(i) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives;

(ii) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(iii) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate;

(iv) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(v) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(vi) the Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(vii) the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(C) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Transportation.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a rural transportation advisory council to consult with and advise the Office of Rural Investment.

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The advisory council shall be composed of 15 members, appointed by the Secretary, of whom—

(i) not fewer than 1 shall be a representative from an institution of higher education or extension program;

(ii) not fewer than 1 shall be a representative from an organization promoting business and economic development, such as a chamber of commerce, a local government institution, or a planning organization;

(iii) not fewer than 1 shall be a representative from a financing entity;

(iv) not fewer than 1 shall have experience in health, mobility, or emergency services;

(v) not fewer than 1 shall have experience in transportation safety;

(vi) not fewer than 1 shall have experience with workforce access;

(vii) not fewer than 1 shall have experience with tourism and recreational activities;

(viii) not fewer than 1 shall have—

(I) experience with rural supply chains, such as direct-to-consumer supply chains; and

(II) wholesale distribution experience;

(ix) not fewer than 1 shall have experience in emerging or innovative technologies relating to rural transportation networks;

(x) not fewer than 1 shall have experience in food, nutrition, and grocery access;

(xi) not fewer than 1 shall represent agriculture, nutrition, or forestry; and

(xii) not fewer than 1 shall have experience with historically underserved regions, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall appoint members to the advisory council in a manner that ensures, to the maximum extent practicable, that the geographic and economic diversity of rural communities and regions of the United States are represented.

(C) TIMING OF INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint the initial members of the advisory council.

(D) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a member of the advisory council shall be appointed for a term of 3 years.

(ii) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—Of the members first appointed to the advisory council—

(I) 5, as determined by the Secretary, shall be appointed for a term of 3 years;

(II) 5, as determined by the Secretary, shall be appointed for a term of 2 years; and

(III) 5, as determined by the Secretary, shall be appointed for a term of 1 year.

(E) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy on the advisory council—

(i) shall not affect the power of the advisory council; and

(ii) shall be filled as soon as practicable and in the same manner as the original appointment.

(F) CONSECUTIVE TERMS.—An appointee to the advisory council may serve 1 additional, consecutive term if the member is reappointed by the Secretary.

(4) MEETINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The advisory council shall meet not less than twice per year, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the initial members of the advisory council are appointed under paragraph (3)(C), the advisory council shall hold the first meeting of the advisory council.

(5) DUTIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The advisory council shall—

(i) advise the Office of Rural Investment on issues related to rural needs relating to Federal transportation programs;

(ii) evaluate and review ongoing research activities relating to rural transportation networks, including new and emerging barriers to economic development and access to investments;

(iii) develop recommendations for any changes to Federal law, regulations, internal Department of Transportation policies or guidance, or other measures that would eliminate barriers for rural access or improve rural equity in transportation investments;

(iv) examine methods of maximizing the number of opportunities for assistance for rural communities and regions under Federal transportation programs, including expanded outreach and technical assistance;

(v) examine methods of encouraging intergovernmental and local resource cooperation to mitigate duplicative investments in key rural communities and regions and improve the efficiencies in the delivery of Federal transportation programs;

(vi) evaluate other methods of creating new opportunities for rural communities and regions; and

(vii) address any other relevant issues as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(B) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the initial members of the advisory council are appointed under paragraph (3)(C), and every 2 years thereafter through 2026, the advisory council shall submit to the Secretary and the relevant committees of Congress a report describing the recommendations developed under subparagraph (A)(ii).

(6) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(A) COMPENSATION.—A member of the advisory council shall serve without compensation.

(B) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the advisory council shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(7) TERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the advisory council shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date on which the initial members are appointed under paragraph (3)(C).

(B) EXTENSION.—Before the date on which the advisory council terminates, the Secretary may renew the advisory council for 1 or more 2-year periods.

(C) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 274—DESIGNATING JULY 24, 2021, AS “NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY”

Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. MARSHALL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 274

Whereas pioneering men and women, recognized as “cowboys”, helped to establish the American West;

Whereas the cowboy embodies honesty, integrity, courage, compassion, respect, a strong work ethic, and patriotism;

Whereas the cowboy spirit exemplifies strength of character, sound family values, and good common sense;

Whereas the cowboy archetype transcends ethnicity, gender, geographic boundaries, and political affiliations;

Whereas the cowboy, who lives off the land and works to protect and enhance the environment, is an excellent steward of the land and its creatures;

Whereas cowboy traditions have been a part of American culture for generations;

Whereas the cowboy continues to be an important part of the economy through the work of many thousands of ranchers across the United States who contribute to the economic well-being of every State;

Whereas millions of fans watch professional and working ranch rodeo events annually, making rodeo one of the most-watched sports in the United States;

Whereas membership and participation in rodeo and other organizations that promote and encompass the livelihood of cowboys span every generation and transcend race and gender;

Whereas the cowboy is a central figure in literature, film, and music and occupies a central place in the public imagination;

Whereas the cowboy is an American icon; and

Whereas the ongoing contributions made by cowboys and cowgirls to their communities should be recognized and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 24, 2021, as “National Day of the American Cowboy”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 275—ACKNOWLEDGING AND APOLOGIZING FOR THE MISTREATMENT OF, AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST, LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVED THE UNITED STATES IN THE ARMED FORCES, THE FOREIGN SERVICE, AND THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred

to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.:

S. RES. 275

Whereas the Federal Government discriminated against and terminated hundreds of thousands of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (referred to in this preamble as “LGBT”) individuals who served the United States in the Armed Forces, the Foreign Service, and the Federal civil service (referred to in this preamble as “civilian employees”) for decades, causing untold harm to those individuals professionally, financially, socially, and medically, among other harms;

Whereas Congress enacted legislation, led oversight hearings, and issued reports and public pronouncements against LGBT military service members, Foreign Service members, and civilian employees;

Whereas the policy that led to the discharge and systematic screening of gay, lesbian, and bisexual military service members was codified in a 1949 decree by the newly-consolidated Department of Defense, which mandated that “homosexual personnel, irrespective of sex, should not be permitted to serve in any branch of the Armed Forces in any capacity and prompt separation of known homosexuals from the Armed Forces is mandatory”;

Whereas the Federal Government maintained policies to drive hundreds of thousands of LGBT military service members, who honorably served the United States in uniform, including many who were fighting in wars around the world, from its military ranks;

Whereas, in 1993, Congress enacted the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160; 107 Stat. 1547), which contained the so-called “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy that prohibited lesbian, gay, and bisexual military service members from disclosing their sexual orientation while they served in the Armed Forces;

Whereas, despite the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy, LGBT military service members continued to be investigated and discharged solely on the basis of the sexual orientation of those military service members;

Whereas historians have estimated that at least 100,000 military service members were forced out of the Armed Forces between World War II and 2011 simply for being LGBT, while countless others were forced to hide their identities and live in fear while serving;

Whereas, although the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy was intended to allow qualified citizens to serve in the Armed Forces regardless of their sexual orientation, the policy was inherently discriminatory against LGBT military service members because it prohibited those service members from disclosing their sexual orientation;

Whereas, with the enactment of the Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (10 U.S.C. 654 note; Public Law 111-321), Congress joined military leaders in acknowledging that lesbian, gay, and bisexual military service members serve the United States just as bravely and well as other military service members;

Whereas the Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (10 U.S.C. 654 note; Public Law 111-321) and the 2016 policy shift of the Department of Defense, which permitted transgender individuals to enlist and openly serve in the Armed Forces, has made the Armed Forces stronger and more effective;

Whereas military leaders have likewise acknowledged that, in addition to lesbian, gay, and bisexual military service members, transgender service members also serve the United States just as bravely and well as other service members;

Whereas, under the pressures of the Cold War, and at the instigation and lead of Congress, the Federal Government also pursued anti-LGBT policies, which resulted in tens of thousands of LGBT civilian employees being terminated;

Whereas the Department of State began investigations into employees for alleged homosexual activity as early as the 1940s;

Whereas following Senator Joseph McCarthy’s targeting of gay employees in the Department of State in 1950, the Senate held hearings on “The Employment of Homosexuals and other Sex Perverts in the Government”, which—

(1) led to the issuance of a widely read report that falsely asserted that gay people posed a security risk because they could be easily blackmailed; and

(2) found that gay people were unsuitable employees because “one homosexual can pollute a Government office”;

Whereas, in response to Senator McCarthy’s allegations against gay people, the Department of State increased its persecution of lesbian, gay, and bisexual employees;

Whereas more than 1,000 Department of State employees were dismissed due to their sexual orientation, and many more individuals were prevented from joining the Department of State due to discriminatory hiring practices;

Whereas thousands of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals served honorably in the Department of State as Foreign Service officers, Foreign Service specialists, civil servants, and contractors, upholding the values, and advancing the interests, of the United States even as the country discriminated against them;

Whereas the effort to purge gay and lesbian employees from the Federal Government was codified in 1953 when President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued Executive Order 10450 (18 Fed. Reg. 2489; relating to security requirements for Government employment), which—

(1) defined “perversion” as a security threat; and

(2) mandated that every civilian employee and contractor pass a security clearance;

Whereas, over many decades, the Federal Government, led by security officials in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Civil Service Commission (referred to in this preamble as the “CSC”), and nearly every other agency of the Federal Government, investigated, harassed, interrogated, and terminated thousands of lesbian, gay, and bisexual civilian employees for no other reason than the sexual orientation of those employees;

Whereas these discriminatory policies by the Federal Government, the largest employer in the United States, encouraged similar efforts at the State and local level, particularly in higher education and the private sector;

Whereas, in 1969, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled in *Norton v. Macy*, 417 F.2d 1161 (1969) that—

(1) “homosexual conduct” may never be the sole cause for dismissal of a protected civilian employee; and

(2) the potential embarrassment stemming from the private conduct of a civilian employee may not affect the efficiency of the Federal civil service;

Whereas, despite the decision in *Norton v. Macy*, the CSC continued its efforts to rid the Federal Government of gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees until 1973, when the United States District Court for the Northern District of California ruled in *Society for Individual Rights, Inc. v. Hampton*, 63 F.R.D. 399 (1973) that the exclusion or discharge from Federal civil service of any lesbian,

gay, or bisexual person because of prejudice was prohibited;

Whereas many Federal Government agencies, including the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State, none of which were subject to the rules of the CSC, continued to harass and seek to exclude lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals from their ranks until 1995, when President Bill Clinton issued Executive Order 12968 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note; relating to access to classified information), which barred the practice of denying a Federal Government security clearance solely on the basis of sexual orientation;

Whereas transgender military service members, Foreign Service members, and civilian employees continued to be harassed and excluded from Federal civil service until 2014, when President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13672 (79 Fed. Reg. 42971; relating to further amendments to Executive Order 11478, Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government, and Executive Order 11246, Equal Employment Opportunity), which prohibited the Federal Government and Federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity;

Whereas, on January 9, 2017, Secretary of State John Kerry issued a formal apology for the pattern of discrimination against LGBT Foreign Service members and civilian employees at the Department of State;

Whereas, despite persecution and systematic mistreatment by the Federal Government beginning in the early 1940s though the 1990s, including what historians have labeled as the “Lavender Scare”, LGBT individuals have never stopped honorably serving the United States;

Whereas LGBT individuals continued to make significant contributions to the United States through their work as clerks and lawyers, surgeons and nurses, Purple Heart recipients and Navy Seals, translators and air traffic controllers, engineers and astronomers, teachers and diplomats, rangers and Postal Service workers, and advisors and policy makers;

Whereas other countries throughout the world, including some of the closest allies of the United States, have apologized for similarly discriminating against LGBT military service members, Foreign Service members, and civilian employees; and

Whereas, in order for the United States to heal and move forward, the Federal Government must accord all LGBT individuals who were discriminated against by, wrongfully terminated by, and excluded from serving in the Armed Forces, the Foreign Service, and the Federal civil service the same acknowledgment and apology: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

The Senate—

(1) acknowledges and condemns the discrimination against, wrongful termination of, and exclusion from the Federal civil service, the Foreign Service, and the Armed Forces of the thousands of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (referred to in this section as “LGBT”) individuals who were affected by the anti-LGBT policies of the Federal Government;

(2) on behalf of the United States, apologizes to—

(A) the affected LGBT military service members, Foreign Service members, veterans, and Federal civil service employees; and

(B) the families of those service members, veterans, and Federal civil service employees; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the Federal Government to treat all military service

members, Foreign Service members, veterans, and Federal civil service employees and retirees, including LGBT individuals, with equal respect and fairness.

