United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 2021 No. 108

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 22, 2021.

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

NANCY PELOSI.
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

HOLDING CHINA ACCOUNTABLE

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, more than a year into the COVID–19 pandemic, I rise once again to bring attention to the Chinese Communist Party's role in this public health and economic crisis and to call for a full congressional investigation into the origin of the virus.

Day after day, we learn more facts and evidence that confirm what we have expected from the beginning: The Chinese Communist Party intentionally covered up the COVID–19 outbreak, squandering valuable time, creating dangerous misinformation, and, ultimately, costing lives.

Over a year ago, the China Task Force began raising real questions about the origin of the virus. At that time, the mainstream media and others dismissed our concerns. Despite their objections, we continued in our efforts to expose this coverup.

Now, after lives and livelihoods have been destroyed, President Biden and the Democrats finally are asking questions about this virus. They finally are waking up to reality.

Not only did this pandemic start in China, but the World Health Organization acted as a willing pawn of the Chinese Government to cover up this virus and hide it from the world.

After taking office, one of President Biden's first actions was rejoining the World Health Organization at taxpayer expense, without requiring a single reform to its corrupt culture.

Time and time again, President Biden has failed to hold the Chinese Communist Party accountable. Now, this Congress must act.

Last year, the China Task Force developed more than 400 commonsense solutions to counter the Chinese Communist Party's threat to our health, our economy, and our way of life. We could start by implementing these legislative solutions and restoring America's leadership in 21st century innovation.

As a Congress, we also should build upon the China Task Force's investigation into the COVID–19 pandemic origin, including whether the virus was engineered at the Wuhan lab.

Why delay? How many more Americans will need to be infected before we say ''enough''?

As my friend, Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY has outlined, we need to demand transparency, and we must seek justice. We need to get to the bottom of this question and allow the truth to come to light.

Thanks to American ingenuity, resilience, and perseverance, our Nation has embarked on the long path to recovery. However, while new virus cases are on the decline, the pandemic isn't over.

For the families of more than 600,000 Americans who have died from COVID–19, grief still lingers.

For the thousands of Americans struggling with post-COVID syndrome, the virus remains a central part of their lives each and every day.

For small business leaders struggling to keep their doors open amid the current workforce shortage, there is still a crisis.

Holding China accountable for the pandemic is still very relevant. We cannot drag our feet. We cannot just move on.

This is the time for Congress to get serious about our oversight responsibilities and fully investigate the origin of the COVID–19 pandemic.

Today, I urge Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats to join with Republicans in exposing this regime's blame in the pandemic and demanding answers from the Chinese Communist Party.

We must ensure that this hostile regime never again is allowed to unleash a virus onto our shores. As we have seen, lives and livelihoods are on the line.

SCIENCE IS NOT A PARTISAN ISSUE

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

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, more than 600,000 Americans have reportedly died from COVID–19; grandfathers, grandmothers, fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters. The true

Printed on recycled paper.

toll of this disease will never be fully understood; not only the loss of life, but the loss of the means to provide for one's family for those who survived, the mental anguish over the loss of a loved one, and the fear and uncertainty of the future.

It is unfortunate that, despite all this suffering, COVID–19 has devolved into a partisan issue, each side bickering as to who is to blame. Despite that, science is not a partisan issue. The facts are this disease killed hundreds of thousands of Americans. It is one of the deadliest diseases to ever hit America. And, for good reason, many Americans want to know how it happened to ensure it never happens again.

That should be a bipartisan pursuit. But, unfortunately, my colleagues across the aisle, led by Speaker PELOSI, have stonewalled our attempts to investigate the origins of COVID–19, and they have done so even in the face of mounting evidence and unanswered questions.

There have been so many theories circulating as to how COVID–19 originated. Some in the scientific community say it was of natural origins, some say it was of manmade origins.

Can we expect the American people to educate themselves on virology and the origins of COVID–19? No. What we can expect is they demand Congress do its job, investigate, and get to the bottom of exactly where this virus came from and how it was so devastating to America.

What we know, based on evidence and research, is that this virus didn't have to be as deadly as it was. Attempts by the Chinese Communist Party to cover up and deceive delayed global readiness in preparing for the devastation of COVID–19.

A 2020 report by the University of Southampton found if interventions in China would have been conducted 1 week earlier, cases could have been reduced by 66 percent; 2 weeks earlier, cases could have been reduced by 86 percent; and if interventions by China had been conducted 3 weeks earlier, cases could have been reduced by 95 percent.

Mounting evidence continues to indicate the CCP intentionally hid information and lied about what it knew about the virus. Additionally, World Health Organization Director-General Tedros Adhanom knowingly and willfully downplayed or outright denied the Chinese Communist Party's negligence, and, instead, chose to cower rather than stand up for the international community.

I am as angry as any American over the avoidable loss of life, loss of livelihood, and loss of future due to the CCP's COVID–19 coverup. We must get to the bottom of how it started and how they deceived the rest of the globe, and that is exactly what Republicans have been working toward.

House Republicans have introduced numerous measures to hold the Chinese Communist Party accountable for their malfeasance, only to be blocked by Democrats. This has not shaken our resolve. We will continue to do the people's business in the people's House.

Holding China accountable requires transparency and justice. We need to declassify intelligence surrounding the origins of COVID–19. The American people have a right to know.

We need to evaluate and defund any investments in gain of function research with the CCP or China. We need to reform the World Health Organization by advocating for new leadership and transparency. And we need to pursue visa and economic sanctions on members of the CCP and any others responsible for the COVID–19 coverup.

We need to send a loud and clear message to the globe that America will hold those responsible for the COVID–19 coverup accountable. We must leave no doubt that if you lie to America and cause death of her people, there will be hell to pay.

SUPPORTING THE SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

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

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our local allies in Afghanistan, those that are trying to come to the United States through the Special Immigrant Visa program.

Beside me here is one of the brave Afghan interpreters who stood alongside my Special Forces unit, my fellow Green Berets, in Afghanistan during one of my tours. He volunteered for that duty. He stood with us in combat. He faced extremism head-on.

And when these brave Afghans stand up, Mr. Speaker, to stand with us, to stand with our soldiers, as a critical asset that enables us to deal with the populous and communicate with the populous that we are trying to protect, but also fight alongside our Afghan security forces partners, we could not do what we have done in the last 20 years in Afghanistan and around the world in places like Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and in places like Africa, without these brave individuals who not only put their lives on the line but put their families' lives on the line to stand with us against extremism.

We called him Spartacus. We didn't use his real name, because if the Taliban found out that he was with us, they would not only track him down, they would track his entire family down.

Well, unfortunately, after our redeployment, Mr. Speaker, the very thing that he needed to get a visa to the United States, the identification paperwork that he had fought with the United States, that he had fought with America, was found on him in a Taliban checkpoint. He was taken back to his home village and beheaded, along with his brothers and cousins in his family.

This story of Spartacus is happening right now, as we speak. The Taliban, as they slowly and methodically take over Afghanistan, are hunting these brave individuals down who stood with us against extremism.

We need to ask ourselves, as Americans, what message are we sending in terms of keeping our promises, not only with the Afghans, but again, around the world? The bottom line is, we need to get them out. We have a moral obligation to get them out.

This is not just a moral obligation, but it is a national security obligation. The State Department has a 14-step process that takes over a year to do the appropriate vetting and to assign these visas. We don't have time for that anymore with U.S. forces withdrawing within weeks.

The Defense Department is ready to do an evacuation right now. The Governor of Guam has said he is ready to accept these people, as they have done with our partners in South Vietnam, as they did with the South Koreans, as they have done with Cubans. We can process them in a safe third country and then bring those individuals home.

The Defense Department says they are ready; Guam says they are ready. Everyone is waiting on the green light from the White House.

Where is that green light, Mr. Speaker? Where is it? Will President Biden stand up and stand with those and do the right thing for those that fought with us?

And I have to be candid, he hasn't always done so. He didn't support the evacuation of our South Vietnamese allies when he was a Senator. I pray and hope he will correct that past sin and stand with those who stood with us against extremism.

I mentioned this is a national security issue as well. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Mr. Speaker, just testified that he believes there is a decent likelihood, a medium probability, that al-Qaida will come roaring back in the wake of our withdrawal. So we must also ask ourselves, when our soldiers have to go back into Afghanistan, who are they going to have to fight alongside? Will they have anyone left that will not have been hunted down like Spartacus was?

□ 1215

Finally, this isn't just an interpreter issue. Twenty-five percent of the Afghan Parliament is set aside for women. These women are also being hunted, abused, forced to stay home, not go into their elected office. Some have had acid thrown on their face. Some are even executed themselves.

Civil society leaders, journalists, all those who have spoken out against the atrocities that we have seen, that we have fought against are also being targeted.

We have an obligation, as an American people, as a military, to support those who have stood with us.

Mr. Speaker, should we not, time is running out. The world is watching, and when that last American soldier

goes wheels up, these people will have a death sentence, and there will be blood on this administration's hands.

CONGRATULATING TERRY HAMBY

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Terry Hamby of Trigg County, Kentucky, for receiving the Distinguished Public Service Award for his outstanding leadership as chairman of the World War I Centennial Commission. Under Terry's leadership the commission completed the construction of the United States National World War I Memorial here in Washington, D.C.

There is no one who better understands the sacrifices of our servicemembers than Terry. He served for 26 years in our Nation's military, first in the Naval Air Wing during the Vietnam war before joining the U.S. Army Reserve.

After his retirement, Terry continued to honor and serve our Nation's military, and was appointed to the World War I Centennial Commission, and elected chairman in 2017. In just four years under his leadership, the United States National World War I Memorial was completed and opened to the public.

I am privileged to represent Terry in Congress, and I appreciate all he does to recognize our Nation's military. I join Terry's family, friends, and all of those impacted by his life of service in congratulating him on this enormous contribution to our Nation.

CONGRATULATING VERNON ANDERSON

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Vernon Anderson of Calloway County on his induction into the Kentucky Trapshooters League Hall of Fame.

Vernon has qualified 10 times for the Kentucky State trapshooters team and has been a member of the Kentucky Trapshooters League's board of directors for the past 12 years. He humbly describes himself as a consistently good trap shooter, but anyone who can hit 99 out of 100 moving targets at various distances is nothing less than a great shot.

Vernon has always paved the way for younger generations to participate in trap shooting. In 2015, his activism led trap shooting to become an official high school sport in Kentucky. He then became Calloway County High School's coach, where he has passed on his knowledge and passion for the sport to students.

Once again, I would like to congratulate my friend Vernon on this great honor and thank him for his continued service to the students of Calloway County, Kentucky.

ECONOMIC ISSUES AND RISING INFLATION

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the current state of our economy.

With ill-advised lockdowns finally ending, our economy should be firing on all cylinders. Unfortunately, we are, in many ways, stuck in the mud.

America has seen a string of disappointing jobs reports that fall short of expectations, and excessive government spending is driving up what is effectively a tax increase on every American—inflation.

Over 8 million jobs are available, even as the government pays people not to work. This is creating a dramatic workforce shortage and forcing our job creators to compete with the heavy hand of government. In fact, our labor participation rate sits at just 61 percent, the lowest total this century when you exclude the opening months of the pandemic.

And the massive spending rammed through by President Biden and Speaker PELOSI is only hurting us. Inflation is surging, affecting the price of everyday items Americans buy, like milk and gasoline.

This $2 trillion in new spending came despite an economy that was reopening and on the mend, and it made Americans less likely to work and the government more likely to waste hard-earned tax dollars.

But for our Democrat friends, this wasteful spending knows no bounds. President Biden has proposed an outrageous $6 trillion Federal budget that is a slap in the face to every American taxpayer.

Instead of focusing on a responsible infrastructure bill that repairs our roads and bridges and puts people to work, we see a focus by this body on ramming through the Green New Deal and more wasteful spending.

As leaders, we must change course to create a stronger recovery. As our economy reopens, we must respect taxpayers, support small businesses, and empower Americans to prosper through the dignity of work.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ERNEST ROBERTSON

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Private First Class Ernest Robertson of Russell County, Kentucky, who served and paid the ultimate sacrifice in the Korean war. Ernest was killed in action at 24 years old, but his remains have never been recovered.

After basic training at Fort Knox, Ernest was assigned to the U.S. Army's Far East Command, M Company, 19th Infantry Regiment, 24th Infantry Division. On April 23, 1951, he suffered a terrible injury and was captured by North Korean forces. On May 6, one day after his 24th birthday, Ernest was killed in action.

The service and sacrifice of our troops must never be forgotten, even long after they have perished. It is truly a tragedy that some brave soldiers have not yet made it home after their horrible death. We must appreciate their sacrifice and remember the cost of freedoms we enjoy here in the United States.

I join with all the First District of Kentucky in thanking Private First Class Robertson for his service, and his family for their efforts to remember him. He will always be in our thoughts.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

God, our creator, redeemer, and friend, we offer to You all that we have and all that we are this day: Our cares and concerns, our annoyances and aggravations, our fears and frustrations, our tempers and our entanglements, as well as our hopes and happiness, our competence and self-confidence, our strength and our service.

We ask that You would recreate our spirits that we would have what we need to face the vagaries of life with renewed purpose and emboldened faith; that You would redeem our lives and the circumstances we face, that from our anxiety and uncertainty would emerge courage and wisdom; and that You would remind us of the joys of daily life, the blessings of home and the warmth of friendship, that through them we would find the gift of Your abiding presence upholding us in the effort of our labors and the living of our days.

In the redemption of Your name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TENNEY 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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CHILD TAX CREDIT MONTHLY PAYMENTS

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be with you today and to tell everyone how excited I am that on July 15 checks are going to be arriving at the homes of families with children who have been struggling for a year and a half, and many have really come to the brink because of the pandemic that we are facing.

This is the child tax credit that is actually going to reduce child poverty by half in the United States of America. It was part of the American Rescue Plan, which we passed in January, and now it is going to come to help people in the form of a check. These payments provide poor, working- and middle-class families with meaningful tax relief.

In my district, over 70 percent of children will benefit from the expanded credit; over 100,000 families in total. This is the result of our work to make sure that families are no longer suffering because of the pandemic.

HONORING GUY DANELLA ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor New York Mills Police Officer Guy Danella, who retired from law enforcement after 23 years this past month.

Guy, a native of my hometown of New Hartford, began his service in law enforcement in 1998, with the Oneida County Sheriff's Department as a corrections deputy. During that time, Guy realized he wanted to continue his career as a police officer and became a deputy sheriff with the road patrol in 2000, where he spent 2 years on the DWI patrol.

In 2004, Guy began his career with the New York Mills Police Department, where he would serve for the next 17 years. During his service with New York Mills, Guy became a field training officer, helping to mentor new officers, and was honored with a number of service awards, including the Meritorious Service Award, Exceptional Service Award, and the Patriot Award.

It was an honor to meet with Guy and his amazing daughter, Alex. I hope she fulfills her dream to go to law school someday.

Guy, we thank you for your many years of service to our wonderful community and for helping to train our next generation of heroes. Our community is truly grateful.

AMATEUR RADIO SERVES AN IMPORTANT PURPOSE

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the important contributions of amateur radio operators in Arizona and across the Nation.

Throughout our Nation's history, amateur radio has served an important purpose. From providing a means of communication in times of crisis, to assisting emergency operators in natural disasters, amateur radio operators are an important part of the communities across our country.

Arizona is home to at least 23,000 amateur radio operators and hundreds of amateur radio groups and clubs. This week, the American Radio Relay League will host their annual field day, where thousands of amateur radio groups across the country will prepare for future crises.

Since 1933, amateur radio operators have practiced the rapid and effective deployment of radio communications equipment through these field day events.

I am honored to recognize the important contributions of amateur radio operators, and I wish them a safe and effective field day this weekend.

RECOGNIZING OZZIE FLETCHER

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

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to tell the story of Ozzie Fletcher.

Seventy-seven years ago, on D-day, June 6, 1944, 22-year-old Osceola ''Ozzie'' Fletcher was working as an Army crane operator on Omaha Beach when he was hit by a German missile, leaving him with serious wounds on his leg and head.

Despite the injuries he sustained that day, Ozzie was overlooked, in fact, denied a Purple Heart simply because of the color of his skin. At the time, our forces were segregated, where Black soldiers could not serve alongside White soldiers.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff learned of Ozzie's story, sending the Army on a 2-month-long fact-finding mission.

This weekend I was honored to attend the ceremony at Fort Hamilton Army Base in my district in Brooklyn, New York, when an historic wrong was corrected and Ozzie was finally awarded the Purple Heart he earned more than seven decades ago, as the Nation observed Juneteenth. This recognition of Ozzie's service was long overdue.

I have great and profound appreciation for his service during World War II and his acts of bravery on that fateful day that changed the course of our world's history.

After the war, Ozzie served as a sergeant with the NYPD, a community relations officer in the Brooklyn District Attorney's Office, and later retired to become a social studies teacher in New York City public schools.

Ozzie has spent his entire life giving back to our country and the residents of New York City, and I am happy to see him finally get the recognition he deserves.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

ENHANCING STATE ENERGY SECURITY PLANNING AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS ACT OF 2021

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1374) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide Federal financial assistance to States to implement, review, and revise State energy security plans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1374

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 ''Enhancing State Energy Security Planning and Emergency Preparedness Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. STATE ENERGY SECURITY PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 367. STATE ENERGY SECURITY PLANS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Federal financial assistance made available to a State under this part may be used for the implementation, review, and revision of a State energy security plan that assesses the State's existing circumstances and proposes methods to strengthen the ability of the State, in consultation with owners and operators of energy infrastructure in such State, to—

''(1) secure the energy infrastructure of the State against all physical and cybersecurity threats;

''(2) mitigate the risk of energy supply disruptions to the State and enhance the response to, and recovery from, energy disruptions; and

''(3) ensure the State has a reliable, secure, and resilient energy infrastructure.

''(b) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—A State energy security plan described in subsection (a) shall—

''(1) address all fuels, including petroleum products, other liquid fuels, coal, electricity, and natural gas, as well as regulated and unregulated energy providers;

''(2) provide a State energy profile, including an assessment of energy production, distribution, and end-use;

''(3) address potential hazards to each energy sector or system, including physical threats and cybersecurity threats and vulnerabilities;

''(4) provide a risk assessment of energy infrastructure and cross-sector interdependencies;

''(5) provide a risk mitigation approach to enhance reliability and end-use resilience; and

''(6) address multi-State, Indian Tribe, and regional coordination planning and response, and to the extent practicable, encourage mutual assistance in cyber and physical response plans.

''(c) COORDINATION.—In implementing a State energy security plan under this section, the energy office of the State shall, to the extent practicable, coordinate with—

''(1) the public utility or service commission of the State;

''(2) energy providers from the private sector; and

''(3) other entities responsible for maintaining fuel or electric reliability.

''(d) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—A State is not eligible to receive Federal financial assistance under this part, for any purpose, for a fiscal year unless the Governor of such State submits to the Secretary, with respect to such fiscal year—

''(1) a State energy security plan described in subsection (a) that meets the requirements of subsection (b); or

''(2) after an annual review of the State energy security plan by the Governor—

''(A) any necessary revisions to such plan; or

''(B) a certification that no revisions to such plan are necessary.

''(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon request of the Governor of a State, the Secretary may provide information and technical assistance, and other assistance, in the development, implementation, or revision of a State energy security plan.

''(f) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on October 31, 2026.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 365(f) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6325(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$125,000,000'' and inserting ''$90,000,000''; and

(2) by striking ''2007 through 2012'' and inserting ''2022 through 2026''.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 363 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6323) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e); and

(B) by striking subsection (e).

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 366(3)(B)(i) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6326(3)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''approved under section 367''.

(3) REFERENCE.—The item relating to ''Department of Energy—Energy Conservation'' in title II of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1985 (42 U.S.C. 6323a) is amended by striking ''sections 361 through 366'' and inserting ''sections 361 through 367''.

(4) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for part D of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 367. State energy security plans.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. 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. 1374.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1374, the Enhancing State Energy Security Planning and Emergency Preparedness Act of 2021.

This is a bipartisan bill introduced by my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee. I thank the bill's sponsors, Energy Subcommittee Chairman BOBBY RUSH and Subcommittee Ranking Member FRED UPTON for their work and leadership on this legislation.

This is an urgent and necessary bipartisan bill. In the wake of the Colonial Pipeline cyberattack and other recent cyber threats to our infrastructure, we are reminded of the consequences of physical and cyber attacks.

H.R. 1374 provides Federal guidance and resources to the States that are most vulnerable to critical energy infrastructure threats. The State Energy Program is a popular, bipartisan program designed to support State energy offices. Funding for the State Energy Program is used for several energy initiatives, including developing energy security plans to help prevent disasters from happening and to mitigate and recover from any damage that does occur.

This bill will help allocate additional resources to further develop and enhance State energy security plans. The funding provided in this bill will facilitate the implementation, review, and revision of State energy security plans while also laying out the criteria for the contents of those plans.

Mr. Speaker, recent events like the Colonial Pipeline cyberattack have highlighted the importance of investing in the physical and cyber security of our energy systems. This legislation passed our committee and the House with overwhelming support from both Republicans and Democrats in the last Congress. It also enjoys strong support from the nonpartisan National Association of State Energy Organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 1374 is a bipartisan bill that has long-time support in the House. We passed it by voice vote on suspension in the 115th Congress and again in the 116th Congress. The legislation reauthorizes the State Energy Program and strengthens our energy emergency planning and preparedness efforts.

This is an important bill, and we are reminded why every year when we witness how States must respond to a variety of hazards, including hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, fuel supply disruptions, and physical and cyber threats.

We have had harmful hurricanes and will continue to do so. Consequently, there is an ongoing urgency for State energy planning and action.

The electricity crises in Texas and surrounding States this past winter provides a vivid example for State responses to energy emergencies; and, of course, the Colonial Pipeline incident last month had State energy officials working with Federal authorities to make sure people had fuel when they needed it.

□ 1415

This legislation provides States with the flexibility they need to address local energy challenges.

It also ensures that State energy security planning efforts address fuel supply issues, assess State energy profiles, address potential hazards to each energy sector, mitigate risk to enhance reliability, and incorporate regional planning efforts.

H.R. 1374 also helps States protect fuel and electric infrastructure from physical and cybersecurity threats and vulnerabilities. It makes sure we are thinking ahead, not just about an actual threat, but how our energy and electric systems might be vulnerable in a broader sense.

The bill also encourages mutual assistance, an essential part of responding and restoring in the event of an energy emergency.

Prioritizing and elevating energy security planning and emergency preparedness is an important step in the face of increased threats, vulnerabilities, and interdependencies of energy infrastructure and end-use systems.

Protecting energy security requires defense in depth, which means a strong energy sector, strong State capabilities, and ensuring sector agencies like the Department of Energy have the tools they need to respond to energy emergencies. This ensures we can help people in energy emergencies, whether caused by weather or cyberattack, and help them when they need it most.

I urge support of H.R. 1374, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would state in conclusion that I urge strong support for H.R. 1374, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I also urge bipartisan support for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1374.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2021

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 482) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs under part A of title XI of such Act relating to genetic diseases, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 482

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 ''Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. IMPROVED NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING AND FOLLOW-UP FOR HERITABLE DISORDERS.

(a) PURPOSES.—Section 1109(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–8(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''enhance, improve or'' and inserting ''facilitate, enhance, improve, or'';

(2) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) to develop, and deliver to parents, families, and patient advocacy and support groups, educational programs that—

''(A) address newborn screening counseling, testing (including newborn screening pilot studies), follow-up, treatment, specialty services, and long-term care;

''(B) assess the target audience's current knowledge, incorporate health communications strategies, and measure impact; and

''(C) are at appropriate literacy levels;''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking ''followup'' and inserting ''follow-up''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', including re-engaging patients who have not received recommended follow-up services and supports''.

(b) APPROVAL FACTORS.—Section 1109(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–8(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or will use'' and inserting ''will use''; and

(2) by inserting '', or will use amounts received under such grant to enhance capacity and infrastructure to facilitate the adoption of,'' before ''the guidelines and recommendations''.

SEC. 3. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITABLE DISORDERS IN NEWBORNS AND CHILDREN.

Section 1111 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–10) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''and adopt process improvements'' after ''take appropriate steps'';

(B) in paragraph (7) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) develop, maintain, and publish on a publicly accessible website consumer-friendly materials detailing—

''(A) the uniform screening panel nomination process, including data requirements, standards, and the use of international data in nomination submissions; and

''(B) the process for obtaining technical assistance for submitting nominations to the uniform screening panel and detailing the instances in which the provision of technical assistance would introduce a conflict of interest for members of the Advisory Committee; and'';

(E) in paragraph (9), as redesignated—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (K) and (L) as subparagraphs (L) and (M), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the appropriate and recommended use of safe and effective genetic testing by health care professionals in newborns and children with an initial diagnosis of a disease or condition characterized by a variety of genetic causes and manifestations;''; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2026''; and

(B) in paragraph (2) by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2026''.

SEC. 4. CLEARINGHOUSE OF NEWBORN SCREENING INFORMATION.