SEC. 2. DISCLAIMER.

Nothing in this resolution—

(1) authorizes or supports any claim against the United States; or
(2) serves as a settlement of any claim against the United States.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, Senator Baldwin and I are pleased to introduce a resolution that acknowledges and apologizes for the mistreatment of and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals who have served our nation as civil servants or members of the Armed Forces and Foreign Service. This systemic mistreatment and discrimination of members of the LGBT community began as early as the 1940s and continued well into the 1990s and is often termed as the Lavender Scare by historians. During this time, it is estimated that 100,000 service members were forced out of the Armed Forces between World War II and 2011. In addition, more than 1,000 State Department employees were dismissed due to their alleged sexual orientation, and many more were prevented from serving due to discriminatory hiring practices.

Policies such as the 1949 decree by the Department of Defense mandating that “homosexual personnel, irrespective of sex, should not be permitted to serve in any branch of the Armed Forces” led to the mass discharge and systemic screening of gay, lesbian, and bisexual military service members. Similar policies within the State Department followed led to mass dismissals and terminations of Foreign Service and civil service employees. Subsequently, policies were enacted across the Federal government targeting members of the LGBT community. To this day, historians do not know the exact number of people impacted. However, despite these harmful and discriminatory policies, LGBT people continued to faithfully serve and make significant contributions to the United States, many of whom became clerks and lawyers, surgeons and nurses, Purple Heart recipients and Navy Seals, translators and air traffic controllers, engineers and astronomers, teachers and diplomats, and rangers and postal workers.

It is time to acknowledge the harm caused to these Americans, their families, and our country by depriving LGBT people of the right to serve as federal civil servants, diplomats, or in the Armed Services. This Senate resolution takes a stand on the side of respect for LGBT Americans who have served our nation and reaffirms our commitment to treat all public servants with fairness and equality, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity. I'm proud to introduce this Senate resolution during Pride Month to reaffirm our nation's commitment to treat everyone, including LGBT Americans, with equal respect and fairness. I will continue working

toward advancing equality for all LGBT people in Virginia and across our nation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATE RESOLUTION 276—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA GATORS FOR WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I MEN'S TENNIS CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. Rubio (for himself and Mr. Scott of Florida) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 276

Whereas, on May 22, 2021, the University of Florida Gators Men's Tennis Team (referred to in this preamble as the “Gators”) won the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the “NCAA”) Division I Men's Tennis Championship;

Whereas the 2021 NCAA Division I Men's Tennis Championship is the first NCAA Division I Men's Tennis Championship the Gators have won;

Whereas the Gators defeated Baylor University's Men's Tennis Team in the NCAA Division I Men's Tennis Championship;

Whereas this marks the 42nd national title for the University of Florida Gators Athletics programs;

Whereas men's tennis is the 15th sport in which the University of Florida has won a national title;

Whereas the University of Florida is 1 of 2 programs in the Nation to win at least 1 national championship in every fully contested season since the 2008–2009 season;

Whereas the championship victory clinching match was won by Ben Shelton, son of Gators Head Coach Bryan Shelton;

Whereas Gators player Blaise Bicknell—

(1) holds a perfect record in dual matches in his career; and

(2) is the fourth player in Gators history to go undefeated in dual matches;

Whereas Gators Head Coach Bryan Shelton—

(1) is the fifth coach across all NCAA sports to coach a men's and women's national championship winning team; and

(2) the first coach in NCAA history to lead a men's program and women's program to a NCAA Division I Tennis Championship; and

Whereas the following entire Gator roster and coaching staff contributed to the NCAA Division I Men's Tennis Championship victory: Associate Head Coach Tanner Stump, Volunteer Assistant Coach Scott Perelman, and student athletes Andy Andrade, Brian Berdusco, Blaise Bicknell, Josh Goodger, Will Grant, Lukas Greif, Johannes Ingildsen, Sam Riffice, Ben Shelton, and Duarte Vale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Florida Gators Men's Tennis Team and the students, alumni, faculty, staff, and trustees of the University of Florida, for winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Tennis Championship; and

(2) respectfully directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the President of the University of Florida, Kent Fuchs;

(B) the Athletic Director of the University of Florida, Scott Stricklin; and

(C) the Head Coach of the University of Florida Gators Men's Tennis Team, Bryan Shelton.

SENATE RESOLUTION 277—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI REBELS WOMEN'S GOLF TEAM ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I WOMEN'S GOLF CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. Wicker (for himself and Mrs. Hyde-Smith) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 277

Whereas, on Wednesday, May 26, 2021, the University of Mississippi Rebels Women's golf team won the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the “NCAA”) Division I women's golf championship at Grayhawk Golf Club in Scottsdale, Arizona;

Whereas, on winning the 2021 NCAA Division I women's golf championship, the University of Mississippi women's golf team became the first women's team in University history to win an NCAA national championship;

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team claimed the first NCAA national championship in a team sport for the University since the football team won the 1962 NCAA Division I football championship;

Whereas the appearance of the University of Mississippi women's golf team in the NCAA Division I women's golf championship was the first appearance in an NCAA national championship game for an athletics team of the University since 1995;

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team defeated the second place Oklahoma State University Cowgirls 4–1 in match play;

Whereas Chiarra Tamburlini secured a 6–and–5 win, the largest margin of victory in NCAA championship match history;

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team was under the leadership of 2020 Southeastern Conference (referred to in this preamble as the “SEC”) Coach of the Year Kory Henkes and Assistant Coach Zack Byrd;

Whereas Coach Kory Henkes has led the University of Mississippi women's golf team to incredible success during her 6 seasons at the helm, including last season, when she led the program to 4 team tournament titles and set the record for most wins in a single season;

Whereas Julia Johnson was named a first-team All-American and first-team All-SEC;

Whereas Kennedy Swann was named second-team All-SEC, with the national championship bringing her career record in match play to 10–2;

Whereas members of the University of Mississippi women's golf team have been honored by various awards throughout the 2020–2021 season, including the selection of Julia Johnson to represent the United States in the Arnold Palmer Cup;

Whereas the University of Mississippi now boasts 26 total NCAA national championships;

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team was ranked 5th in the United States by Golfweek and the Golfstat Team Rankings;

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team, composed of Julia Johnson, Kennedy Swann, Chiarra Tamburlini, and teammates McKinley Cunningham, Ellen Hume, Ellen Hutchinson-Kay, Andrea Lignell, Macy Somoskey, and Smilla Sonderby displayed outstanding dedication, teamwork, and sportsmanship throughout the 2020–2021 season; and

Whereas the University of Mississippi women's golf team has brought great pride and honor—

- (1) to the University of Mississippi;
- (2) to loyal fans of the University of Mississippi; and
- (3) to the entire State of Mississippi: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Mississippi women's golf team, including the athletes, coaches, faculty, students, and alumni of the University of Mississippi, on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's golf championship;

(2) recognizes the University of Mississippi for its excellence as an institution of higher education; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the Chancellor of the University of Mississippi, Dr. Glenn Boyce;

(B) the Athletic Director of the University of Mississippi, Keith Carter; and

(C) the head coach of the University of Mississippi women's golf team, Kory Henkes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 278—RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED SPINAL ASSOCIATION, A LEADING NATIONAL ADVOCACY ORGANIZATION THAT IS DEDICATED TO PROMOTING THE INDEPENDENCE AND ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF ALL PEOPLE LIVING WITH SPINAL CORD INJURIES AND NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS, INCLUDING VETERANS, AND PROVIDING SUPPORT AND INFORMATION TO THEIR LOVED ONES, CARE PROVIDERS, AND PERSONAL SUPPORT NETWORKS

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:.

S. RES. 278

Whereas, in 1946, a group of returning veterans from World War II in New York, New York, formed the organization now known as United Spinal Association to address the needs of paralyzed veterans;

Whereas, in 1948, members of this organization advocated for and secured the first accessible housing bill in the United States (the Act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 500; Public Law 80-702)), which provided Federal funds for the building of accessible homes for paralyzed veterans;

Whereas, in 1968, members of this organization advocated for the passage of the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.), which guarantees equal access to federally-funded buildings and facilities for wheelchair users and all people of the United States with disabilities;

Whereas, in 1970, James J. Peters, who would later lead United Spinal Association, exposed the deplorable conditions that paralyzed Vietnam veterans faced at the Bronx Veterans Administration Hospital with an article in LIFE magazine, leading the Veterans Administration to establish a national spinal cord injury service office to address the needs of paralyzed veterans and the renovation of the Bronx Veterans Administration Hospital, which was later named for Peters;

Whereas, in 1985, New York City settled a lawsuit initiated by United Spinal Association, agreeing to make all city buses, key

subway stations and commuter rail stations, and all new transit stations accessible to wheelchair users, and New York City established a paratransit system for people unable to use mass transit, leading to a model that would be incorporated as part of the transportation provisions of the landmark Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.);

Whereas, regardless of a person's level of abilities, United Spinal Association seeks to build an inclusive world that—

(1) removes barriers, particularly for wheelchair users;

(2) embraces the talents of all people with disabilities to achieve their full potential; and

(3) provides people with disabilities equal opportunities to pursue their interests and dreams;

Whereas United Spinal Association continues to support and advocate on behalf of more than 2,000,000 people in the United States living with spinal cord injuries or neurological disorders, as well as veterans, through—

(1) proven programs and services, and nurturing innovative self-reliance, advocacy, and leadership;

(2) empowering its members, their loved ones, care providers, and stakeholders with resources, one-on-one assistance, and peer support;

(3) promoting independence through employment opportunities and inclusion into mainstream society; and

(4) advocating for greater disability rights, including access to health care, rehabilitation, mobility equipment, transportation, community services, and the built environment; and

Whereas the legacy of James J. Peters, who once described the straightforward strategy in advocating for people in the United States with disabilities as simply refusing to accept no for an answer, is alive and well throughout United Spinal Association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that throughout 75 years of service, United Spinal Association has made significant contributions to the lives of people in the United States with disabilities, including veterans;

(2) honors United Spinal Association for its continued role in supporting and advocating for people with spinal cord injuries and neurological disorders, as well as all veterans; and

(3) commemorates 2021 as the 75th anniversary of the founding of United Spinal Association.