Section 1112(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–11(c)) is amended by striking ''and supplement, not supplant, existing information sharing efforts'' and inserting ''and complement other Federal newborn screening information sharing activities''.

SEC. 5. LABORATORY QUALITY AND SURVEILLANCE.

Section 1113 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–12) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''performance evaluation services,'' and inserting ''development of new screening tests,''; and

(ii) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''performance test materials'' and inserting ''test performance materials''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) performance evaluation services to enhance disease detection, including the development of tools, resources, and infrastructure to improve data analysis, test result interpretation, data harmonization, and dissemination of laboratory best practices.''; and

(2) in subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and taking into consideration the expertise of the Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children established under section 1111, shall provide for the coordination of national surveillance activities, including—

''(1) standardizing data collection and reporting through the use of electronic and other forms of health records to achieve real-time data for tracking and monitoring the newborn screening system, from the initial positive screen through diagnosis and long-term care management; and

''(2) by promoting data sharing linkages between State newborn screening programs and State-based birth defects and developmental disabilities surveillance programs to help families connect with services to assist in evaluating long-term outcomes.''.

SEC. 6. HUNTER KELLY RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 1116 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–15) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) by inserting '', or with a high probability of being recommended by,'' after ''recommended by''; and

(ii) by striking ''that screenings are ready for nationwide implementation'' and inserting ''that reliable newborn screening technologies are piloted and ready for use''; and

(2) in subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) FUNDING.—In carrying out the research program under this section, the Secretary and the Director shall ensure that entities receiving funding through the program will provide assurances, as practicable, that such entities will work in consultation with State departments of health, as appropriate.''.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEWBORN SCREENING PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

Section 1117 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–16) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''$11,900,000'' and inserting ''$31,000,000'';

(B) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2022''; and

(C) by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2026''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''$8,000,000'' and inserting ''$29,650,000'';

(B) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2022''; and

(C) by striking ''2019'' and inserting ''2026''.

SEC. 8. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS; ETHICS GUIDANCE PROGRAM.

Section 12 of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 289 note) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 12. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS; ETHICS GUIDANCE PROGRAM.

''Research on nonidentified newborn dried blood spots shall be considered secondary research (as that term is defined in section 46.104(d)(4) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)) with nonidentified biospecimens for purposes of federally funded research conducted pursuant to the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 200 et seq.).''.

SEC. 9. NAM REPORT ON THE MODERNIZATION OF NEWBORN SCREENING.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Medicine (in this section referred to as ''NAM'') (or if NAM declines to enter into such an agreement, another appropriate entity) under which NAM, or such other appropriate entity, agrees to conduct a study on the following:

(1) The uniform screening panel review and recommendation processes to identify factors that impact decisions to add new conditions to the uniform screening panel, to describe challenges posed by newly nominated conditions, including low-incidence diseases, late onset variants, and new treatments without long-term efficacy data.

(2) The barriers that preclude States from adding new uniform screening panel conditions to their State screening panels with recommendations on resources needed to help States implement uniform screening panel recommendations.

(3) The current state of federally and privately funded newborn screening research with recommendations for optimizing the capacity of this research, including piloting multiple prospective conditions at once and addressing rare disease questions.

(4) New and emerging technologies that would permit screening for new categories of disorders, or would make current screening more effective, more efficient, or less expensive.

(5) Technological and other infrastructure needs to improve timeliness of diagnosis and short- and long-term follow-up for infants identified through newborn screening and improve public health surveillance.

(6) Current and future communication and educational needs for priority stakeholders and the public to promote understanding and knowledge of a modernized newborn screening system with an emphasis on evolving communication channels and messaging.

(7) The extent to which newborn screening yields better data on the disease prevalence for screened conditions and improves long-term outcomes for those identified through newborn screening, including existing systems supporting such data collection and recommendations for systems that would allow for improved data collection.

(8) The impact on newborn morbidity and mortality in States that adopt newborn screening tests included on the uniform panel.

(b) PUBLIC STAKEHOLDER MEETING.—In the course of completing the study described in subsection (a), NAM or such other appropriate entity shall hold not less than one public meeting to obtain stakeholder input on the topics of such study.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the effective date of the agreement under subsection (a), such agreement shall require NAM, or such other appropriate entity, to submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the appropriate committees of jurisdiction of Congress a report containing—

(1) the results of the study conducted under subsection (a);

(2) recommendations to modernize the processes described in subsection (a)(1); and

(3) recommendations for such legislative and administrative action as NAM, or such other appropriate entity, determines appropriate.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2022 and 2023 to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. 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. 482.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 482, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2021.

Newborn screening is a well-established and proven public health program that identifies certain genetic and functional conditions in newborns. Each year, almost all of the 3.8 million babies born in the U.S. are screened for medical conditions that can cause serious disability or death if not detected and treated early.

Newborn screening includes blood, hearing, and heart screening. While most families may likely forget this routine testing ever took place, more than 12,000 families each year will be notified of a positive screening result and referred for immediate diagnosis and treatment. Many of these families might not have considered or had access to these tests without newborn screening. Newborns can appear healthy but, without warning, can quickly deteriorate due to these undetected conditions, and that is why these tests are so critical. If diagnosed early, many of these conditions can be treated and managed successfully.

In 2008, the original Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act was signed into law. It established national newborn screening guidelines and supported the facilitation of newborn screening at the State level. Before 2008, only 10 States and the District of Columbia required newborn screening for recommended disorders. Today, all 50 States and D.C. screen for most or all of these recommended diseases.

This bipartisan program was reauthorized in 2014 and 2019. Those reauthorizations renewed Federal support to help States to expand and improve their newborn screening programs.

H.R. 482, before us today, once again renews Federal funds and activities to assist States in continuing and improving their newborn screening programs. This bill also supports parent and provider education and laboratory quality and surveillance.

Newborn screening, Mr. Speaker, is a simple set of tests that can improve and save the lives of thousands of babies so that they and their families can grow to live healthy and happy lives. Through the national expansion of these life-saving health screenings, no baby should receive inadequate care because of the State that they live in. With the continuous reauthorization of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act, every baby in the U.S. can have access to equitable healthcare from the day they are born.

I commend the steadfast champions of this bipartisan legislation—foremost, Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, who has been working on this for such a long time, and this is something that she and I have talked about quite a bit, and Congressman SIMPSON, Congresswoman HERRERA BEUTLER, and Assistant Speaker KATHERINE CLARK for their ongoing commitment and leadership toward eliminating preventable newborn deaths. No newborn should suffer or die from a condition that can be detected and treated by newborn screening.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to control the time on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 482, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2021.

Newborn screening is critical in the early detection and intervention of health conditions, some life-threatening, for our Nation's infants. They are for serious but rare conditions that families and doctors may otherwise be unable to detect at birth. Newborns are screened in the hospital when they are 1 or 2 days old by blood tests, in addition to hearing and heart screenings.

About 1 in 300 newborns has a condition that can be detected via newborn screening. However, if not detected and left untreated, these conditions can impact a child for the rest of their life by causing disabilities, developmental delays, illness, or even death.

Prior to the passage of the first Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act in 2008, which helped better standardize screening programs, States had varying standards for newborn screening, and they were not screening for many of the core conditions on the Recommended Uniform Screening Panel.

This bill authorizes funding for the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institutes of Health to ensure that our newborn screening remains comprehensive and that our Nation's healthcare providers are adequately equipped to conduct the screenings.

Specifically, H.R. 482 reauthorizes grants through the Health Resources and Services Administration to expand State screening programs and improve follow-up care after a detection, in addition to allowing for the National Institutes of Health Hunter Kelly Newborn Screening program to continue to identify new treatments for conditions detected by newborn screening.

The importance of newborn screenings can't be overstated. Screening provides physicians and families with critical information regarding infant health, allowing for early intervention and treatment, if necessary.

I urge my fellow Members to support H.R. 482, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), the prime sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support reauthorization of my Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act. I thank Chairman PALLONE for his support and for bringing my bill to the floor.

My sincere gratitude to my newborn screening partners and colleagues, MIKE SIMPSON, KATHERINE CLARK, and JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, and my heartfelt appreciation to the public health groups that continue to support my newborn screening efforts, including the March of Dimes, the Association of Public Health Laboratories, the Muscular Dystrophy Association, and

the National Organization for Rare Disorders.

Newborn screening involves a baby receiving a simple blood test to identify life-threatening diseases before symptoms begin. Prior to the development of these tests, children would die or suffer lifelong disabilities.

In 2008, when my original bill passed, newborn screenings and access to follow-up information were not consistent or available to families in all communities. Only 10 States and the District of Columbia required screening for a complete panel of recommended disorders, and there was no Federal repository of information on the diseases.

Today, all 50 States and D.C. screen for at least 30 of the 35 recommended core conditions, and a national clearinghouse has the most recent newborn screening information available to parents and professionals.

Newborn screening is a public health success story that makes the difference between health and disability, or even life and death, for the approximately 12,000 babies who each year test positive for one of these conditions, babies like Cruz, a beautiful little girl born on February 4 this year to one of my district office deputies. Thanks to newborn screening, in just 4 days, Cruz was diagnosed with maple syrup urine disease, which prevents the body from breaking down certain amino acids typically obtained from protein.

If Cruz's disease had gone undetected, the buildup of amino acids in her body would have become toxic, leading to seizures, swelling of the brain, coma, and, ultimately, death. Today, the management of her amino acid levels keeps Cruz out of the hospital, protects her from critical medical complications, and gives her family the gift of watching their daughter grow up healthy.

This is just one of the thousands of success stories that illustrate the critical need to pass H.R. 482 into law. This will guarantee high-quality technical assistance for State programs and public health labs, access to the most current programs and educational materials, and it will ensure the advisory committee continues its work of researching and recommending new screenings for State programs, which also save our healthcare system millions of dollars for each child identified and treated early.

Reauthorization will also commission a National Academy of Sciences study to make recommendations for a 21st century newborn screening system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the passage of H.R. 482 to ensure all newborns like Cruz are blessed with early, comprehensive, and consistent testing and follow-up programs for a healthy and productive life.

□ 1430

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill and encourage others to do so. When I first was elected to the State Senate, the General Assembly of Kentucky, one of the biggest public policy efforts I got involved in was Governor Patton—our governor at the time—who was proposing a big 0–3 kind of overall for Kentucky's babies and children, and a big part of it was newborn screenings.

And that was a section I was kind of assigned to look into and I spent a lot of time doing research—even going down to see a lady who does this kind of research at Vanderbilt University and walked away convinced that it is the right public policy to do. It is money well-spent. It really changes people's ability. If you can't get your language at an early time, you can never get it back.

So this absolutely prevents—if you want to look at the cost of this system, this system going forward, but more importantly, it really enhances people to have the opportunity to live a full life if we catch it at the youngest level.

So I am convinced of this. I support this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to do so.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would also ask Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 482.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

PANDEMIC EFFECTS ON HOME SAFETY AND TOURISM ACT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3752) to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to study the effect of the COVID–19 pandemic on injuries and deaths associated with consumer products and to direct the Secretary of Commerce to study and report on the effects of the COVID–19 pandemic on the travel and tourism industry in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3752

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Pandemic Effects on Home Safety and Tourism Act''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—COVID–19 HOME SAFETY

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Study and report on the effect of the COVID–19 public health emergency on injuries and deaths from consumer products.

TITLE II—PROTECTING TOURISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Study and report on effects of COVID–19 pandemic on travel and tourism industry in United States.

TITLE I—COVID–19 HOME SAFETY

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''COVID–19 Home Safety Act''.

SEC. 102. STUDY AND REPORT ON THE EFFECT OF THE COVID–19 PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY ON INJURIES AND DEATHS FROM CONSUMER PRODUCTS.

(a) COVID–19 REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this section and every 3 months thereafter for the duration of the COVID–19 public health emergency, the Consumer Product Safety Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and make publicly available, a report on the effect of the COVID–19 public health emergency on injuries and deaths from consumer products.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report shall include the following:

(1) Relevant data and statistics from—

(A) the data sources of the Commission;

(B) other appropriate agencies;

(C) media reports;

(D) poison control centers, to the extent practical; and

(E) any other relevant data sources.

(2) An identification of trends in injuries and deaths from consumer products, comparing data from representative time periods before and during the COVID–19 public health emergency.

(3) An identification of subpopulations that have experienced elevated risk of injury or death from consumer products during the COVID–19 public health emergency, such as minorities, infants, people with disabilities, children, or the elderly.

(4) An identification of where most injuries or deaths from consumer products during the COVID–19 public health emergency are taking place, such as the type of building or outdoor environment.

(5) A specification about whether consumer products associated with a substantial number of injuries or deaths during the COVID–19 public health emergency are—

(A) under recall;

(B) subject to a voluntary consumer product safety standard; or

(C) subject to a mandatory consumer product safety standard.