SENATE RESOLUTION 279—DESIGNATING JUNE 21, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 25, 2021, AS “NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY EDUCATION WEEK”

Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. CASIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:.

S. RES. 279

Whereas, according to a 2017 projection, the United States will face a shortage of 1,800,000 cybersecurity workers by 2022;

Whereas recent cyberattacks on the United States have highlighted the cybersecurity workforce shortage in the United States that—

(1) poses a threat to the national security of the United States;

(2) jeopardizes the economy of the United States;

(3) puts the digital privacy of the United States at risk; and

(4) threatens the critical infrastructure of the United States;

Whereas expanding cybersecurity education opportunities is important to address the cybersecurity workforce shortage and prepare the United States for ongoing and future national security threats;

Whereas cybersecurity education can provide learning and career opportunities for kindergarten through grade 12 students across the United States, as well as bolster the capacity of the domestic workforce to defend the United States and secure the economy of the United States;

Whereas, in 2020, introduced as part of the Providing Resources for Ongoing Training and Education in Cyber Technologies Act of 2020 and enacted as part of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283), Congress authorized the Cybersecurity Education Training Assistance Program, a Department of Homeland Security initiative to provide cybersecurity career awareness, curricular resources, and professional development to elementary and secondary schools; and

Whereas ensuring access to cybersecurity education for all students in the United States regardless of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or geographic location will expand opportunities for good-paying jobs in high-demand fields: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 21, 2021 through June 25, 2021, as “National Cybersecurity Education Week”;

(2) encourages the people of the United States to acknowledge the importance of cybersecurity education;

(3) encourages educational and training institutions to increase the understanding and awareness of cybersecurity education at such institutions; and

(4) commits to—

(A) raising awareness about cybersecurity education; and

(B) taking legislative actions to address cybersecurity education expansion and address the cybersecurity workforce shortage.

SENATE RESOLUTION 280—SUPPORTING A STABLE COLOMBIA AND OPPOSING ANY THREAT TO DEMOCRACY IN COLOMBIA

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:.

S. RES. 280

Whereas Colombia is among the oldest standing democracies in Latin America;

Whereas the United States established diplomatic relations with Colombia in 1822;

Whereas Colombia is a constitutional republic where the people of Colombia hold the power and elect representatives to exercise that power;

Whereas, after many years of violence and armed conflict, in 2021 Colombia is the strongest ally to the United States in Latin America;

Whereas, with the support of the United States, Colombia has transformed itself between 2001 and 2021 from a volatile and near-failed state into a rich democracy with a growing free market economy;

Whereas May 15, 2022, will mark the 10-year anniversary of the entry into force of the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, which has supported economic growth and employment opportunities in both Colombia and the United States;

Whereas the United States maintains support for Colombia in response to the COVID-

19 pandemic, including provision of excess vaccine doses to help revitalize the economy of Colombia;

Whereas presidential and legislative elections were held in Colombia in 2018, and the people of Colombia elected Iván Duque Márquez president in a second round of elections that impartial international observers considered free and fair and the most peaceful in decades;

Whereas the United States and Colombia share a commitment to promoting security, prosperity, human rights, and democracy in Colombia and across the Western Hemisphere;

Whereas, in recent years, the Government of Colombia has taken courageous steps to enforce the law, stop drug traffickers, and rein in foreign terrorist organizations like the National Liberation Army (referred to in this preamble as the “ELN”) and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (referred to in this preamble as the “FARC”);

Whereas the United States continues to support the efforts of the Government of Colombia for peace, including protection of vulnerable populations such as Indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities, support for human rights defenders, provision of greater educational opportunities, increases in public and private investments, especially in rural areas, and respect for human rights and the rule of law;

Whereas the United States maintains a strong commitment to cooperating with the Government of Colombia to investigate, arrest, and prosecute members of transnational criminal organizations and to dismantle terrorist groups like the ELN, the FARC, and Hezbollah, whose illicit activities, specifically narco-trafficking, devastate the citizens of Colombia and Latin America;

Whereas, since 2016, the United States has provided more than \$1,000,000,000 in direct and indirect support to peace implementation in Colombia;

Whereas Colombia is an essential partner of the United States in continuing efforts to support the courageous people of Venezuela in their fight for freedom, democracy, and economic prosperity against the dictatorship of Nicolás Maduro by generously hosting and providing aid to nearly 1,800,000 citizens of Venezuela as of June 2021 and by providing them essential services such as healthcare and education;

Whereas, in February 2021, President Duque issued temporary protective status with work authorization to citizens of Venezuela living in Colombia;

Whereas the leadership of the Government of Colombia during the humanitarian crisis in Venezuela has been critical in organizing regional support for Interim President Juan Guaidó, as well as in denouncing the dictatorship of Maduro and helping implement policies to isolate his narcoterrorist regime, specifically through the Lima Group and the Organization of American States;

Whereas the security situation in Colombia has improved significantly between 2000 and 2021, but the migrant influx from Venezuela and the economic effects of the COVID-19 pandemic have hurt the economy of Colombia, creating unique challenges for Colombia that demand action and support from strong democratic allies like the United States;

Whereas freedom of speech, freedom to peacefully assemble, and other human rights are inalienable, and any acts of excess force against peaceful protesters should be condemned and investigated; and

Whereas enemies of freedom, such as the communist regime of Raul Castro in Cuba and the Maduro regime in Venezuela, exploit and abuse the vulnerable and individuals simply asking for their voices to be heard by

promoting violent unrest, vandalism, and destruction of property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) declares its firm commitment to Colombia, the strongest ally of the United States in Latin America;

(2) opposes any effort to undermine the democracy or sovereignty of Colombia;

(3) encourages the international community to stand for democracy in Colombia and to condemn any efforts to undermine that democracy;

(4) condemns any regime in any country, such as Cuba, Venezuela, or Iran, that gives aid to terrorist groups in Colombia by providing training, weapons, or funding, or by hosting those groups within the borders of the nation-state;

(5) strongly condemns the terrorist attack perpetrated on June 15, 2021, and attributed to the National Liberation Army by the Duque administration, against the military base of the 30th Army Brigade of Colombia in Cúcuta, Colombia, the northeastern border city near Venezuela, where United States soldiers were present, at least 36 people were injured, and infrastructure of the military base was destroyed;

(6) condemns any blockade of essential goods and services, including imports or transports of medicine or food, and strongly condemns all violence or attacks against innocent citizens of Colombia or their private property or businesses;

(7) recognizes that a stable and prosperous Colombia serves United States interests in Latin America; and

(8) reemphasizes the shared democratic values of Colombia and the United States through free and fair elections with the peaceful participation of all political leaders and parties, accompanied by credible local and international observers, including in the presidential elections in Colombia in 2022.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

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 Thursday, June 17, 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 Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on

Thursday, June 17, 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 Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 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 Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREADS AND SPENDING OVERSIGHT

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threads and Spending Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Parker Loy, an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges for today, June 17, 2021.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 21, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, June 21; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Fonzone nomination; finally, that the cloture motions filed during today's session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 21, 2021, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:48 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 21, 2021, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CARLOS DEL TORO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, VICE KENNETH J. BRAITHWAITE.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

DAMON Y. SMITH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE J. PAUL COMPTON, JR.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

MICHAEL D. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE, VICE BARBARA STEWART.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SANDRA D. BRUCE, OF DELAWARE, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE KATHLEEN S. TIGHE, RESIGNED.

CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD

MARGARET A. BURNHAM, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

CLAYBORNE CARSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

GABRIELLE M. DUDLEY, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

HENRY KLIBANOFF, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. EDWIN J. DEEDRICK, JR.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 17, 2021:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU, OF ALASKA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

MATTHEW T. QUINN, OF MONTANA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR MEMORIAL AFFAIRS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TANYA MARIE TRUJILLO, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

JOHN K. TIEN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

CHRIS INGLIS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE NATIONAL CYBER DIRECTOR.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN

THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 305:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. MICHAEL F. MCALLISTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 305:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PAUL F. THOMAS

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

PAMELA A. MELROY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE COMMANDANT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 304:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. LINDA L. FAGAN

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

RICHARD W. SPINRAD, OF OREGON, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE.

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES J. CLARK AND ENDING WITH LUKE P. STRITTMATTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 27, 2021.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LISA M. THOMPSON AND ENDING WITH TARA E. LARKIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 27, 2021.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING REN HARRIS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ren Harris, the 2021 Napa Valley Grape Grower of the Year, for his accomplishments and contributions toward our community.

Born in 1941 in San Francisco, Harris is a sixth generation Californian. After attending Napa Valley College, the University of San Francisco, the University of California Davis and the University of Bordeaux, Mr. Harris began his career in the wine community in 1967 as a grape grower and vintner. In the late 1960's, Mr. Harris and his wife Marilyn moved from San Francisco to Oakville and began planting grapes on what was once a prune orchard. By 1975, they had successfully created the Paradigm brand, which is known and loved by residents throughout Napa Valley today.

Mr. Harris's contributions to the wine community extend far beyond Paradigm Winery. His leadership within the industry is exemplary, having served as the President of the Napa County Farm Bureau, Council Member of the California Growers Board, Director of the Napa Valley CoOp Winery, and both President and Director of the Oakville Winegrowers. Additionally, he was the founder of both the Napa Valley Grape Growers and the California Grower Foundation.

Perhaps the best testament to Mr. Harris's dedication to Napa Valley and his fellow viticulturists is his extensive work throughout his career advocating for the protection of Napa Valley's land, workforce, and community. Through the California Grower Foundation, he was able to help improve the working conditions of viticulturalists as well as establish affordable healthcare access for farmworkers. These contributions have made a lasting impact on Napa Valley and beyond.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Harris is a community member we should all strive to be. His passion for viticulture and dedication to his grape growing community make him deserving of the Napa Valley Grower of the Year. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor Ren Harris here today.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HERBERT KALINER

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise to pay tribute to a great man, Herbert Kaliner, who passed away on June 1st at the age of 94.

Herb was a cherished member of the Miami community. One of the last living survivors of Kristallnacht and the SS *St. Louis*, Herb was widely known and respected for his decades of engagement with community groups, schools, churches, and synagogues. He was a ubiquitous presence as a teacher and docent at the Holocaust Memorial on Miami Beach, where he spent every Saturday leading tours and educating generations of visitors about the Holocaust.

Born in Germany, Herb was just 12 when he and his family fled the Nazi regime on "the Voyage of the Damned," the tragic ocean liner which was forced to return to Europe in 1939 after being turned away from the United States, Cuba, and Canada. When the ship returned to Europe, about 250 of the passengers were killed in the Holocaust, including Herb's parents and two sisters. "We were so close to Miami Beach, I could see it," Herb told the Miami Herald in 1997. "I said to my parents, 'Someday, I'll come back here.'"