(6) An identification of emerging consumer products that are posing new risks to consumers.

(c) COVID–19 PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY DEFINED.—The term ''COVID–19 public health emergency'' means a public health emergency declared pursuant to section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d) as a result of confirmed cases of 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID–19), including any renewal thereof.

TITLE II—PROTECTING TOURISM IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Protecting Tourism in the United States Act''.

SEC. 202. STUDY AND REPORT ON EFFECTS OF COVID–19 PANDEMIC ON TRAVEL AND TOURISM INDUSTRY IN UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the United States Travel and Tourism Advisory Board and the head of any other Federal agency the Secretary considers appropriate, shall complete a study on the effects of the COVID–19 pandemic on the travel and tourism industry, including various segments of the travel and tourism industry, such as domestic, international, leisure, business, conventions, meetings, and events.

(b) MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In conducting the study required by subsection (a) and the interim study required by subsection (e)(1), the Secretary shall consider—

(1) changes in employment rates in the travel and tourism industry during the pandemic period;

(2) changes in revenues of businesses in the travel and tourism industry during the pandemic period;

(3) changes in employment and sales in industries related to the travel and tourism industry, and changes in contributions of the travel and tourism industry to such related industries, during the pandemic period;

(4) the effects attributable to the changes described in paragraphs (1) through (3) in the travel and tourism industry and such related industries on the overall economy of the United States during the pandemic period and the projected effects of such changes on the overall economy of the United States following the pandemic period; and

(5) any additional matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT.—In conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with representatives of—

(A) the small business sector;

(B) the restaurant or food service sector;

(C) the hotel and alternative accommodations sector;

(D) the attractions or recreations sector;

(E) the travel distribution services sector;

(F) destination marketing organizations;

(G) State tourism offices; and

(H) the passenger air, railroad, and rental car sectors; and

(2) provide an opportunity for public comment and advice relevant to conducting the study.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the study required by subsection (a) is completed, the Secretary, in consultation with the United States Travel and Tourism Advisory Board and the head of any other Federal agency the Secretary considers appropriate, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and make publicly available on the website of the Department of Commerce, a report that contains—

(1) the results of such study; and

(2) policy recommendations for promoting and assisting the travel and tourism industry.

(e) INTERIM STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, after consultation with relevant stakeholders, including the United States Travel and Tourism Advisory Board, shall—

(1) complete an interim study, which shall be based on data available at the time when the study is conducted and provide a framework for the study required by subsection (a), on the effects of the COVID–19 pandemic (as of such time) on the travel and tourism industry, including various segments of the travel and tourism industry, such as domestic, international, leisure, business, conventions, meetings, and events; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and make publicly available on the website of the Department of Commerce, an interim report that contains the results of the interim study required by paragraph (1).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''pandemic period'' has the meaning given the term ''emergency period'' in section 1135(g)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b–5(g)(1)(B)), excluding any portion of such period after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce; and

(3) the term ''travel and tourism industry'' means the travel and tourism industry in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. 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. 3752.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3752.

I begin by thanking Representatives CÁRDENAS, CASTOR, DAVIS, and UPTON for their leadership on this bill, the Pandemic Effects on Home Safety and Tourism Act.

While there is now light at the end of the tunnel for many Americans, the past 15 months have been unlike any other time in modern history. The COVID–19 pandemic has forced us to spend more time at home and find new indoor and outdoor activities suitable for social distancing, which has resulted in new injury patterns. Keeping track of any new trends in injuries and deaths that might be occurring can help us learn how to keep consumers safer at home now as well as in the future.

This bill will require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to provide quarterly updates to the American public regarding the effects of COVID–19 on home safety, including any emerging threats from either new products or new habits from working and playing at home. This report will assemble data from a variety of sources, including media reports and poison control centers, in addition to the CPSC's traditional data sources.

Initial reports from the CPSC about injuries related to consumer products during COVID–19 are already concerning. For example, hospitalizations related to the ingestion of dangerous button cell batteries rose by 93 percent among young children during the period from March to September 2020, and injuries related to cleaning agents also rose 84 percent.

Continued regular reporting required by this legislation can help parents better identify how to keep their children safe when they need to stay at home. And this bill will also identify communities or groups that may be disproportionately affected so that the CPSC can better target efforts to protect these communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that this bill will also help rebuild the tourism and travel industry, which has certainly struggled under the strain of the COVID–19 pandemic. Specifically, this legislation requires the Department of Commerce to conduct a detailed study and report to Congress on the pandemic's effects on the travel industry, including on jobs and revenue. And this information will be helpful in determining how we can best direct assistance to the 16 million American workers and families who rely on the jobs the travel industry supports.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our Ranking Member RODGERS, and our Consumer Protection and Commerce Subcommittee Ranking Member BILIRAKIS, for working with us to build bipartisan support. And, of course, I also thank the chairwoman of this subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3752, the Pandemic Effects on Home Safety and Tourism Act.

I first thank Representatives CÁRDENAS and DAVIS for their efforts on this bill to protect consumers. I also thank Representatives UPTON and CASTOR for including provisions to promote and assist our tourism industry, an essential component of our Nation's economy, and something I care deeply about as cochair of the Congressional Tourism Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3752 directs the Consumer Product Safety Commission to report on trends of injuries and deaths from consumer products during the COVID–19 pandemic. As more Americans have spent time in their homes, it is important the CPSC continues to inform consumers with information about potentially hazardous products.

Additionally, H.R. 3752 requires the Department of Commerce to study and report on how the COVID–19 pandemic has impacted our travel and tourism industry. This industry plays a significant role in many local communities and supports over 50 million jobs across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the chairwoman of the subcommittee.

I also want to say that she is really our superhero when it comes to these consumer issues, always looking out for things, because as the world changes, we have to constantly be vigilant. And that, she certainly is.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his kind words.

I also thank the authors of this legislation, Representatives CÁRDENAS, DAVIS, CASTOR, and UPTON, a bipartisan leadership group on this legislation.

And I also thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for his cooperation on this and so many other issues.

Mr. Speaker, children are particularly vulnerable to risks associated with household consumer products. These risks have been magnified by the pandemic as families spend more time at home and parents juggle working from home and supervising children.

This legislation will direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to study and report injuries and deaths associated with consumer products during the pandemic. A lot of progress has been made, but the pandemic is not yet over.

Americans deserve up-to-date information about emerging threats to the safety of their children, and so this legislation is very important.

This legislation also directs the Department of Commerce to study and report to the Congress on the impact of the pandemic on the travel and tourism industries.

These industries were really hit hard by the pandemic. Over 15.7 million Americans work in travel or tourism. Many of these jobs are just now starting to come back. Industries that depend on travel or tourism like the arts, live events, hotels, and restaurants are still hurting. We must understand the full impact of the pandemic on travel and tourism so that we can help these industries to be able to build back better.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill. I think it is a good bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I also urge bipartisan support for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3752.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

MR. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

CONSUMER SAFETY TECHNOLOGY ACT

MR. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3723) to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to establish a pilot program to explore the use of artificial intelligence in support of the mission of the Commission and direct the Secretary of Commerce and the Federal Trade Commission to study and report on the use of blockchain technology and digital tokens, respectively.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3723

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Consumer Safety Technology Act''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Pilot program for use of artificial intelligence by Consumer Product Safety Commission.

TITLE II—BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION

Sec. 201. Short title.
Sec. 202. Study on blockchain technology and its use in consumer protection.

TITLE III—DIGITAL TOKEN TAXONOMY

Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Findings.
Sec. 303. Reports on unfair or deceptive acts or practices in transactions relating to digital tokens.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''consumer product'' has the meaning given such term in section 3(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)); and

(2) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

TITLE I—ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''AI for Consumer Product Safety Act''.

SEC. 102. PILOT PROGRAM FOR USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE BY CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Consumer Product Safety Commission shall establish a pilot program to explore the use of artificial intelligence by the Commission in support of the consumer product safety mission of the Commission.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the pilot program established under subsection (a), the Commission shall do the following:

(1) Use artificial intelligence for at least 1 of the following purposes:

(A) Tracking trends with respect to injuries involving consumer products.

(B) Identifying consumer product hazards.

(C) Monitoring the retail marketplace (including internet websites) for the sale of recalled consumer products (including both new and used products).

(D) Identifying consumer products required by section 17(a) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2066(a)) to be refused admission into the customs territory of the United States.

(2) Consult with the following:

(A) Technologists, data scientists, and experts in artificial intelligence and machine learning.

(B) Cybersecurity experts.

(C) Members of the retail industry.

(D) Consumer product manufacturers.

(E) Consumer product safety organizations.

(F) Any other person the Commission considers appropriate.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the conclusion of the pilot program established under subsection (a), the Consumer Product Safety Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and make publicly available on the website of the Commission, a report on the findings and data derived from such program, including whether and the extent to which the use of artificial intelligence improved the ability of the Commission to advance the consumer product safety mission of the Commission.

TITLE II—BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Blockchain Innovation Act''.

SEC. 202. STUDY ON BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY AND ITS USE IN CONSUMER PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Federal Trade Commission, and in consultation with the any other appropriate Federal agency the Secretary determines appropriate, shall conduct a study on current and potential use of blockchain technology in commerce and the potential benefits of blockchain technology for limiting fraud and other unfair and deceptive acts and practices.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR STUDY.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall examine—

(A) trends in the commercial use of and investment in blockchain technology;

(B) best practices in facilitating public-private partnerships in blockchain technology;

(C) potential benefits and risks of blockchain technology for consumer protection;

(D) how blockchain technology can be used by industry and consumers to reduce fraud and increase the security of commercial transactions;

(E) areas in Federal regulation of blockchain technology that greater clarity would encourage domestic innovation; and

(F) any other relevant observations or recommendations related to blockchain technology and consumer protection.

(3) PUBLIC COMMENT.—In producing the study required in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary shall provide opportunity for public comment and advice relevant to the production of the study.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the completion of the study required pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the

Senate, and make publicly available on the website of the Department of Commerce, a report that contains the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

TITLE III—DIGITAL TOKEN TAXONOMY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Digital Taxonomy Act''.

SEC. 302. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) it is important that the United States remains a leader in innovation;

(2) digital tokens and blockchain technology are driving innovation and providing consumers with increased choice and convenience;

(3) the use of digital tokens and blockchain technology is likely to increase in the future;

(4) the Federal Trade Commission is responsible for protecting consumers from unfair or deceptive acts or practices, including relating to digital tokens;

(5) the Commission has previously taken action against unscrupulous companies and individuals that committed unfair or deceptive acts or practices involving digital tokens; and

(6) to bolster the Commission's ability to enforce against unfair or deceptive acts or practices involving digital tokens, the Commission should ensure staff have appropriate training and resources to identify and pursue such cases.

SEC. 303. REPORTS ON UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES IN TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO DIGITAL TOKENS.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act and each year thereafter until fiscal year 2024, the Federal Trade Commission shall transmit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and make publicly available on its website, a report of—

(1) any actions taken by the Commission relating to unfair or deceptive acts or practices in transactions relating to digital tokens;

(2) the Commission's other efforts to prevent unfair or deceptive acts or practices relating to digital tokens; and

(3) any recommendations by the Commission for legislation that would improve the ability of the Commission and other relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to further protect consumers from unfair or deceptive acts or practices in the digital token marketplace; and

(B) to promote competition and promote innovation in the global digital token sector.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. 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. 3723.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3723, the Consumer Safety Technology Act, and I want to begin by thanking Representatives MCNERNEY and BURGESS for their leadership on this bill, which they reintroduced this Congress.

This legislation will help modernize our consumer protection agencies and encourage the use of advanced technologies, like artificial intelligence and blockchain in support of product safety and consumer protection.

These technologies can help the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the Federal Trade Commission improve their operations and more effectively carry out their mission.

Technological advances and globalization have greatly expanded the range of consumer products on the market. And as consumers shop online, more and more of these products are being shipped directly to homes. Artificial intelligence could help the CPSC oversee the increasingly complex range of products under its jurisdiction by helping to identify new injury trends and emerging hazards.

AI can also help the CPSC monitor online marketplaces for the illegal sale of recalled products. The persistence of recalled products on online third-party marketplaces is a particularly pernicious problem that puts Americans needlessly at risk.

For example, months after the dangerous Fisher-Price Rock 'n Play and other infant inclined sleepers were recalled, a Consumer Reports investigation found that these products were still being sold on sites like Facebook Marketplace and Craigslist, even though they had been linked to dozens of infant fatalities. I am hopeful that artificial intelligence can be harnessed here to help eradicate the illegal sale of recalled products on online marketplaces.

The CPSC could also use AI to assess the risks of the growing number of imported consumer products entering our country and being sent directly to consumers.

This bill incorporates a bill originally introduced by Representative SOTO and GUTHRIE, the Blockchain Innovation Act, and a bill originally introduced by Representatives DAVIDSON and SOTO, the Digital Taxonomy Act.

As incorporated in this legislation, these bills will help identify ways blockchain technology can be used to further support consumer protection. It will also make sure that scammers and fraudsters don't get ahead of consumers and law enforcement in the realm of blockchain and digital tokens.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I thank Ranking Member RODGERS and Consumer Protection and Commerce Subcommittee Ranking Member BILIRAKIS for working with us to move this bill; and as always, to the chairwoman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3723, the Consumer Safety Technology Act.

I thank Representatives BURGESS, MCNERNEY, GUTHRIE, SOTO, and DAVIDSON for their leadership on this effort and, of course, our chairman and our ranking member, and our ranking member on the subcommittee, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan bill directs the Consumer Product Safety Commission to conduct a pilot program to determine how artificial intelligence may be used to advance the agency's product safety mission.

Given the agency's broad jurisdiction over so many consumer products, efficiently and accurately analyzing data in the marketplace is critical to its effective operation.

This bill also includes an important study of how blockchain technology may be used to prevent fraud, increase privacy, and bolster our Nation's supply chain. This is complementary to the American COMPETE Act that also prioritizes this emerging technology to ensure America leads in the technology and in its development.

Furthermore, H.R. 3723 also focuses on digital tokens, which are seeing increased adoption by consumers. The bill targets ways in which we can protect consumers from fraud in the digital token marketplace, a dangerous trend that has recently become more apparent.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their important work on this particular piece of legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1445

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY), who is the prime sponsor of this bill.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for recognizing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, H.R. 3723, the Consumer Safety Technology Act.

H.R. 3723 will encourage the use of emerging technologies, specifically artificial intelligence and blockchains, to help keep consumers safe. It will aid our consumer protection agencies with carrying out their missions.

H.R. 3723 incorporates the AI for Consumer Product Safety Act legislation that I authored with Representative BURGESS. These provisions direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC, to establish a pilot program for the agency to use AI in furtherance of the agency's work to protect consumers from unsafe products.

For example, the CPSC could use artificial intelligence to more quickly and efficiently identify consumer product hazards, such as exploding laptops that have faulty batteries, defective USB chargers, furniture that tips over, and unsafe infant sleeping products.

Being able to identify these hazards more quickly will enable the CPSC to

help also recall products more quickly and, in turn, help save lives.

We have heard firsthand from CPSC commissioners when they testified before the House Energy and Commerce Committee that artificial intelligence can benefit the agency's work in serving the American people.

I am pleased that last year my legislation, the AI in Government Act, was enacted into law. Among other things, the AI in Government Act establishes an AI Center of Excellence to facilitate adoption of AI technology in the Federal Government. This will provide a central resource within the government to aid agencies with AI adoption and help agencies share best practices.

But it is also critical that agencies build up their capacity internally to adopt AI technology. H.R. 3723 will empower the CPSC to do just that. The CPSC's experience here will also serve as an example for other agencies that are looking to integrate AI in furtherance of their agency's missions.

H.R. 3723 also incorporates the Blockchain Innovation Act introduced by Representative SOTO and GUTHRIE. These provisions will help ensure that we use the benefits of blockchain technology to help stop scams and fraud.

Additionally, H.R. 3723 incorporates the Digital Taxonomy Act from Representatives SOTO and DAVIDSON. These provisions will help ensure the scammers and fraudsters don't get ahead of consumers and law enforcement in the realm of blockchain and digital tokens.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representatives BURGESS, SOTO, GUTHRIE, and DAVIDSON for their work in H.R. 3723, and Chairman PALLONE and Ranking Member RODGERS for helping to move this important bill. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation with Representative MCNERNEY, H.R. 3723, the Consumer Safety Technology Act.

You know, over my time in the Energy and Commerce Committee, I have made several trips out to the CPSC and observed firsthand how the men and women dedicate their lives to ensuring that consumers have safe products, that consumers have products that are not going to cause harm to the user.

And as we approach the anniversary of our Nation's independence on July 4, I also have a lot of respect for these same individuals who ensure that our fireworks that are sold at the commercial stands at the side of the road also meet certain specifications.

So as we approach Independence Day, it is always a good time to acknowledge the work done by the men and women in the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

The bill we are talking about today actually passed the last Congress by a voice vote, but it did fail to advance in the United States Senate. It includes the bill that Mr. MCNERNEY and I introduced, the Artificial Intelligence for Consumer Product Safety legislation, along with, as referenced, the Blockchain Innovation Act and the Digital Taxonomy Act.

We are once again considering this bill because this is commonsense legislation that should be signed into law to improve and modernize our consumer protection agencies.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission has jurisdiction over 15,000 consumer products. Many of these are purchased online without the consumer reviewing or assessing the product in person. Throughout the time of the pandemic, Americans have sought to fulfill their needs through online shopping, and many companies and small businesses have innovated products to further increase convenience of daily life. The pool of products available to consumers is continually expanding, putting further strain on the Consumer Product Safety Commission to ensure the safety of those products.

While technological advances are increasing the number of types of products available for consumption, the Consumer Product Safety Commission can employ advanced technology to assist in that mission.

This bill directs the Consumer Safety Product Commission to establish a pilot program to use artificial intelligence for tracking injury trends, identifying consumer product hazards, monitoring the retail marketplace for the sale of recalled products, or identifying unsafe imported consumer products.

It is safe to say that when the Consumer Product Safety Commission was created, no one anticipated the sheer volume of material that would be being imported, for which they now have responsibility.

Artifical intelligence uses algorithms to quickly automate human functions and to filter and analyze data. Artificial intelligence is already advancing capabilities in multiple sectors to better serve consumers by increasing capacity and enhancing outcomes. As artificial intelligence advances, it should be capable of helping predict fail rates and identifying problems in consumer products before they can significantly impact the market.

If we want the United States to stay ahead of China and other global competitors, we must advance and utilize artificial intelligence in all appropriate products and processes. I can think of no better place to implement these capabilities than in the protection of products used every single day by American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge colleagues to support this bill. Again, it passed the last Congress in a voice vote. We should advance it today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), another sponsor of the bill from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE, Chairwoman SCHAKOWSKY, Representative MCNERNEY, Ranking Member RODGERS, Ranking Member BILIRAKIS, and Representative GUTHRIE for bringing forward these key bills on technology.

Emerging technologies like artificial intelligence, blockchain technologies, and cryptocurrency are playing a growing importance in our daily lives and are going to be an economic driver for the 21st century economy.

Blockchain, in essence, is a fixed ledger. Once you add data or a transaction, it cannot be changed. Therefore, it makes the data have integrity and makes sure that, as we are doing transactions and adding data over the internet, it can't be changed and that there is certainty to it. That is why it is so critical.

Then once we add AI to analyze this fixed data, we could help solve some of the largest problems that we face as a nation: healthcare, climate change, to be two examples; the delivery of personal protection equipment during a pandemic.

And, of course, cryptocurrency allows for small businesses, in particular, to provide services across the world without the transaction costs of exchanging currencies. It will help with remittances and other ways that we can modernize our economy.

It is essential that the United States continue to be a global leader in these emerging technologies to ensure our democratic values remain at the forefront of this technological development. Authoritarian regimes like China and Russia are investing heavily in these areas. It is absolutely critical for the free world to invest and to win the future in these areas.

Also, as a responsible global leader, the United States must strike the appropriate balance of providing an environment that fosters innovation while ensuring appropriate consumer protection.

That is why I am proud to work with Representative MCNERNEY on H.R. 3723. It includes parts of the Digital Taxonomy Act and all of the Blockchain Innovation Act. As many of you know, blockchain technology will be helpful in the ways we discussed already.

First, H.R. 3639, the Blockchain Innovation Act, directs the Department of Commerce, in consultation with the FCC, to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the state of blockchain technology in commerce, including its use to reduce fraud and increase security.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GUTHRIE for cosponsoring and co-introducing this bill. This is a first step toward a long-term goal of setting up a Blockchain Center of Excellence in the Department of Commerce.

In addition, the Digital Taxonomy Act requires a similar report from the FCC to report recommendations on deceptive practices, and the relationship between the FTC, FCC, and the CFTC.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative DAVIDSON for his cosponsorship.

When we look at market volatility, the use of cryptocurrency for ransomware in recent attacks like the Colonial Pipeline and tax evasion, it is critical that we get in on the front end of this.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to work with Representative MCNERNEY, and I urge support for H.R. 3723.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), an important member of the Energy and Commerce full committee and also the subcommittee.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3723, the Consumer Safety Technology Act.

This is important legislation that helps the U.S. solidify its position as a world leader in technology and innovation while protecting our constituents.

This legislation builds on the American COMPETE Act, which sought to remove burdensome regulatory barriers to promote American innovation and consider how safely using artificial intelligence can transform the future.

This is also a critical step in maintaining our global competitive edge in emerging technologies over foreign adversaries like China. It will make us less reliant on these bad actors for important technologies.

The Consumer Safety and Technology Act establishes a pilot program to explore how to safely use artificial intelligence to protect consumers from unsafe products while advancing cutting-edge American innovation.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the chairwoman of the subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the authors of this bipartisan legislation, Representatives MCNERNEY, BURGESS, SOTO, GUTHRIE, and DAVIDSON.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government should put the incredible technological innovation of the last few years to work for the American people, and that is exactly what this bill does. It promotes the use of artificial intelligence in product safety and studies how blockchain can protect consumers.

□ 1500

Regulators will be stronger and the American consumer safer when we consider how these technologies can help them achieve this mission.

Part of the mission of the Federal Trade Commission is to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive business practices. It is important to keep track of any such practices in the digital token ecosystem where unscrupulous businesspeople may be seeking to take advantage of the vast wealth created by digital tokens. This bill directs the Federal Trade Commission to report on its work keeping users of the digital token system safe.

Emerging technologies pose both perils and promise. That is why we must direct Federal agencies to make sure that consumers are safe.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill. We have to get it past the finish line this time. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I also urge support for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3723.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

SAFE SLEEP FOR BABIES ACT OF 2021

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3182) to provide that inclined sleepers for infants and crib bumpers shall be considered banned hazardous products under section 8 of the Consumer Product Safety Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3182

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 ''Safe Sleep for Babies Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. BANNING OF INCLINED SLEEPERS FOR INFANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, inclined sleepers for infants, regardless of the date of manufacture, shall be considered a banned hazardous product under section 8 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2057).

(b) INCLINED SLEEPER FOR INFANTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''inclined sleeper for infants'' means a product with an inclined sleep surface greater than ten degrees that is intended, marketed, or designed to provide sleeping accommodations for an infant up to 1 year old.

SEC. 3. BANNING OF CRIB BUMPERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, crib bumpers, regardless of the date of manufacture, shall be considered a banned hazardous product under section 8 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2057).

(b) CRIB BUMPER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''crib bumper''—

(1) means any material that is intended to cover the sides of a crib to prevent injury to any crib occupant from impacts against the side of a crib or to prevent partial or complete access to any openings in the sides of a crib to prevent a crib occupant from getting any part of the body entrapped in any opening;

(2) includes a padded crib bumper, a supported and unsupported vinyl bumper guard, and vertical crib slat covers; and

(3) does not include a non-padded mesh crib liner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. 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. 3182.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3182, the Safe Sleep for Babies Act.

This important piece of legislation was reintroduced this Congress by Vice Chair CÁRDENAS and Chair SCHAKOWSKY of our Consumer Protection and Commerce Subcommittee.

Parents and caregivers deserve the peace of mind that any infant sleep product they buy is consistent with longstanding safe sleep recommendations that babies should only sleep on their backs on a firm, flat surface free of extra bedding.

This legislation would ban two very dangerous products for babies that defy safe sleep best practices and have tragically taken far too many infant lives: inclined sleepers and crib bumpers. To date, inclined sleepers have been linked to at least 94 infant fatalities, and crib bumpers have contributed to at least 107 deaths.

Inclined sleepers position babies on a dangerous incline that can lead to the baby's airway becoming obstructed, among other hazard patterns. Crib bumpers create unnecessary suffocation, entrapment, and strangulation risks for babies.

There is simply no reason either of these products should still be on the market. Yet, incline sleepers and crib bumpers are heavily marketed and remain widely available online and on store shelves. Many parents, grandparents, and caregivers continue to purchase these products, wholly unaware of the grave risks they pose to babies.

Since April 2019, when Consumer Reports first reported on the deadly toll of infant inclined products, an independent expert hired by the CPSC has confirmed that all sleep products with inclines greater than 10 degrees pose serious dangers to infants.