Despite the odds, Herb survived the Nazi invasion of France by hiding in the woods and working under false papers. In 1949 he immigrated to Miami and would go on to serve admirably in the Korean War, open a bakery, marry the love of his life, and raise a wonderful family.

Herb dedicated much of the latter part of his life to advocating for the rights, interests, and needs of Holocaust survivors, especially those living in poverty. As a member of the Holocaust Survivors Foundation USA Executive Committee, he often met with elected national political and communal leaders, even testifying before Congress to ensure the rights of Holocaust survivors to live in dignity. Despite the tragedy he endured, Herb never let his commitment to justice waiver and is an enduring example of commitment, leadership, and service. He will be deeply missed.

Herb is survived by his wife of almost 60 years, Vera; his daughters Debbie and Michelle; son-in-law Amir; and three grandchildren, Jessica, Zachary, and Jonah.

RECOGNITION OF MS. ALTHEA MARGARET DAILY MILLS

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Ms. Althea Margaret Daily Mills is an unsung hero in the fight for desegregation in Florida. Ms. Mills began her education in Pughsville, Winter Haven's first Black community. When she was 13, she moved to Pennsylvania to live with her aunt. There, she was able to attend integrated schools. In 1963, Mills filed a lawsuit against the Polk County Board of Public Instruction to end the "dual school system" and allow her son to attend the then, all-white, Winter Haven High School. This lawsuit eventually led to the integration of all Polk County public schools.

When asked about her motivation to challenge the system, Mills would later say "Our instructors were just as good, but some of my son's textbooks would go to page 3 and then skip to page 35. You can't learn like that."

Ms. Mills also was the first black career employee of the United States Postal Service in Winter Haven and eventually became manager of the Florence Villa Post Office. But as the first Black postal worker, her career was not easy. At one point, Ms. Mills was transferred to another post office, in an area known to be unwelcoming to Black people, in an effort to get her to quit. While the move was intimidating, she once recalled that her worst day was when a Black patron refused to buy stamps from her because she was Black.

Although Ms. Mills passed away in 2008, her legacy lives on. C.A. Boswell, Jr., the longtime attorney for the Polk County School Board, said of his former opponent, "She was a good lady and had the best interests of the kids at heart, it was a different time. It took some brave people to hold that thing (the lawsuit) up."

The recognition of Ms. Althea Margaret Daily Mills is all the more special as we do it on June 17, 2021, on the first recognition of Juneteenth as a National Holiday. This Juneteenth is the 155th anniversary of the oldest nationally celebrated commemoration of the ending of slavery in the United States.

General Gordon Granger read General Order No. 3 in Galveston, Texas which announced the freedom of the last American slaves.

GENERAL ORDER NO. 3

The people of Texas are informed that, in accordance with a proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free. This involves an absolute equality of personal rights and rights of property, between former masters and slaves and the connection heretofore existing between them, becomes that between employer and hired labor. The Freedmen are advised to remain at their present homes and work for wages . . .

By the reading of this order two-hundred and fifty thousand slaves were freed nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation went into effect.

We thank Ms. Althea Margaret Daily Mills on this special day and appreciate her efforts to make our community a better place.

IN RECOGNITION OF BUILDING SAFETY MONTH

HON. SHARICE DAVIDS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, in honor of Building Safety Month, I am pleased to recognize the importance of safety in the built environment and the dedication of the members of the International Code Council (ICC) to their roles in protecting our communities.

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

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

members of the International Code Council (ICC) to their roles in protecting our communities.

With natural disasters only expected to increase in frequency and severity, building codes include important safeguards to protect the public from tornadoes, floods, hurricanes, ice and snowstorms, wildland fires, and earthquakes. Last November, FEMA released, "Building Codes Save: A Nationwide Study" and found that implementing modern building codes could save \$600 billion in disaster spending by 2060. This further confirmed findings from the National Institute of Building Sciences (NIBS) that show adopting modern model building codes save \$11 for every \$1 invested through earthquake, flood, and wind mitigation benefits, with a \$4 to \$1 wildfire mitigation benefit. These benefits represent avoided casualties, property damage, business interruptions, and insurance costs, and are enjoyed by all building stakeholders—from developers, titleholders, and lenders, to tenants and communities.

Vulnerable and underserved populations are most affected by increases in utility costs, and they often have the most to lose in the event of a disaster or health emergency. Building codes establish minimum requirements that ensure safe, resilient, and energy efficient schools, childcare and healthcare facilities, housing, and places of employment.

Year round, building safety and fire prevention officials, architects, engineers, plumbers, builders, tradespeople, laborers, and others in the construction industry work to ensure the safe construction of buildings through the use of model building codes. The dedicated members of the International Code Council, a national standards developing organization, come together with local, state and federal officials to develop voluntary consensus codes that protect us in the buildings where we worship, live, work, learn, and play. The International Codes, the most widely adopted building safety and fire prevention codes in the nation, are used by most U.S. cities and counties and in all 50 states, including the State of Kansas. I commend Johnson County, which makes up a large portion of my district, for recently adopting the 2018 International Codes.

During the pandemic, building and fire prevention departments' essential work has ensured that healthcare centers are structurally sound and capable of withstanding natural disasters, and that temporary healthcare facilities providing medical surge capacity are built and maintained to protect occupant safety. These officials enforce state, local, and federal regulations that require adequate ventilation and sanitization. More broadly, code officials protect the health and welfare of building occupants to prevent dangerous sanitary, air quality, structural, or electrical hazards.

In a Presidential Proclamation designating May 2021 as Building Safety Month, President Biden stated, "Investing in our infrastructure and adopting and implementing modern building codes are the most effective mitigation measures communities can undertake." Building Safety Month was sponsored by the International Code Council to remind the public about the critical role of our communities' code officials in assuring us safe, efficient, and livable buildings. This year's Building Safety Month theme was, "Prevent, Prepare, Protect. Building Codes Save" and it encouraged all of us to raise awareness of the importance of

safe and resilient construction, fire prevention, sanitation, disaster mitigation, and new technologies in the construction industry.

Madam Speaker, please join me in thanking International Code Council Board President Greg Wheeler, as well as ICC's Chief Executive Officer Dominic Sims, the International Code Council leadership, and ICC's Members and staff for recognizing Building Safety Month.

AMERICAN HELLENIC INSTITUTE
(AHI) TESTIMONY ON FISCAL
YEAR 2022 APPROPRIATIONS
BILL

HON. NICOLE MALLIOTAKIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD remarks from the American Hellenic Institute on the Administration's proposed FY2022 foreign aid budget and U.S. interests in the Eastern Mediterranean. In promoting peace and stability in this critical region, Congress must authorize robust, America-first security assistance to our democratic allies in the Eastern Mediterranean—Greece and Cyprus. Any security assistance which counters U.S. interests, to Turkey and UN "Peacekeeping" efforts in Cyprus, namely, will only serve to advance instability and ideological expansionism in this region. Greece and Cyprus are key allies of our Nation, and we must continue to support their security for years to come.

TESTIMONY OF NICK LARIGAKIS, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN HELLENIC INSTITUTE (AHI), FISCAL YEAR 2022 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, SUBMITTED TO THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(By Nick Larigakis)

I am pleased to submit testimony to the House on behalf of the nationwide membership of the American Hellenic Institute (AHI) on the Administration's proposed FY2022 foreign aid budget.

The Administration's budget aims to confront 21st century security challenges. The budget's vision for the United States is to ensure it "... plays a lead role in defending democracy, freedom, and the rule of law" by recommending a significant increase in resources to: "strengthen and defend democracies throughout the world; advance human rights; fight corruption; and counter authoritarianism."

In keeping with the best interests of the United States, AHI opposes: (1) any proposed foreign aid and assistance to Turkey from the United States; (2) any proposed reduction in the aid levels for the UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus.

Further, AHI recommends an FY2022 funding level of \$1.5 million for NATO ally Greece's International Military Education and Training (IMET) program as authorized for appropriation in The Eastern Mediterranean Security and Energy Partnership Act. The Act also authorized \$500,000 for the Republic of Cyprus' IMET program for FY2022, which AHI recommends. In 2020, the U.S. Department of State provided, for the first time, IMET program funding for the Republic of Cyprus. AHI welcomed this policy development, and urges that this policy be continued.

Finally, AHI recommends robust investment for Foreign Military Financing (FMF)

assistance for Greece, in the amount of at least \$10 million, due to its strategic importance to the United States as the House will see presented in this testimony. The East Med Act authorized appropriations of \$3 million for FMF assistance in FY2020.

U.S. Interests in Southeast Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean. The U.S. has important interests in southeast Europe and the eastern Mediterranean. It is in the United States' best interest for the region to be politically, economically, and socially stable, and for democratic principles to flourish, including adherence to the rule of law. Significant commerce and energy sources pass through the region. With Greece's centuries of enduring presence, its close cultural, political, and economic ties to the Mediterranean countries, including Israel; Western Europe, the Balkans, Eastern Europe and the Middle East, Greece is strategically situated in a vital region to be an ideal strategic partner for the U.S.

America Values Its Alliance with Greece. Greece is an immensely valuable link as "a pillar of stability" in the region as several high-level U.S. government officials have noted. The U.S.-Greece relationship has reached new heights by virtue of an ongoing Strategic Dialogue, where avenues for cooperation among many sectors, including: regional cooperation, defense and security, and trade and investment, among others, are plotted for implementation. Greece is a pivotal and dependable NATO ally to advance U.S. interests and is a frontline state against terrorism. The Mutual Defense Cooperation Agreement between the United States and Greece illustrates the two allies' commitment to address over a longer term the security challenges in the region. The Agreement currently is under revision. After it is upgraded, it will offer more flexibility to deepen cooperation in the defense sector, according to Greece's Minister of Defense Nikos Panagiotopoulos. For its part, Greece further demonstrates its commitment to the Alliance as a top contributor to the defense efforts of NATO. Greece is estimated to spend 2.68% of its GDP on defense expenditures in 2020 in accordance with NATO standards despite battling economic challenges. By percentage of GDP, Greece is second to the U.S.

Greece is also important for the projection of U.S. strategic interests by being home to the most important U.S. military facility in the Mediterranean Sea, Souda Bay, Crete. It is a base from where joint USN/USAF reconnaissance missions and air refueling support for U.S. and NATO operations were implemented successfully, and it continues to be immensely important. In 2020, the United States homeported the Expeditionary Sea Base ship, the USS Hershel "Woody" Williams, at Souda Bay, assisting the U.S. armed forces in maritime missions and special operations in both Europe and North Africa. Military installations located at Souda Bay include the NATO Maritime Interdiction Operational Training Centre (NMIOTC) and the NATO Missile Firing Installation (NAMFI). To illustrate Souda Bay's importance, these figures show the volume of operations conducted there:

In 2020, at least 90 U.S. and 40 NATO (total 130) ships made a port visit at Souda Bay.

It also has been noted by U.S. government officials how Souda Bay allows United States Navy vessels—especially aircraft carriers—the ability to dock, make needed repairs and maintenance, and resupply, all within a couple of weeks and without having to return to Naval Station Norfolk. According to U.S. Ambassador to Greece, Geoffrey Pyatt, in a March, 20, 2021 statement: "Souda Bay is the jewel in the crown of US-Greece defense cooperation ... the unique capacities the

Souda provides to support US presence in the strategically dynamic East Med.” To further demonstrate that Greece’s value extends well beyond Souda Bay:

NATO Joint-Command HQ: Thessaloniki hosts a NATO Rapid Deployment Corps combined with its Third Army Corps for two years.

Operation Atlantic Resolve: Greece enables a substantial portion of the U.S. Army’s 10th Combat Aviation Brigade to enter the European theater through the port of Thessaloniki and to depart through Alexandroupolis. Alexandroupolis is being recognized as a city with increased geostrategic importance, which can also contribute to economic development and energy security.

The 101st Combat Aviation Brigade of the U.S. Army, from October–November 20, 2020, and from February–Mar 21, 2021, stationed and trained at Volos and Stefanoviko.

The U.S. and Greece held a joint military exercise in May 2021 as part of a larger “DEFENDEREurope” program, which, according to the U.S. Army, is “an annual large-scale U.S. Army-led, multinational, joint exercise designed to build readiness and interoperability between U.S., NATO and partner militaries.” Greece was one of only four participating countries whose port was used to deploy equipment into Europe and to host a “DEFENDER-Europe 21” logistical center.

USAF temporarily operated MQ-9 Reaper Drones from Greece’s Larisa Air Force Base.

Increased aircraft and soldier involvement at Stefanoviko Hellenic Army airbase improves NATO transit capability.

The trilateral naval exercise “Noble Dina” between the U.S., Greece, and Israel is held annually off of the coast of Souda Bay.

Greece is also an active participant in peacekeeping and peace-building operations conducted by international organizations, including the UN, NATO, EU, and OSCE. In sum, it is evident Greece contributes significantly to U.S. interests. AHI strongly contends these actions justify a robust investment by the U.S. in Foreign Military Financing assistance to Greece.

Regional Instability. The successful projection of U.S. interests in the Eastern Mediterranean depends heavily on the region’s stability. A key to peace and stability in the region is for good neighborly relations among NATO members and respect for the rule of law. Therefore, the U.S. has a stake in focusing on the problems that are detrimental to U.S. interests and to call out those who cause instability in the region. Turkey is the fundamental cause of instability in the eastern Mediterranean and broader region:

Turkey’s unilateral claims against sovereign Greek territory in the Aegean which are in violation of international law, and Turkey’s refusal to refer its unilateral claims to binding international arbitration.

Turkey’s aggression against Cyprus which includes its continuing illegal occupation of 37.3 percent of Cyprus.

Turkey’s numerous incursions into Cyprus’ Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), illegal drilling in Cyprus’ EEZ that were supported by Turkish warships and drones, and demonstrated “gunboat diplomacy.”

Turkey’s continuing violations of Greece’s territorial waters and airspace, numbering over 7,000 violations in 2020, which are in violation of international and U.S. law, including the Arms Export Control Act (AECA). There were 4,605 airspace and 3,215 maritime incidents.

Illegal immigration via Turkey that threatens Greece’s economic development and the peace and stability of Europe.

The Turkey-Libya Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on maritime borders, which

has been resoundingly dismissed by the international community as illegal.

Turkey’s open support for Hamas, and active role in terror financing.

Turkey’s exacerbation of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict by encouraging Azerbaijan’s aggression against Armenia, including transiting Syrian mercenaries with ties to jihadist groups to fight on behalf of Azerbaijan. The threat by Turkey of casus belli still stands, and Greece continues to register a considerable number of formal complaints over continued violations of the Greek airspace and territorial waters by Turkey. In fact, Greece’s Chief of the Hellenic National Defense General Staff, General Konstantinos Floros, called out Turkey’s provocative behavior, stating to an AHI audience on April 1, 2021, that Turkey threatens “Greece’s sovereign rights.” In addition, Ambassador Pyatt has called the maritime border MoU between Turkey and Libya MoU “unhelpful” and “escalatory” in nature in previous public statements. He also affirmed the internationally recognized legal concept that “inhabited islands as a matter of customary international law are entitled to the same treatment as continental territory.” These reoccurring acts by Turkey are egregious, must cease, and unnecessarily cost the Greek government millions of dollars a year deal with the provocative actions of a NATO member country.

Further, Turkey’s continuing occupation of Cyprus, its intransigence in solving the Cyprus problem, and its refusal to recognize the Republic of Cyprus (a prerequisite to Turkey’s E.U. accession process), which is a member of the European Union; are detrimental to U.S. interests and contributes to regional instability. To illustrate, Turkey insists on maintaining troop levels illegally on Cyprus, and President Erdogan’s promotion of a two-state solution for Cyprus and support for illegally re-opening the beach in Varosha inflame tensions and are in violation of international law and United Nations Resolutions.

In addition, Turkey’s actions regarding occupied Cyprus are deeply troubling. Turkey is transforming the former Lefkoniko Airport, located in occupied Cyprus, into a drone base, moving Bayraktar-TB2 drones onto the complex. From occupied Cyprus, these advanced drones are in range of Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East, posing a threat to regional security.

Secretary Antony Blinken, during a January 19, 2021 hearing in front of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, stated: “Turkey is an ally, that in many ways . . . is not acting as an ally should and this is a very, very significant challenge for us and we’re very clear-eyed about it.”

Turkey. Turkey continues to demonstrate it is not a true and dependable U.S. and NATO ally. The U.S. government, both executive and legislative branches, rightly sanctioned Turkey for its procurement of the Russian-made S-400 missile defense system under Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (CAATSA) in December 2020. Those penalties should be expanded. AHI calls for the continued inclusion of appropriations language that direct the suspension of delivery or transfer of F-35 aircraft to Turkey until reports detailing the impact of Turkey’s purchase of the S-400 missile system from Russia on U.S. weapon systems such as the F-35s are provided to Congress. Further, Turkey’s invasion of northeast Syria and attack upon U.S.-allied Kurds was not in the United States’ best interests and rightfully resulted in the passage by an overwhelming vote in the U.S. House of Protect Against Conflict by Turkey (PACT) Act to sanction Turkey for its actions. In addition, Turkey’s support for Hamas has been evident.

President Erdogan has hosted Hamas’ top leadership, including individuals designated as global terrorists. In doing so, Turkey is in contravention of the Arms Export Control Act, which requires that the United States cannot supply arms to nations that support international terrorism. Hamas’ recent attack against U.S. ally Israel only further highlights Turkey’s role as a malign regional influence.

We oppose any foreign aid for Turkey and any other assistance programs from the United State. This includes most favored nation trade benefits including textile quotas and the transfer of any nuclear related assistance which we oppose as not in the best interests of the U.S. AHI applauded the United States’ decision to terminate Turkey’s designation as a beneficiary developing country under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) program, which became effective May 17, 2019. AHI has long argued for this type of action by the U.S. government, especially in testimony presented to this House, until the following actions are taken: (1) the immediate withdrawal of all Turkish troops from Cyprus; (2) the prompt return to Turkey of the over 180,000 illegal Turkish settlers in Cyprus; (3) the Turkish government’s safeguarding the Ecumenical Patriarchate, its status, personnel and property, reopening the Halki Patriarchal School of Theology, returning church properties illegally seized, and the reversal of Hagia Sophia’s status, returning it to a UNESCO-designated museum; (4) the cessation of violations against Greece’s territorial integrity in the Aegean and of its airspace; (5) the cessation of illegal interference in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of the Republic of Cyprus; (6) Turkey must cease its support and promotion of a “two-state” solution regarding Cyprus, in violation of United Nations resolutions and the position of the U.S. government; (7) Turkey must cease its egregious violations of important United States laws, in particular the Arms Export Control Act & the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (CAATSA). Of course, Turkey’s ongoing human rights, freedom of speech, and religious freedom violations are problematic.

Cyprus. The illegal military occupation of the Republic of Cyprus by 40,000 Turkish troops continues. As long as the Republic of Cyprus remains under Turkish military occupation, a strong UN peacekeeping force must be maintained on the island. Congress can assist the Republic of Cyprus by reaffirming the United States’ position that assistance appropriated for Cyprus should support measures aimed at solidifying the reunification of Cyprus and the unified government in Cyprus. It would provide a settlement, should it be achieved, with a chance to succeed. Therefore, AHI recommends the following language from Title III of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2012 be included in the FY2022 State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations bill:

Assistance provided to Cyprus under this Act should foremost ensure that the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) can fully implement its mandate, while remaining available to also contribute to the creation of a conducive environment for the settlement talks under the auspices of the UN Secretary General’s Good Offices. Furthermore, in the event of reunification, further assistance should be used to contribute towards the cost of reunification, including towards monitoring provisions, facilitation for settlement of the property issue, supporting and underpinning the new federal structures of a reunified island and assisting with the construction of a strong unified Cypriot economy able to cope with

the new challenges, and strengthening the contacts between the two communities as conducive to reunification, in a way agreed to between the United States and Cyprus.

The last UN-led attempt, which took place in Crans-Montana in 2017, aimed to achieve a just and viable solution to the near 47-year division of the Republic of Cyprus, ended without reaching an agreement because of Turkish intransigence. Instead of helping to provide stability by promoting a just settlement supported by both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities, Turkey continued to insist on antiquated and obstructive stances, such as its insistence to maintain the Treaty of Guarantee with a right of future unilateral Turkish military intervention.

More recently, during the latest 5+1 informal meeting in Geneva at the end of April 2021, aiming to assess whether there was sufficient common ground for the resumption of the negotiations, Turkey fundamentally changed its official position on the form of settlement of the Cyprus problem, insisting on a "two-state-solution" to solidify its occupation of the island, contrary to UN Security Council resolutions and the stated position of the United States government.

Furthermore, Turkey hinders the humanitarian work of the Committee on Missing Persons (a previous recipient of USAID support) by denying access to areas under its occupation, including Turkish military zones, in order to excavate for the remains of 996 Cypriots still missing (including four U.S. citizens) following the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974.

Congress should call on Ankara to constructively support the reunification efforts, in accordance with the UN Security Council Resolutions calling for a bizonal, bicomunal federation, as well as for a solution that embodies the full respect of the principles and laws of the European Union, of which Cyprus is a member state. The new state of affairs ought to safeguard that a reunified Cyprus would have a single international legal personality, a single sovereignty and a single citizenship. Finally, AHI welcomed Secretary of State Antony Blinken's testimony to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 10, 2021, where he stated "American diplomacy will be fully engaged" on the issue of a Cyprus settlement.

AHI is also concerned with energy security. AHI contends the U.S. must continue to support the sovereign rights of the Republic of Cyprus to explore and develop the resources within its EEZ free of any third-party interference and to underscore the importance of avoiding any actions that escalate tension. As mentioned, Turkey's threats in Cyprus' EEZ endanger U.S. companies. In addition, Turkey's illegal actions in Cyprus' EEZ raise tensions and security concerns, hindering any real chance for the resumption of settlement talks.