Earlier this month, CPSC approved a strong, new Federal safety standard on infant sleep products that will effectively prohibit infant inclined sleepers. However, the new safety standard will not take effect for some time, and there is still no Federal standard to eliminate the hazard posed by crib bumpers.

That is why this bill is necessary. H.R. 3182 bans crib bumpers along with inclined sleepers, and it will take effect 6 months after the date of enactment, making sure strong protections for babies are not needlessly delayed.

We must take action on this bill today, Mr. Speaker, to protect babies across the Nation. I call on my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3182, the Safe Sleep for Babies Act. I thank Mr. CÁRDENAS and, of course, Chair SCHAKOWSKY for their hard work on this bill.

H.R. 3182 addresses the risk of dangers that infants face from inclined sleepers and crib bumpers. This bill bans all products with an inclined sleep surface greater than 10 degrees to address the tragic deaths related to inclined sleepers and any crib bumpers intended to cover the sides of a crib or that prevent access to openings on the sides of the crib.

I am always ready to work with my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee to help protect Americans from potentially harmful products. That is the reason I requested this subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this particular measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who is the chair of the subcommittee and one of the major sponsors of the bill.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PALLONE and my ranking member because this is such an important bipartisan bill that is designed to save lives.

My colleague, TONY CÁRDENAS, and I introduced the Safe Sleep for Babies Act after the release of several devastating reports linking inclined sleep products and crib bumpers to infant deaths. This urgently needed legislation will add these dangerous products to the list of banned hazardous products under the Consumer Product Safety Act.

The science is clear: The safest sleep environment for babies is a flat, firm, bare surface with no restraints or soft bedding. Infant inclined sleep products and crib bumpers are dangerous and should not be on the market at all.

If we do not pass this legislation, companies will continue to sell and market these products that can harm and even kill infants, and infants will continue to be harmed if we don't act now. As a mother and grandmother, I know that we must act now to ensure that no more babies die from unsafe sleep products.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me rise with a great deal of concern and, as well, righteousness and enthusiasm to support the Safe Sleep for Babies Act of 2021.

Our children are our most precious resource, and no one knows how to address parents who have had a child lose their life because of devices that were sold to them to comfort their babies. The Safe Sleep for Babies Act of 2021, in particular, is going to help to take those products off that heretofore have gone without discovery, without assessment, and without penalty. They are devices that are in cribs and bassinets that have not been assessed to cause death.

Babies have been losing their lives to frightened parents, shocked parents, caretakers, and grandparents. What a tragedy to lose that infant in the early part of their life through no fault of the caretaker, the parent, and, certainly, that baby.

This legislation, I hope, will find its way quickly through the United States Senate and as well find its way quickly to the President's desk.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, we have, frighteningly, seen over the past weeks and months the loss of life of children through gun violence. We have a responsibility from the very birth of a child, from its time to come to be with its loving family, to find a way to protect and preserve its life. Babies, again, are enormously precious.

I think this legislation is long overdue. I ask my colleagues to support the Safe Sleep for Babies Act of 2021. I am glad to join the Energy and Commerce Committee and its original sponsor, Mr. CÁRDENAS, to be able to, hopefully, move this bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this very important bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask for support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3182.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

STOP TIP-OVERS OF UNSTABLE, RISKY DRESSERS ON YOUTH ACT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1314) to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety rule for free-standing clothing storage units to protect children from tip-over related death or injury, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1314

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 ''Stop Tip-overs of Unstable, Risky Dressers on Youth Act'' or the ''STURDY Act''.

SEC. 2. CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY STANDARD TO PROTECT AGAINST TIP-OVER OF CLOTHING STORAGE UNITS.

(a) CLOTHING STORAGE UNIT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''clothing storage unit'' means any free-standing furniture item manufactured in the United States or imported for use in the United States that is intended for the storage of clothing, typical of bedroom furniture.

(b) CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY STANDARD REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c)(1), not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Consumer Product Safety Commission shall—

(A) in consultation with representatives of consumer groups, clothing storage unit manufacturers, craft or handmade furniture manufacturers, and independent child product engineers and experts, examine and assess the effectiveness of any voluntary consumer product safety standards for clothing storage units; and

(B) in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, promulgate a final consumer product safety standard for clothing storage units to protect children from tip-over-related death or injury that includes—

(i) tests that simulate the weight of children up to 60 pounds;

(ii) objective, repeatable, and measurable tests that simulate real world use and account for any impact on clothing storage unit stability that may result from placement on carpeted surfaces, drawers with items in them, multiple open drawers, or dynamic force;

(iii) testing of all clothing storage units, including those under 30 inches in height; and

(iv) warning requirements based on ASTM F2057–17, or its successor at the time of enactment, provided that the Consumer Product Safety Commission shall strengthen the requirements of ASTM F2057–17, or its successor, if reasonably necessary to protect children from tip-over-related death or injury.

(2) TREATMENT OF STANDARD.—A consumer product safety standard promulgated under paragraph (1) shall be treated as a consumer product safety rule promulgated under section 9 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2058).

(c) SUBSEQUENT RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At any time subsequent to the publication of a consumer product safety standard under subsection (b)(1), the Commission may initiate a rulemaking, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to modify the requirements of the consumer product safety standard described in subsection (b)(1) if reasonably necessary to protect children from tip-over-related death or injury.

(2) REVISION OF RULE.—If, after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention revises its Clinical Growth Charts, the consumer product safety standard described in subsection (b)(1) shall, on the date that is 180 days after such revision, be revised to include tests that simulate the weight of children up to the 95th percentile weight of children 72 months in age, as depicted in the revised Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Clinical Growth Charts, unless the Commission determines the modification is not reasonably necessary to protect children from tip-over-related death or injury.

(3) TREATMENT OF RULES.—Any rule promulgated under paragraph (1) or revision made pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be treated as a consumer product safety rule promulgated under section 9 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2058).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1314.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 1314, the STURDY Act. I want to begin by thanking Consumer Protection and Commerce Subcommittee Chair SCHAKOWSKY for championing and reintroducing this critical piece of legislation, which will help protect children from deadly furniture tip-overs.

Tip-overs remain one of the top five hidden hazards in the home. According to new data from the Consumer Product Safety Commission, between 2000 and 2019, tip-over incidents have been linked to more than 450 child fatalities and tens of thousands more injuries.

Every 46 minutes a child is injured in a tip-over incident. The victims tend to be young children who are curious and creative, eager to climb and play make-believe with the world around them. But dressers pose a deadly danger, and their crushing weight can lead to tragedy in just minutes.

These incidents often happen silently, too. Parents who have lost children from furniture tip-overs report never hearing the dresser falling because the child's body had absorbed the brunt of the impact or a child was pinned in such a way that he or she couldn't even scream or cry out.

The current voluntary furniture stability standards are woefully inadequate and have not stopped children from dying from unstable dressers. In March, Consumer Reports reported on two tip-over incidents, including one death that happened within 1 week of each other, highlighting the ongoing and urgent need for this lifesaving legislation.

□ 1515

Our children deserve a strong, mandatory standard that keeps them safe from such a common household danger. Right now, the current voluntary standard only applies to dressers 30 inches or taller, despite multiple fatalities and injuries involving shorter dressers.

Also, the voluntary testing doesn't incorporate the upper weight range for children affected by tip-overs. It also ignores real-world dynamics, such as the movement of drawers and different flooring surfaces that a dresser might be resting on.

The STURDY Act would finally establish a strong mandatory furniture stability safety standard and protect children from being crushed under the weight of their bedroom furniture. This legislation will save lives, and that is why I call on my colleagues to support this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill directs the Consumer Products Safety Commission to issue a consumer product safety standard for clothing storage units to protect children from tip-over related injuries, as the chairman stated.

The CPSC has recognized this as one of the top five potential hidden hazards in the home, with an average of one child fatality every 2 weeks from falling furniture and appliances. It is good to restate it because people need to know.

We support this bill moving forward with House passage today. I thank the chairwoman of the subcommittee, my colleague, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for championing this bill; along with Mr. CÁRDENAS and all of the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1314, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the chairwoman of the subcommittee and sponsor of this bill. I am sure many have noticed today that many of these bills that protect consumers, particularly children, have been championed by Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PALLONE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, since 2000, more than 460 children have died from furniture tip-overs, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission has reported that tip-overs cause an average of 25,500 emergency room-treated injuries every year as children are crushed, trapped, or stuck by furniture.

These deaths and injuries should never have happened in the first place, but they continue to happen because current furniture stability standards are both inadequate and only voluntary. We can't continue to allow the furniture industry to regulate itself. It hasn't worked and it has come at a cost of children's lives.

That is why I have reintroduced the legislation, the STURDY Act, H.R. 1314, which would strengthen and make mandatory furniture stabilization standards for clothing storage units.

No parent should have to worry about their children being injured, or worse, by a piece of furniture.

I want to give a special shout-out to the organization Kids In Danger that has been advocating for this for a long time, and for the moms who came to this Congress and told the stories of their lost children because of these tip-overs. Their stories have moved everyone who has heard them.

It is time now that we act. We can do something to help prevent these furniture tip-overs that put our Nation's children in danger.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman SCHAKOWSKY for championing this very important bill. The best ideas come from the people, from our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill swiftly, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I also urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and the founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1314, the "Stop Tip-Overs of Unstable, Risky Dressers on Children Act," or "STURDY Act," which directs the Consumer Product Safety Commission to adopt a stronger, mandatory stability standard for clothing storage units within one year of enactment, following the streamlined rulemaking process that it has used for numerous children's products.

A tip-over can involve a piece of furniture, often a dresser or other type of clothing storage unit, falling onto a small child.

These dangerous episodes can lead to a trip to the emergency room, or even death.

A child is sent to the emergency room because of a tip-over incident every 60 minutes, and on average, 1 to 2 children die every month.

Children age 2 to 5 are at the highest risk—their motor abilities allow them to navigate the home by themselves and their intellectual development makes them curious about objects that might be out of reach.

In June 2016, IKEA recalled 29 million dressers and chests due to a tipover hazard;

at least 8 children died in tragic tip-over accidents and hundreds of children have been injured by IKEA furniture.

Mr. Speaker, relying upon a voluntary standard for dressers is not enough to protect our children from tip-overs.

The voluntary standard only tests whether a dresser or drawer will tip with 50 lbs. hanging from an open drawer.

This standard has not proven stringent enough to reduce tip-overs, and it also only applies to dressers over 27 inches.

Even as weak as it is, dressers do not have to meet this voluntary standard.

That is why the STURDY Act is needed; it will help prevent the deaths of children from tip-overs.

Specifically, the STURDY Act:

1. Mandates testing on all clothing units;

2. Requires testing to simulate the weights of children up to 72 months old;

3. Requires testing measures to account for scenarios involving carpeting, loaded drawers, and the dynamic force of a climbing child;

4. Mandates strong warning requirements; and

5. Requires the CPSC to issue the mandatory standard within 1 year of the STURDY Act's enactment.

I strongly support H.R. 1314, the Stop Tip-Overs of Unstable, Risky Dressers on Youth Act, and urge all Members to join me in voting for its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1314.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

TRIBAL HEALTH DATA IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2021

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3841) to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the collection and availability of health data with respect to Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3841

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 ''Tribal Health Data Improvement Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. COLLECTION AND AVAILABILITY OF HEALTH DATA WITH RESPECT TO INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) DATA COLLECTION.—Section 3101(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300kk(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking '', by not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this title,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''Tribal,'' after ''State,''.

(b) DATA REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION.—Section 3101(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300kk(c)) is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (F) of paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(F) the Indian Health Service, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and epidemiology centers authorized under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act;''; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and epidemiology centers,'' after ''Federal agencies,''.

(c) PROTECTION AND SHARING OF DATA.—Section 3101(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300kk(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(3) DATA SHARING STRATEGY.—With respect to data access for Tribal epidemiology centers and Tribes, the Secretary shall create a data sharing strategy that takes into consideration recommendations by the Secretary's Tribal Advisory Committee for—

''(A) ensuring that Tribal epidemiology centers and Indian Tribes have access to the data sources necessary to accomplish their public health responsibilities; and

''(B) protecting the privacy and security of such data.

''(4) TRIBAL PUBLIC HEALTH AUTHORITY.—

''(A) AVAILABILITY.—Beginning not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Tribal Health Data Improvement Act of 2021, the Secretary shall make available to the entities listed in subparagraph (B) all data that is collected pursuant to this title with respect to health care and public health surveillance programs and activities, including such programs and activities that are federally supported or conducted, so long as—

''(i) such entities request the data pursuant to statute; and

''(ii) the data is requested for use—

''(I) consistent with Federal law and obligations; and

''(II) to satisfy a particular purpose or carry out a specific function consistent with the purpose for which the data was collected.