International Military Education & Training (IMET)—Greece and Cyprus. AHI recommends FY2022 funding for Greece's IMET program at \$1.5 million and the Republic of Cyprus's IMET program at \$500,000. The recommended funding levels are in line with the authorization of appropriations passed in The Eastern Mediterranean Security and Energy Partnership Act. For Greece, the country experienced 11 fiscal years (FY2006–FY2017) of a steady decline of its IMET funding levels. It resulted in the drastic decrease in the number of Greek military students participating in the program. An investment of \$1.5 million in FY22 will help address that 11-year decline in funding, but more investment is needed to make up for "lost time." For the Republic of Cyprus, which received its first IMET program funding in FY21, it is

critical to continue this investment in FY22. It will be the next step in a series of positive developments since the Statement of Intent that the U.S. and Republic of Cyprus signed in November 2018. Since then, Cyprus has assigned a defense attaché to the Embassy in Washington, the Cyprus Center for Land, Open-Seas, and Port Security (CYCLOPS), an innovative security site that has been partially funded by the U.S., is scheduled to begin operations in January 2022; and the U.S. implemented a partial lifting of an arms prohibition on Cyprus. The U.S. must fully and permanently lift its arms prohibition on Cyprus and remove Cyprus from the list of countries to which arms sales are prohibited under International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) and calls for appropriations language to direct this of the U.S. Department of State.

The IMET program advances the professional military education of the Greek and Cypriot Armed Forces. It enhances interoperability with U.S. forces, and in Greece's case, NATO forces. Through the training of Greek and Cypriot military and noncommissioned officers in a multitude of professional military education and technical courses in the U.S., IMET offers strong U.S.-Greece and U.S.-Republic of Cyprus mil-to-mil relations. It is an effective and wise investment toward a key component of U.S. security assistance. It also helps the U.S. because it contributes toward the strengthening of U.S. security interests in an important part of the world by training and promoting the professionalization of the Greek and Cypriot Armed Forces.

Thank you for the opportunity to present them in our written testimony to the House.

IN HONOR OF COLONEL RALPH
PUCKETT, JR., USA (RET.)

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to extend my personal congratulations to an extraordinary man, leader, soldier, veteran, and true national treasure, Colonel Ralph Puckett, Jr. USA (ret.). On Friday, May 21, 2021, Colonel Puckett was awarded the Medal of Honor, our Nation's most prestigious military award, by President Joseph R. Biden for his valiant and commendable service to his nation. A dinner congratulating him on this momentous achievement will be held at The National Infantry Museum in Columbus, Georgia on Friday, June 18, 2021 at 6pm.

Before receiving this momentous honor, the Tifton, Georgia native had already established an impressive career in the U.S. military. Colonel Ralph Puckett, Jr. graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1949. Assigned as an Infantry Lieutenant to occupation duty in Japan, he volunteered for the Eighth U.S. Army Ranger Company when the Korean War began. On November 25, 1950, the then-First Lieutenant began a multiday operation with the Eighth Army Ranger Company, a company of 51 U.S. and nine South Korean soldiers, against a plethora of Chinese troops on Hill 205. During the initial daylight assault, Colonel Puckett exposed himself to enemy fire, rallying pinned down U.S. troops to advance and take the hill from its defenders. In the following hours, temperatures dropped, and the Chinese attempted to retake the hill

and Col. Puckett radioed in an artillery strike to stop the enemy's advance. Over the course of six brutal enemy attacks, Colonel Puckett incurred severe wounds on his left shoulder, feet, thighs, and buttocks. Although severely injured, he was still able to command his company and call on artillery to avert enemy attacks, before being carried to safety by two of his troops.

Colonel Puckett was originally awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for his actions at Hill 205, but John Lock, a retired U.S. Army officer, and assistant professor at the U.S. Military Academy, discovered Colonel Puckett's story and believed it met the criteria to be awarded our nation's most prestigious military award, the Medal of Honor. In 2003, Mr. Lock began the strenuous process to have Colonel Puckett's initial award upgraded to the Medal of Honor. After being met with unforeseen opposition, Lock submitted a petition for an upgrade to the Army Award Corrections Board. In 2020, the petition for Colonel Puckett was approved, and on Friday, May 21, 2021, Colonel Puckett was awarded the Medal of Honor by President Joseph R. Biden for his valiant and commendable service to his Nation.

During his 22-year career, Colonel Puckett received several illustrious awards and commendations for his outstanding leadership and heroic actions in the line of duty and on behalf of his fellow servicemen. To date, he has received the Distinguished Service Cross twice, along with two Silver Stars for valor, two Bronze Star Medals, and five Purple Hearts. Similarly, in 1992, he became one of the first people to be inducted into the U.S. Army Ranger Hall of Fame.

Former Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm once said that "Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth." As one of our nation's most decorated military heroes, Colonel Puckett has paid his rent many times over and continued to give a prodigious amount of love and service back to his community following his military service. As a retiree, Colonel Puckett has remained actively involved with military affairs, including as a volunteer with the Ranger Brigade as well as serving as an executive with Outward Bound, a nonprofit educational organization that exposes students, especially those from cities, to wilderness settings.

Colonel Puckett has accomplished many things in his life, but none of these would have been possible without the grace of God, and the enduring love and support of his wife, Jean; and their children, Martha and Thomas.

Madam Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join my wife, Vivian, and me, along with the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District, in recognizing and commending Colonel Ralph Puckett, Jr. USA (ret.) on receiving the prestigious Medal of Honor and his lifetime of service to his community and his nation.

REMEMBERING REVEREND
DOCTOR MARCUS GARVEY WOOD

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. MFUME. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to commemorate the life of a gentle

Reverend Wood, who I knew as “my mother’s favorite cousin,” was one of seven children born to Frank Wood, a hardworking carpenter born into slavery, and Julia Wood, a dedicated and giving homemaker. They lived modestly on a family farm in Gloucester, Virginia. With nothing more than 25 cents and a commitment to serve, Reverend Wood entered adulthood at the age of 17. It did not take him long to begin his spiritual journey. He preached his first sermon as a senior in high school and shortly thereafter, became licensed by the church to preach in 1937. By the Grace of God, Dr. Wood was ordained as a Baptist minister only 3 years later.

Reverend Wood devoted most of his life to serving the community around him. An inspiring leader, he was pivotal in community service and played a key role in the 1960’s Civil Rights Movement in Baltimore, marching alongside his noteworthy former classmate and lifelong friend, Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King Jr.

Reverend Wood and I share the same undergraduate alma mater, Morgan State University. By the end of his academic journey, Reverend Wood had obtained two bachelor’s degrees, a master’s degree in divinity, and was bestowed the high honor of receiving a “Distinguished Alumni Award” from Crozer Theological Seminary. He was the last surviving member of his class at Crozer Theological Seminary—where he met Dr. King—to begin what was to be a personal connection to both Dr. King and his legacy.

Reverend Wood carried what he learned from his academic pursuits and his peers into a career of visionary leadership and public service. From launching innovative techniques like opening solar-heated and ADA accessible church facilities, to developing the Providence Adult Day Care Center, no stone could be left unturned. He spread his love around the world and traveled to countries like England, Scotland, Russia, and Ireland to attend religious conferences. He made room to dedicate time to developing food programs, an AIDS ministry, prison outreach, and a committee for the homeless. He maintained memberships to different organizations, boards, and agencies such as the Baltimore Urban League, the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance, the NAACP, and many more.

Reverend Wood’s wife of 69 years, the former Bessie Pendleton, died in 2017. He leaves to mourn his passing a brother, Dr. Garnett Wood; daughter, Jeanetta James; son, Marcus G. Wood; and grandchildren Kevin Brown, Darrell Brown-Bey, Monica G. Wood and Melissa G. Wood Bartholomew; as well as two great grandchildren and a number of nieces, nephews and cousins.

Madam Speaker, in closing, Reverend Wood disavowed any trappings or pretensions and lived his faith in God. He did not suffer fools lightly and was one of a kind. He was, as they say, “the Real McCoy.” Reverend Doctor Marcus Garvey Wood left a memory with every person he interacted with, including myself. May his soul forever rest in peace.

MRS. JOSEFA FLORES 14-YEARS OF SERVICE RECOGNITION

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Josefa “Josie” Flores who is celebrating 14 years of service to the people of Texas Congressional District 12 on June 22, 2021.

Josie was born a first generation American in Grand Prairie, Texas. She has a servant’s heart and a strong commitment to her faith and family. She is never flustered and has been a beacon of hope in my office and my district for the last 14 years.

At 17, Josie joined the United States Army. Her 11 years of military service included a tour of duty in Bosnia, which she describes as one of her fondest memories. Upon returning to her husband, Jose, and firstborn son, Dee, Josie continued serving members of the armed forces in the fleet and family support center. Shortly after her second son, Leo, was born, Josie came to my office as a bilingual caseworker where she has been assisting constituents ever since.

Josie is not just good at her job; she is the best at her job. People from all over the world contact my office in hopes of having Josie pick up their case because they know that if there is a way to do it, Josie will get the job done. Josie often says her job is to help people and helping people is what she loves to do. No matter the stresses involved, she does all in her power to help every individual or family that reaches out. Her passion for others has carried her on to be a successful caseworker with a wealth of knowledge that few, if any, can match. In addition to helping constituents, Josie is a resource for others in the congressional casework community. She mentors’ caseworkers from all over the nation, sharing her experience and passion. The respect she has earned is a direct reflection of the work and dedication she has demonstrated to my office for the last 14 years, and during her entire 25 years of public service.

Josie will always provide an ear to listen or a shoulder to lean on. She is a sounding board for my staff and a lighthouse for my constituents. I have been beyond blessed to work with this incredible woman during my time in Congress, and I am forever grateful for her service to our nation. May her light never extinguish.

On behalf of Texas’ 12th Congressional District, I offer my congratulations and best wishes on this special occasion.

JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ALMA S. ADAMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 2021

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, as one of the original sponsors of Juneteenth legislation in the House, I am proud to stand with my colleagues in voting to make Juneteenth a national holiday.

Juneteenth is a celebration of freedom, of our right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Of emancipation instead of dehumanization. Of a message that made its way from Washington to Texas, freeing women and men upon its sight.

It is our history, a reminder of deeds darker than death or night, and a debt unpaid that must still be made right.

On this Juneteenth, I encourage all Americans to reflect on the long walk to freedom, that took Union soldiers from sea to shining sea. Though we’ve travelled a long way, that walk continues today.

And while I am overjoyed to send this legislation to the President’s desk and make it the law of the land, the work continues.

When Congress made MLK Day a federal holiday in the 1980s, it didn’t end the economic injustice that the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. fought against his entire life.

In fact, the gap between rich and poor has only widened since then.

So as we celebrate this victory for our history, we must remember that while Juneteenth marked a victory over slavery, it was only the start of our fight for voting rights and equal justice under the law.

That fight, that long march to justice and equality and equity will not be over until we have fully protected the right to vote for all Americans, guaranteed equal justice under law, and achieved equitable treatment that repays the debts of past wrongs.

Madam Speaker, thank you for joining me in celebrating Juneteenth, thanks to everyone who worked so hard to make it a federal holiday . . . and never giving up the faith.

God bless.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CAREER OF JEFF VANDELEEST

HON. MIKE GALLAGHER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the career of retiring President and CEO of Family Services of Northeast Wisconsin, Jeff VandeLeest.

During his 25 years at Family Services of Northeast Wisconsin, Jeff VandeLeest served as Executive Vice President, Senior Vice President, and finally President and CEO of the organization. Mr. VandeLeest’s dedication and commitment to Family Services of Northeast Wisconsin and the people it serves is truly remarkable.

Throughout his tenure, Mr. VandeLeest’s leadership and knowledge lead to the expansion and long-term success of the organization. Family Services of Northeast Wisconsin is a non-profit, human services agency that offers more than 35 programs to people within Northeast Wisconsin during challenging periods in their lives. In 2019 alone, under the leadership of Mr. VandeLeest, Family Services was able to assist over 18,000 children, families, and individuals through some of life’s most challenging transitions.

For 25 years, Mr. VandeLeest has upheld the mission of Family Services; to protect, heal, and care. Throughout his 25 years with Family Services, the organization has grown exponentially. Mr. VandeLeest has been an

advocate for a wide range of services, from training individuals to handle the most traumatic of cases, to educating communities about prevention. Mr. VandeLeest's expertise and knowledge in the services provided by Family Services will surely be missed by his peers and the entire Green Bay community.

Prior to Jeff's career at Family Services of Northeast Wisconsin he spent nearly 20 years delivering and managing juvenile justice services. Jeff has dedicated his entire career to giving back to those in our community who are most in need.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing Mr. Jeff VandeLeest's 25-year career with Family Services of Northeast Wisconsin and wish him and his wife, Mary, all the best in retirement. His service and commitment to Northeast Wisconsin is deserving of the highest degree of recognition.

CONGRATULATING THE BARBERS HILL HIGH SCHOOL EAGLES ON THEIR FIRST BASEBALL STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Barbers Hill High School Eagles Baseball team for winning the 2021 Texas University Interscholastic League (UIL) 5A High School Baseball State Championship. The Eagles Baseball team joins the Lady Eagles Softball team in clinching their first State Championship in school history. Barbers Hill is the first 5A High School, and only the seventh overall, in Texas history to win both State titles in the same season.

The Eagles finished the 2020–2021 season, with a record of 35 wins and eight losses. In the playoffs, Barbers Hill faced Manvel, Foster, Santa Fe, Lake Creek, Friendswood, and Amarillo before facing Hallsville for the State Championship. On June 12, 2021, the Eagles beat the Hallsville Bobcats by a score of two to one winning their first state title.

Raithen Malone, a senior pitcher, was named the State Tournament Most Valuable Player. Six Eagles were selected by the Texas High School Baseball Coaches Association to play on the Conference 5A All-Tournament Team: Raithen Malone, Brodey Williams, Simon Larranaga, Braden Jacobs, Jace Martinez, and Carson Garrett.

I would like to personally recognize each individual that contributed to this team's winning season. Players: Luke Sims, Carson Garrett, Trevor Bates, Cameron Cauley, Jace Martinez, Raithen Malone, Braden Jacobs, Will Buntin, Brent Holdren, Colin Schmadl, McKade Massengale, Kyle Isaacks, Kasyn Franco, Ernest Sanders, Josh Campbell, Brodey Williams, Logan Knichel, Hunter Mercer, Blaine Huntley, Colt Erickson, Alden Brookshire, Maddox Malone, Carson Dunham, Simon Larranaga, and Kaden Garcia. Head Coach: David Denny. Assistant Coaches: Darren Seymour, Chris Cauley, Josh Presnall, and Noel Garcia. Athletic Trainers: Gina Pace, Adam Carroll, and Ha Nguyen. Manager: Brennan McDonald. Statistician: Maddi Clary. Superintendent: Dr. Greg Poole. Athletic Director: Tom Westerberg. Principal: Rick Kana.

I wish each of these young men continued success in the classroom and athletics. Go Eagles.

HONORING CATHY LEWIS FOR HER CONTRIBUTIONS ON HEARSAY

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Cathy Lewis upon the culmination of her time as host of WHRO's HearSay.

Twenty-five years ago, Cathy became the founding host of HearSay, WRHO's flagship public affairs program. During her time with HearSay, Cathy has connected listeners with a variety of guests, from political candidates, to business owners, and civics leaders, including President Barack Obama. Cathy has used her exceptional ability to lead civil discussion to educate audiences about governance and inform them about important issues in their communities. Her work has made Cathy a prominent voice in Coastal Virginia, and she has routinely made lists of the most influential individuals in the region.

I am grateful for Cathy's service and for the outstanding contributions that she has made to our community and beyond. Again, it is an honor to congratulate Cathy for her 25 years with HearSay, and I wish her the best as she moves on to the next chapter of her career.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. DeFAZIO. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, June 15, 2021, I was unable to vote due to a medical procedure. Had I been present, I would have voted: Yea on Roll Call Vote 159, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass Certain Bills; Yea on Roll Call Vote 160, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act; Yea on Roll Call Vote 161, On the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 3325, To award four congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021; and Yea on Roll Call Vote 162, On the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, The LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act.

IN HONOR OF ANNA THOMAS

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Anna Thomas as the Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year. Anna has worked in the Manchester Health Department since 1994 and currently serves as its Director.

During her time at the Health Department, Anna has been a model public servant working on behalf of the residents of New Hampshire's largest city. Public health knows no boundaries, and Anna has worked hard to build partnerships with a diverse group of stakeholders to address the needs of her city. Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic last year, Anna has served her community as the co-leader of the Manchester Emergency Operations Center, which coordinates municipal first responder agencies and resources. Equipped with a background in emergency response and health promotion, Anna took swift action when the COVID-19 pandemic threatened the health and well-being of Manchester and its surrounding communities. Alongside the dedicated public servants at the Manchester Health Department, which is only one of two standalone health departments in our state, Anna and her many partners have done a remarkable job managing the most severe public health crisis of our time. Now, as the Granite State continues its crucial vaccination effort, Anna has been an outspoken advocate for equity and expanding access to reach our most vulnerable residents.

In addition to aiding public health efforts, Anna is also a proud veteran and active community member involved in a host of local organizations, including Veterans Count, Granite United Way, Mary Gale Foundation, and Bean Foundation. Anna works tirelessly to realize a brighter, healthier future for the greater Manchester area.

During an unprecedented year of loss, Anna has embodied smart, compassionate leadership benefitting our entire community. On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I congratulate Anna Thomas for being named Citizen of the Year by the Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce and thank her again for her lifetime of public service.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT CLASS OF 2021 GRADUATES FROM MICHIGAN

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to recognize the Class of 2021 graduates from the United States Military Academy at West Point and twenty-seven exemplary graduates from the state of Michigan.

From Plebes to Firsties, and now Second Lieutenants in the United States Army, the Class of 2021 has come through one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives to join "The Long Gray Line." I commend the graduates for their dedication to support and defend the American Constitution and uphold the ethical standards of the United States Army and United States of America. While their career of professional excellence and service to our Nation has just begun, I am confident these new officers embody the values of "Duty, Honor, Country" and will be steadfast leaders Until the Battle Is Won.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Olivia Bennett, Tully

Boylan, Zachary Calderone, Gurjiwan Chahal, Charles Debczak, Scott Donnellon, Luke Ensing, Ben Fernquist, Connor Fischer, Ananth Ghosh, Marta Grivins, Paul Harrington, Emma Lawson, Julien Levesque, Curtis Manore, Connor McQueen, AnnMarie Moolenaar, Dylan Moser, Shreyans Munot, Isabel Olds, Gavin Poulin, Joseph Price, Jessica Reimchen, Sarah Richardson, David Rose, Gerrit Rummel, and Nathan Schubring; the United States Military Academy at West Point Class of 2021 graduates from Michigan. I am positive the Class of 2021 will excel in their future endeavors, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes as they begin their service to our Nation.

RECOGNIZING FUNERAL DIRECTOR
AND EMBALMER RAUL
VILLEGAS, JR.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Funeral Director and Embalmer Raul Villegas, Jr. (May 15, 1962—January 20, 2021). Mr. Villegas demonstrated never-ending patience and compassion to the families in his community during his life.

Mr. Villegas was born in Laredo, TX and attended J.W. Nixon High School. He then attended the Commonwealth Institute of Funeral Service and graduated in 1986. After that, he served his 35-year career as a Texas Licensed Funeral Director and Embalmer dedicated to the families of Laredo and Webb County, Texas. During this time, he was a great team leader and community member. As a funeral service professional, he met and exceeded expectations by having ceaseless patience and sympathy. Mr. Villegas had the right words for every situation and was reliable and strong even when those around him were undergoing difficult times.

Mr. Villegas will have an enduring impact on his family, team members, and all of the families in the community he served. He lived and worked his entire life by the principles of endless patience and kindness. I want to commemorate the life of Raul Villegas, Jr. and his numerous contributions to his community. As we move forward, let us take the time to appreciate Mr. Villegas and his notable life and career. However, in the words of President John F. Kennedy, "As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words, but to live by them."

Mr. Villegas is survived by his beloved wife Maricela G. Villegas; children, Raul Villegas III (Melissa Guerrero), Marlene (Fernando Garza, Jr.) Villegas, David (Anabel) Villegas, Danny (Michelle) Villegas, Ricardo (Jessica) Ramirez, Jr., Melissa (Salvador) Silva, Roberto C. Ramirez (Vivian); parents, Raul and Hortencia Villegas; siblings, Irma (Wayo) Butron, Jerry (Lily) Villegas, Eddie (Juanita) Villegas, Javier Villegas, and Sammy (Anna) Villegas; 20 grandchildren; as well as other family and friends.

Madam Speaker, again I rise to recognize the life and career of Raul Villegas, Jr.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GEORGETOWN WATERFRONT ENSLAVED VOYAGES MEMORIAL ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce the Georgetown Waterfront Enslaved Voyages Memorial Act. This bill would authorize the establishment of a memorial on federal land in the District of Columbia commemorating the enslaved individuals who disembarked at the Georgetown waterfront after forced migration to the United States by way of the Transatlantic Slave Trade. The commemorative work, to be established by the Georgetown African American Historic Landmark Project and Tour, would honor the enslaved individuals' presence, celebrate their contributions to history, recognize their resilience and fortitude and acknowledge their deeds and feats.

This week, we recognize Juneteenth (June 19), which marks the arrival of the news of emancipation to enslaved African Americans in Confederate-controlled Texas—two years after the Emancipation Proclamation was issued—the final end of slavery in the United States. Juneteenth celebrates the culmination of the long struggle for freedom from bondage in the United States. This monumental event prompts us to reflect on the past and look to the future.

For four centuries, enslavers packed 12.5 million captive Africans into their ships to sell as chattel in the Americas. The vestiges of this history are everywhere yet scarcely marked, including here in the District. The Georgetown waterfront had an extensive and long-neglected history of involvement in the slave trade. Due to its location at the northernmost navigable point on the Potomac River, North Potomac, as it was then known, the Georgetown waterfront was a busy commercial port that operated as a mid-Atlantic trading center of enslaved people.