''(B) ENTITIES.—The entities listed in this subparagraph are—

''(i) the Indian Health Service;

''(ii) Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations; and

''(iii) epidemiology centers.''.

(d) TECHNICAL UPDATES.—Section 3101 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300kk) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (g) and (h); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (h).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—After executing the amendments made by subsection (d), section 3101 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300kk) is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'epidemiology center' means an epidemiology center established under section 214 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, including such Tribal epidemiology centers serving Indian Tribes regionally and any Tribal epidemiology center serving Urban Indian organizations nationally.

''(2) The term 'Indian Tribe' has the meaning given to the term 'Indian tribe' in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

''(3) The term 'Tribal organization' has the meaning given to the term 'tribal organization' in section 4 of the of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

''(4) The term 'Urban Indian organization' has the meaning given to that term in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.''.

(f) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 3101(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300kk(b)) is amended by striking ''DATA ANALYSIS.—'' and all that follows through ''For each federally'' and inserting ''DATA ANALYSIS.—For each federally''.

SEC. 3. IMPROVING HEALTH STATISTICS REPORTING WITH RESPECT TO INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) TECHNICAL AID TO STATES AND LOCALITIES.—Section 306(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242k(d)) is amended by inserting '', Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and epidemiology centers'' after ''jurisdictions''.

(b) COOPERATIVE HEALTH STATISTICS SYSTEM.—Section 306(e)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242k(e)(3)) is amended by inserting '', Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and epidemiology centers'' after ''health agencies''.

(c) FEDERAL-STATE-TRIBAL COOPERATION.—Section 306(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242k(f)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''the Indian Health Service,'' before ''the Departments of Commerce'';

(2) by inserting a comma after ''the Departments of Commerce and Labor'';

(3) by inserting '', Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and epidemiology centers'' after ''State and local health departments and agencies''; and

(4) by striking ''he shall'' and inserting ''the Secretary shall''.

(d) REGISTRATION AREA RECORDS.—Section 306(h)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242k(h)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''in his discretion'' and inserting ''in the discretion of the Secretary''; and

(2) by striking ''Hispanics, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders'' and inserting ''American Indians and Alaska Natives, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders''.

(e) NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON VITAL AND HEALTH STATISTICS.—Section 306(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242k(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking '', not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996,'' each place it appears; and

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking ''Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, and annually thereafter, the Committee shall'' and inserting ''The Committee shall, on a biennial basis,''.

(f) GRANTS FOR ASSEMBLY AND ANALYSIS OF DATA ON ETHNIC AND RACIAL POPULATIONS.—Section 306(m)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242k(m)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''Subject to subparagraph (B), the'' and inserting ''The''; and

(B) by striking ''and major Hispanic subpopulation groups and American Indians'' and inserting '', major Hispanic subgroups, and American Indians and Alaska Natives''; and

(2) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) In carrying out subparagraph (A), with respect to American Indians and Alaska Natives, the Secretary shall—

''(i) consult with Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, the Tribal Technical Advisory Group of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services maintained under section 5006(e) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, and the Tribal Advisory Committee established by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in coordination with epidemiology centers, to develop guidelines for State and local health

agencies to improve the quality and accuracy of data with respect to the birth and death records of American Indians and Alaska Natives;

''(ii) confer with Urban Indian organizations to develop guidelines for State and local health agencies to improve the quality and accuracy of data with respect to the birth and death records of American Indians and Alaska Natives;

''(iii) enter into cooperative agreements with Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and epidemiology centers to address misclassification and undersampling of American Indians and Alaska Natives with respect to—

''(I) birth and death records; and

''(II) health care and public health surveillance systems, including, but not limited to, data with respect to chronic and infectious diseases, unintentional injuries, environmental health, child and adolescent health, maternal health and mortality, foodborne and waterborne illness, reproductive health, and any other notifiable disease or condition;

''(iv) encourage States to enter into data sharing agreements with Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and epidemiology centers to improve the quality and accuracy of public health data; and

''(v) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Tribal Health Data Improvement Act of 2021, and biennially thereafter, issue a report on the following:

''(I) Which States have data sharing agreements with Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and Tribal epidemiology centers to improve the quality and accuracy of health data.

''(II) What the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is doing to encourage States to enter into data sharing agreements with Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and Tribal epidemiology centers to improve the quality and accuracy of health data.

''(III) Best practices and guidance for States, Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, Urban Indian organizations, and Tribal epidemiology centers that wish to enter into data sharing agreements.

''(IV) Best practices and guidance for local, State, Tribal, and Federal uniform standards for the collection of data on race and ethnicity.''.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—Section 306 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242k) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (m) the following:

''(n) In this section:

''(1) The term 'epidemiology center' means an epidemiology center established under section 214 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, including such Tribal epidemiology centers serving Indian Tribes regionally and any Tribal epidemiology center serving Urban Indian organizations nationally.

''(2) The term 'Indian Tribe' has the meaning given to the term 'Indian tribe' in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

''(3) The term 'Tribal organization' has the meaning given to the term 'tribal organization' in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

''(4) The term 'Urban Indian organization' has the meaning given to that term in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.''.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 306(o) of the Public Health Service Act, as redesignated by subsection (g), is amended to read as follows:

''(o)(1) To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $185,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

''(2) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall not use more than 10 percent for the combined costs of—

''(A) administration of this section; and

''(B) carrying out subsection (m)(2).''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H.R. 3841.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, American Indian and Alaska Native communities experience disproportionately worse health outcomes than other groups in the United States. The root causes of these poor health outcomes are complex, but, unfortunately, not surprising. For centuries, American Indian and Alaska Native communities have been displaced and damaged by violence, poverty, disease, and adverse social conditions. As a result, Tribal members live shorter lives than any other demographic group.

Unfortunately, the COVID–19 pandemic has also devastated Tribal communities. According to data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, American Indians and Alaska Natives are at greater risk of COVID–19 infection and more than three times more likely to be hospitalized.

Moreover, there are significant gaps in data collection and the full picture of the disease burden is really unknown. So it is important for us to improve Tribal health data collection efforts so that we can improve health outcomes. Tribal Epidemiology Centers manage regional public health information systems and disease prevention and control services. These centers also collaborate with other public health authorities to study, collect, and analyze epidemiological data.

Clear communication and coordination by Federal, State, and local public health departments is necessary to the success and security of these efforts. So the bill before us, H.R. 3841, the Tribal Health Data Improvement Act, equips Tribal communities with enhanced resources to collect public health data and adapt public health programs to improve health outcomes.

The bill clarifies the Federal Government's role in the collection and distribution of public health and disease surveillance data. It does this by creating a strategy to share information with the Indian Health Service, Indian Tribes and organizations, and Tribal Epidemiology Centers.

The legislation requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to release all applicable public health data to Tribal entities within 180 days of enactment.

It also requires the CDC to encourage and enhance collaborative efforts between States and Tribal organizations to synergize data collection.

Finally, the bill reauthorizes the National Center for Health Statistics with an additional $185 million in funding to implement the programs established by the legislation.

I thank Representatives MULLIN and O'HALLERAN for their bipartisan efforts to bringing this bill forward. They are always champions for the Tribes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3841, the Tribal Health Data Improvement Act of 2021, introduced by my Energy and Commerce colleagues, Representatives MULLIN and O'HALLERAN.

This important public health bill addresses the chronic challenges faced by Tribal Nations and Tribal Epidemiology Centers in gaining access to critical healthcare and public health surveillance data.

Obtaining this data is necessary for engaging in preventative public health work and combating the current health crises in American Indian and Alaska Native communities.

Structural barriers to accessing data have been especially problematic during the COVID–19 pandemic, which has disproportionately impacted these communities. In order to ensure that Tribal Nations and Tribal Epidemiology Centers have access to the data necessary to accomplish public health priorities, the bill requires that the Secretary of HHS create a data-sharing strategy that takes into consideration the recommendations of the Secretary's Tribal Advisory Committee.

In addition, in reauthorizing the CDC's National Center for Health Statistics, the bill requires the Secretary to make public health surveillance data available to the Indian Health Service, Indian Tribes, the Tribal organizations, and Tribal Epidemiology Centers so long as the data requested for use is consistent with Federal law and obligations.

The Secretary must also consult with Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, urban Indian organizations, and the Tribal Technical Advisory Group of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to develop guidelines for State and local health agencies to improve the quality and accuracy of birth and death records of American Indians and Alaska Natives.

It makes a lot of sense. By improving the sharing of data between the Federal Government and the Tribes, this

important bill would help address the health disparities in American Indian and Alaska Native communities.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this particular bill. Let's pass this bill swiftly and get it to the Senate.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I also urge support for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3841.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, on all of these good bills that are being debated with strong bipartisan support on the Democratic side and the Republican side when they go to a voice vote, Mr. Speaker, does there need to be even one ''no'' vote, which there have not been for this whole series, for a Member to ask for a recorded vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper point of order, but the Chair would inform Members that the gentleman from Montana requested the yeas and nays, and pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

PREVENTING CRIMES AGAINST VETERANS ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 983) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 983

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 ''Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL TOOL TO PREVENT CERTAIN FRAUDS AGAINST VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1352. Fraud regarding veterans' benefits

''(a) Whoever knowingly executes, or attempts to execute, any scheme or artifice to defraud an individual of veterans' benefits, or in connection with obtaining veteran's benefits for that individual, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) In this section—

''(1) the term 'veteran' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38; and

''(2) the term 'veterans' benefits' means any benefit provided by Federal law for a veteran or a dependent or survivor of a veteran.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1352. Fraud regarding veterans' benefits.''.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1530

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. 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. 983.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 983, the Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2021, bipartisan legislation that would make it a crime to knowingly engage in any scheme to defraud a veteran of his or her veteran's benefits.

Our Nation owes a great debt to veterans. There are currently about 18 million veterans of the United States military, men and women who selflessly served our Nation.

Unfortunately, many of our veterans, as a result of their service, have physical and mental scars. There are well over 1 million American veterans with service-connected disabilities, and 43 percent of post-9/11 veterans have a service-connected disability which may entitle them to certain benefits.

Receipt of benefits requires the veteran to file an application and undergo a thorough review by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Sometimes these benefits are granted outright. Other times, the veteran must appeal their initial denial to receive the benefits they deserve.

Under current law, the VA allows agents or attorneys to assess a nominal fee to assist claimants who are appealing different aspects of their benefits. They are not permitted, however, to charge for services related to the initial preparation and filing of their claims.

Accordingly, it is currently illegal for a nonattorney or a person not registered as an agent to assist such initial claims. The rationale for this prohibition is that many veterans may fall victim to benefit fraud schemes, where individuals may divert benefits or apply for benefits that should not be awarded.

To enforce this prohibition, Federal prosecutors currently rely on the wire and mail fraud statutes to ensure that nonattorneys or nonregistered agents do not assist in benefit applications or unlawfully divert benefits.

However, if an unauthorized individual offers a veteran assistance in person, they cannot be prosecuted under current fraud statutes. The wire and mail fraud statutes do not extend to in-person fraudulent schemes.

The Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act would close this critical loophole and would ensure that in-person benefit fraud schemes may also be prosecuted.

For example, in one instance, a scammer held briefing seminars in a senior community. He asked the staff to round up the veterans, then used high-pressure sales tactics to coerce the veterans to apply for benefits.

In-person solicitation like this requires no electronic or mail transmission and, thus, evades wire and mail fraud criminal prohibitions. Other reports indicate that scammers have also been known to hand out flyers outside of VA regional medical centers and VA regional offices to identify unwitting veterans.

These examples are precisely why closing this loophole is so critically important. Under H.R. 983, anyone convicted of such crimes could be fined, imprisoned, or be subject to both penalties.

By adopting this bill, Congress would affirm the integrity of the benefits program and would protect veterans and their survivors who receive payments, such as those to veterans with service-connected disabilities, pensions for veterans with limited incomes, and education and training payments under the GI bill.

In recognition of the extreme sacrifice by our veterans and the hardships many of them continue to face after their military service, it is our duty to provide, to the best of our ability, an appropriate measure of compensation for them, particularly for those who are in need.

This legislation would ensure that attempts to defraud them of the benefits they need and deserve may be fully prosecuted.

I commend the bill's sponsors, Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. FITZPATRICK, for their hard work and bipartisan efforts to address this critical problem.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today makes a small but significant change to the Federal fraud statutes to protect veterans from criminals who seek to steal their benefits. It does so by inserting a new provision into the criminal code to complement the mail and wire fraud statutes.

Unfortunately, there have been reports in recent years of criminals entering nursing homes in search of elderly veterans with the intent to defraud them of their Federal benefits.