The first Africans were brought as slaves through the Georgetown port in 1732. Though records are incomplete, scholars have determined that between that year and 1761, seven ships carrying an estimated 1,475 enslaved people arrived there. Those who survived the traumatic "Middle Passage" voyage were marched through tunnels that led from the C&O Canal, through the sewage system, to a slave auction block on M Street, now Georgetown's main commercial thoroughfare.

Commodities to be sold for profit, these people were assigned no more value in America than that paid for them by enslavers. Slavery and the slave trade remained for generations an integral part of the United States. While the entire contribution of enslaved African Americans in the District and region cannot be determined, we know with certainty that white citizens and the federal government both relied heavily on enslaved labor to build the Nation's capital.

We must not hide from this history. The enslaved individuals, known and unknown, who disembarked at the Georgetown waterfront after forced migration, rest at the core of our Nation's shared history. The atrocities of the system of chattel slavery shed light on our Nation's central struggle between slavery and

freedom—a freedom under which some could be owned, beaten, separated from their families, and denied any rights. This bill provides for the creation of a powerful marker of truth-telling and remembrance. Let us honor the personhood of these individuals, who were repeatedly assumed to have none, so that they will never be forgotten.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON ESTES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 167 on Agreeing to the Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, on June 16, 2021, I missed Roll Call vote 163. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on H. Res. 479.

CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF THE
ANN ARBOR PEACE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2021

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the anniversary of the Peace Neighborhood Center in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Their 50 years of service to our community and its families is worthy of commendation.

In Ann Arbor, the Peace Neighborhood Center has served children, families, and individuals affected by social and economic challenges since 1971. The center seeks to foster a community of personal growth and opportunity to break the cycle of poverty and social inequality.

In the past 50 years, more than 16,000 members of the Ann Arbor community have participated in programs that enhance skills, promote education, and teach fiscal independence. Starting off as a place for community members to meet and discuss their concerns, the work of the Peace Neighborhood Center has expanded to after-school programs, jobs programs, substance abuse prevention programs, and so much more.

A half-century after its founding, the Peace Neighborhood Center is a pillar of the Ann Arbor community. At the onset of the Corona virus pandemic, the organization shifted gears by expanding their food distribution program and later spearheaded the effort to vaccinate community members by setting up a vaccine clinic. With the help of their dedicated leadership and their many enthusiastic volunteers,

the Peace Neighborhood Center has lent its unwavering support to those in need, supporting and uplifting all members of our community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Peace Neighborhood Center. We are grateful for the center's half-century of

impactful work and wish Peace Neighborhood Center continued success in service in the years ahead.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4599–S4635

Measures Introduced: Forty-five bills and eight resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2094–2138, S.J. Res. 21, and S. Res. 274–280.

Pages S4622–24

Measures Passed:

North Carolina Judicial Districts: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. 1340, to amend title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina, and the bill was then passed.

Page S4618

Congratulating the University of Florida Gators: Senate agreed to S. Res. 276, congratulating the University of Florida Gators for winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Tennis Championship.

Page S4618

Congratulating the University of Mississippi Rebels: Senate agreed to S. Res. 277, congratulating the University of Mississippi Rebels women's golf team on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's golf championship.

Page S4617

United Spinal Association 75th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 278, recognizing the 75th anniversary of United Spinal Association, a leading national advocacy organization that is dedicated to promoting the independence and enhancing the quality of life of all people living with spinal cord injuries and neurological disorders, including veterans, and providing support and information to their loved ones, care providers, and personal support networks.

Page S4617

Measures Considered:

For the People Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2093, to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy.

Page S4617

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Kiran Arjandas Ahuja, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

Page S4617

Prior to the consideration of this measure, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Page S4617

Fonzone Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Page S4616

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, June 17, 2021, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, June 21, 2021.

Page S4616

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Page S4616

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the nomination at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, June 21, 2021; and that the motions to invoke cloture filed during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 17, 2021, ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, June 21, 2021.

Page S4634

Ahuja Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Kiran Arjandas Ahuja, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

Page S4617

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Christopher Charles Fonzone, of

Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. **Page S4617**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S4617**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S4617**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 88 yeas to 9 nays (Vote No. EX. 239), Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior. **Pages S4602–07**

By 60 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. EX. 241), John K. Tien, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security. **Pages S4608–10**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 63 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. EX. 240), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S4607–08**

Tanya Marie Trujillo, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Matthew T. Quinn, of Montana, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Memorial Affairs.

Pamela A. Melroy, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Richard W. Spinrad, of Oregon, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

Chris Inglis, of Maryland, to be National Cyber Director.

3 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Coast Guard. **Page S4617**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Carlos Del Toro, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Navy.

Damon Y. Smith, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Michael D. Smith, of Virginia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

Sandra D. Bruce, of Delaware, to be Inspector General, Department of Education.

Margaret A. Burnham, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Review Board.

Clayborne Carson, of California, to be a Member of the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Review Board.

Gabrielle M. Dudley, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Review Board.

Henry Klibanoff, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Review Board. 1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

Page S4635

Messages from the House: **Page S4621**

Measures Referred: **Page S4621**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S4621**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S4621**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S4621**

Executive Communications: **Page S4621**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S4621–22**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S4622**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4624–25**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4625–34**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4620–21**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4634**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4634**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—241) **Pages S4607–08, S4610**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:48 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 21, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4634.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 for the Department of Defense, after receiving testimony from Lloyd J. Austin III, Secretary, and General Mark A. Milley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, both of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the posture of the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2022 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from John P. Roth, Acting Secretary of the Air Force,

General Charles Q. Brown, USAF, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and General John W. Raymond, USSF, Chief of Space Operations, all of the Department of Defense.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program, after receiving testimony from David Maurstad, Deputy Associate Administrator for Insurance and Mitigation, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

NCAA STUDENT ATHLETES AND NIL RIGHTS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine National Collegiate Athletic Association student athletes and name, image, and likeness rights, after receiving testimony from Christina Chenault, University of California, Los Angeles; Kaira Brown, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee; Martin McNair, The Jordan McNair Foundation, Baltimore, Maryland; and Sari Cureton, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

USFS BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2022 for the U.S. Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Victoria Christiansen, Chief, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

U.S.-TAIWAN RELATIONSHIP

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy concluded a hearing to examine building the U.S.-Taiwan relationship, focusing on strength through partnership, after receiving testimony from Erica J. Barks-Ruggles, Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, and Jonathan Fritz, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, both of the Department of State.

CYBERSECURITY THREATS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and

Spending Oversight concluded a hearing to examine addressing emerging cybersecurity threats to state and local government, after receiving testimony from Karen Huey, Ohio Department of Public Safety Assistant Director, Columbus; B. Glen Whitley, Tarrant County Judge, Fort Worth, Texas, on behalf of the National Association of Counties; Mayor Stephen Schewel, Durham, North Carolina, on behalf of the National League of Cities; Russell E. Holden, Sunapee School District, Sunapee, New Hampshire; and Dan Lips, Lincoln Network, Washington, D.C.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND COVID-19 RECOVERY

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine COVID-19 response and recovery, focusing on supporting the needs of students in higher education and lessons on safely returning to campus, after receiving testimony from Youlonda Copeland-Morgan, University of California, Los Angeles; Reynold Verret, Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans; Anthony Harris, Baldwin Wallace University, Berea, Ohio; and Madeline Pumariega, Miami Dade College, Miami, Florida.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Tiffany P. Cunningham, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, and Anne Milgram, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement, and Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General, both of the Department of Justice.

21ST CENTURY CAREGIVING

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine 21st century caregiving, focusing on supporting workers, family caregivers, seniors, and people with disabilities, after receiving testimony from Ai-jen Poo, National Domestic Workers Alliance, Chicago, Illinois; Stephanie Blunt, Trident Area Agency on Aging, North Charleston, South Carolina; Brittany Williams, SEIU Local 775, Burien, Washington; and Theo Braddy, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 62 public bills, H.R. 3960–4021; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 53; and H. Res. 483–484 were introduced.

Pages H2925–28

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H2930–31

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2062, to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–63);

H.J. Res. 34, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review” (H. Rept. 117–64);

H.R. 1443, to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–65); and

H.R. 2662, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–66, Part 1).

Page H2925

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative DeGette to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H2897

Repealing the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002: The House passed H.R. 256, to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 268 yeas to 161 nays, Roll No. 172.

Pages H2899–H2910

Rejected the McCaul motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs by a yeas-and-nays vote of 204 yeas to 219 nays, Roll No. 171.

Page H2909

H. Res. 473, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 256) and (H.R. 1187) was agreed to Monday, June 14th.

Select Committee on Economic Disparity and Fairness in Growth—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members to the Select Committee on Economic Disparity and Fairness in Growth: Representative Himes, Chair; Representatives Kaptur, Moore (WI), Vicente Gonzalez (TX), Jayapal, Craig, Ocasio-Cortez, and Jacobs (CA).

Page H2910

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yeas-and-nays votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2909 and H2910.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

Committee Meetings

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY FISCAL YEAR 2022 BUDGET REQUEST FOR SEAPOWERS AND PROJECTION FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing entitled “Department of the Navy Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces”. Testimony was heard from Jay Stefany, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research, Development and Acquisition, Department of the Navy; Vice Admiral James Kilby, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Warfighting Requirements and Capabilities, Department of the Navy; and Lieutenant General Eric M. Smith, Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps.

A REVIEW OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2022 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “A Review of the Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Request for the Department of Homeland Security”. Testimony was heard from Admiral Karl L. Schultz, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard.

UNDOING THE DAMAGE OF THE WAR ON DRUGS: A RENEWED CALL FOR SENTENCING REFORM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism held a hearing entitled “Undoing the Damage of the War on Drugs: A Renewed Call for Sentencing Reform”. Testimony was heard from Kyana Givens, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Office of the Federal Public Defender, Eastern District, North Carolina; and public witnesses.

EXAMINING FEDERAL FACILITIES IN INDIAN COUNTRY

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States held a hearing entitled “Examining Federal Facilities in Indian Country”. Testimony was heard from Randy Grinnell, Deputy Director for Management Operations, Indian Health Service, Department of Health

and Human Services; and Jason Freihage, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2022 BUDGET

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "President's Proposed Fiscal Year 2022 Budget". Testimony was heard from Janet Yellen, Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

BUILDING A MORE CIVIL AND COLLABORATIVE CULTURE IN CONGRESS

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Building a More

Civil and Collaborative Culture in Congress". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 21, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, June 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Monday, June 21

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 9 a.m.

Extension of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adams, Alma S., N.C., E665
 Babin, Brian, Tex., E666
 Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E664
 Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E667
 Davids, Sharice, Kans., E661
 DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E666

Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E667
 Estes, Ron, Kans., E667
 Gallagher, Mike, Wisc., E665
 Granger, Kay, Tex., E665
 Luria, Elaine G., Va., E666
 Mallioakis, Nicole, N.Y., E662
 Mfume, Kweisi, Md., E664
 Moolenaar, John R., Mich., E666

Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E667
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E667
 Pappas, Chris, N.H., E666
 Soto, Darren, Fla., E661
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E661
 Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E661



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.