Like many crimes of fraud, these fraudsters present themselves to their victims as a helping hand in a time of need. This is a truly despicable crime worthy of this body's attention.

This legislation has passed this House three times by overwhelming margins, including a vote of 417–0 last Congress.

Our men and women in uniform have sacrificed much for us. They have earned our gratitude, our respect, and our protection.

Mr. Speaker, there is little, in my mind, more contemptuous than someone who tries to defraud a veteran of what they have earned in defense of our country. We must put an end to this fraud.

I urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 983, the Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act.

Financial fraud is an increasingly sophisticated enterprise. The unfortunate reality is that our Nation's veterans have become one of its biggest new targets.

Far too often, so-called pension poachers prey on elderly veterans. They use high-pressure sales pitches to con vulnerable veterans, survivors, and their families out of their hard-earned and well-deserved benefits.

Scammers make big promises, knowing that they will never be able to deliver. In the end, they leave veterans with their personal information and financial security compromised.

These criminals not only prey on our veterans, they prey on every American taxpayer who wants to do right by those who have served our country. Sadly, the COVID–19 pandemic has only made the situation worse, as scams have been on the rise.

The VA, community groups, and veterans service organizations are working to alert and educate our communities about these scams. But Congress must ensure that we do not let pension poachers get away with taking advantage of those who have served.

Unfortunately, our current laws fail to keep up with the increasing complexity of these fraudulent schemes.

This bill will give Federal prosecutors the tools they need to target criminals who actively work to avoid current mail and wire fraud statutes. It will specifically outlaw attempts to defraud veterans of their benefits.

It is past time that we take action to crack down on pension poachers and other fraudsters who prey on our veterans.

I want to thank the Palm Beach County Veterans Services office including, Greg Dover, Jose Capellan, Rohn Hultgren, Andrew Reese, and Yolanda Asante. They are working hard to help veterans receive their benefits, and they first raised the troubling rise of pension poaching with me years ago.

I thank Congressman FITZPATRICK for his leadership on this important bipartisan effort. Again, I want to thank Mr. NADLER and the gentleman from North Carolina, and I am thankful to every Member of this body who voted to pass this legislation last Congress 417–0.

I would, again, ask my colleagues to support and honor our veterans by passing the Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act. Our veterans have done so much to protect this Nation. It is now our turn, and this bill is an opportunity for us to help protect them.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to lend my voice in support of H.R. 983, the Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act, and I congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for his work, again, on an enormously commonsense bill.

This is a commonsense and needed bipartisan fix to close a loophole in Federal law that allows con artists who make in-person pitches to defraud veterans of their well-earned benefits.

The State of Texas is home to 1.5 million veterans, and the State of Texas operates a large network of nursing homes for veterans.

All of us have heard stories in our offices, through our veterans' caseworker, of the horrible, horrible attacks on veterans because of the benefits they receive. Yes, financial attacks. And they are attacks. Unlike the battlefield, where they can defend themselves, these attacks, they cannot.

Veterans at these homes and veterans seeking treatment at medical treatment facilities may be susceptible to the in-person grifters falsely claiming that they can facilitate the provisions of additional veterans' benefits.

This bill would help hold scammers accountable and allow the Department of Justice to protect the integrity of veterans' benefits programs. Protecting veterans and their survivors from these types of in-person scams is particularly important, since so many depend on service-connected disability payments.

As chair of the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee, I am focused on addressing fraud and other veterans' issues.

To that end, I ask my colleagues today to join me as I also work on legislation to buttress veterans' courts and to make them a more equitable and successful rehabilitation model.

I thank my colleague from the Judiciary Committee, TED DEUTCH, for championing this bill and persisting in his effort.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to lend my voice in support of H.R. 983, the "Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act."

This bill is a commonsense and needed bipartisan fix to close a loophole in federal law that allows con artists who make in-person pitches to defraud veterans of their well-earned benefits.

My state of Texas is home to nearly 1.5 million veterans, and the state of Texas operates a large network of nursing homes for veterans.

Veterans at these homes and veterans seeking treatment at medical treatment facilities may be susceptible to the in-person grifters falsely claiming that they can facilitate the provision of additional veterans benefits.

This bill would help hold scammers accountable and allow the Department of Justice to protect the integrity of veterans' benefits programs. Protecting veterans and their survivors from these types of in-person scams is particularly important since so many depend on service-connected disability payments.

As Chair of the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee, I am focused on addressing fraud and other veterans' issues.

To that end, I ask my colleagues here today to join me as I also work on legislation to buttress veterans' courts and to make them more equitable and successful rehabilitation models.

I thank my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Representative TED DEUTCH, for championing this bill and persisting in this effort.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, Congress owes a continuing debt to veterans. This bill would help protect the more than 1 million veterans diagnosed with service-connected disabilities who receive related benefits, as well as the thousands who are undiagnosed and may apply for such benefits in the future.

Helping to ensure that their benefits are protected against fraud, as H.R. 983 would do, is one way of expressing our appreciation for veterans' service.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to lend my voice in support of H.R. 983, the "Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act."

This bill is a commonsense and needed bipartisan fix to close a loophole in federal law that allows con artists who make in-person

pitches to defraud veterans of their well-earned benefits.

My state of Texas is home to nearly 1.5 million veterans, and the state of Texas operates a large network of nursing homes for veterans.

Veterans at these homes and veterans seeking treatment at medical treatment facilities may be susceptible to the in-person grifters falsely claiming that they can facilitate the provision of additional veterans benefits.

This bill would help hold scammers accountable and allow the Department of Justice to protect the integrity of veterans' benefits programs. Protecting veterans and their survivors from these types of in-person scams is particularly important since so many depend on service-connected disability payments.

As Chair of the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee, I am focused on addressing fraud and other veterans' issues.

To that end, I ask my colleagues here today to join me as I also work on legislation to buttress veterans' courts and to make them more equitable and successful rehabilitation models.

I thank my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Representative TED DEUTCH, for championing this bill and persisting in this effort.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and the Chair of its Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, I rise in strong support of H.R. 983, the "Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act," commonsense and necessary bipartisan legislation that establishes a new criminal offense for knowingly engaging in or attempting to engage in a scheme to defraud veterans of their hard-earned benefits.

My state of Texas is home to nearly 1.5 million veterans, and the state operates a large network of nursing homes for veterans called Texas State Veterans Homes.

Houston houses over 282,000 of these veterans, many of whom live in these state-owned nursing homes.

Veterans at these Texas nursing homes or those seeking treatment at medical facilities are susceptible to in-person scammers falsely claiming that they can facilitate the provision of additional veterans benefits when they are actually swindling veterans out of their benefits.

H.R. 983 will help hold these con artists accountable and provide an additional tool to the Department of Justice to protect the integrity of veterans' benefits programs and prevent fraud.

Protecting veterans and their survivors from these types of in-person scams is imperative since so many depend on service-connected disability payments, including those in my district in Houston.

I ask my colleagues here today to join me as I also work on legislation to strengthen veterans' courts and to make them more equitable and successful rehabilitation models.

I thank my colleague from the Judiciary Committee, Congressman DEUTCH of Florida, for championing this bill and persisting in his effort to protect our veterans with this legislation.

I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 983, the Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 983, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

CRIMINAL JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2694) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for transportation and subsistence for criminal justice defendants, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2694

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 ''Criminal Judicial Administration Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. TRANSPORTATION AND SUBSISTENCE FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT DEFENDANTS.

Section 4285 of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking ''when the interests of justice would be served thereby and the United States judge or magistrate judge is satisfied, after appropriate inquiry, that the defendant is financially unable to provide the necessary transportation to appear before the required court on his own'' and inserting ''when the United States judge or magistrate judge is satisfied that the defendant is indigent based on appointment of counsel pursuant to section 3006A, or, after appropriate inquiry, that the defendant is financially unable to provide necessary transportation on his own'';

(2) by striking ''to the place where his appearance is required,'' and inserting ''(1) to the place where each appearance is required and (2) to return to the place of the person's arrest or bona fide residence,''; and

(3) by striking ''to his destination,'' and inserting ''which includes money for both lodging and food, during travel to the person's destination and during any proceeding at which the person's appearance is required''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE USE OF MAGISTRATE JUDGES TO DECIDE POSTJUDGMENT MOTIONS.

Section 3401 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking ''and'' after ''trial, judgment,'';

(B) in the second sentence, by inserting '', and rulings on all post-judgment motions'' after ''sentencing'';

(C) in the third sentence, by striking ''and'' after ''trial, judgment,''; and

(D) in the third sentence, by inserting '', and rulings on all post-judgment motions'' after ''sentencing'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking '', with the approval of a judge of the district court,''; and

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

''(j) A magistrate judge who exercises trial jurisdiction under this section, in either a petty offense case or a misdemeanor case in which the defendant has consented to a magistrate judge, may also rule on all post-judgment motions in that case, including but not limited to petitions for writs of habeas corpus, writs of coram nobis, motions to vacate a sentence under section 2255 of title 28, and motions related to mental competency under chapter 313 of this title.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. 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. 2694.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2694, the Criminal Judicial Administration Act of 2021, is bipartisan legislation that makes two modest but important amendments to current law, promoting efficient, effective, and fair administration of justice.

The first part of this bill concerns out-of-custody criminal defendants, particularly those who are released pending trial to live in communities that are located far from the courthouses where their cases are being heard.

Most Federal criminal defendants are detained pending trial. The U.S. Marshals Service is responsible for housing and transporting them to court hearings, including trial. Under current law, the court may order the marshals to provide funds for a criminal defendant who is released pending trial but cannot afford the cost of travel to the location of the courthouse for required court proceedings.

However, defendants must fund their own way back home, and defendants in this position are not able to receive financial support from the marshals for subsistence, such as lodging and meals. For an indigent defendant, these costs are sometimes insurmountable.

For years, Federal courts have struggled with how to assist indigent defendants when they find themselves in these difficult situations. Unfortunately, the courts' efforts have come up against the text of the statute.

This bill would authorize courts, in the interest of justice, to order the U.S. marshals to cover roundtrip travel and subsistence for defendants who must attend court hearings but who cannot afford to pay this on their own. The Judicial Conference of the United States has urged us to correct this grave unfairness, and I am pleased to see that we are finally doing so with this bill.

The second part of this bill, concerning Federal magistrate judges, is

also supported by the Judicial Conference. Magistrate judges have trial jurisdiction over certain misdemeanors, except for Class A misdemeanors, for which the maximum sentence is up to 1 year in custody. With a defendant's consent, however, a magistrate judge may exercise trial jurisdiction over a case involving a Class A misdemeanor. Magistrate judges frequently do so and often hear Class A misdemeanor cases all the way through judgment and sentencing.

□ 1545

Under current law, a magistrate judge's jurisdiction ends after judgment is entered in a misdemeanor case, and post-judgment jurisdiction reverts to the district court. Indeed, magistrate judges are not authorized to hear post-judgment motions, such as motions to vacate a sentence, even though they are the ones who handled the entire matter at the trial level and are best equipped to hear such post-judgment motions.

Among other things, this bill would authorize a magistrate judge to hear post-judgment motions in misdemeanor cases in which he or she exercised trial jurisdiction. This amendment clearly improves judicial economy and makes perfect sense.

This is a straightforward and bipartisan measure that will help our criminal justice system operate in a more effective and fair manner. I thank Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. ROY for sponsoring this legislation, and I urge all Members to support it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2694, the Criminal Judicial Administration Act of 2021.

This bill strengthens existing laws that provide for the transportation and subsistence for indigent criminal defendants when they are brought to court proceedings.

H.R. 2694 also allows a magistrate judge to finally decide post-judgment motions in a misdemeanor case where that magistrate judge was the judge who handled the underlying case.

This provision will improve the efficiency of our court system by allowing our courts to manage caseloads in a more economical manner.

I thank the bipartisan sponsors of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2694, the Criminal Judicial Administration Act of 2021.

This legislation reflects another step in our ongoing work commitment to ensure that justice is administered fairly and equally in this country.

The first part of the bill relates to our Federal pretrial system. I thank Mr. NADLER, our chairman; and, of course, the author of this bill, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

As we work on changes to our pretrial system, we must also make certain that indigent defendants who are released on bail pending trial, who live far away from the courthouse in which they must appear, can make it to the court for required appearances.

As the chair of the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee, it is our committee that deals with the criminal justice system and the system that should be fair to victim and alleged perpetrator. That means that individuals who are defendants and are indigent must be able to get to the courthouse in order to assure a fair justice system.

For out-of-custody defendants, the financial and emotional toll of making required court appearances is considerable. It can mean taking time off from sorely needed jobs, sometimes without compensation, or shifting scarce household resources to make it to court on time and to avoid rearrest for failure to appear.

These challenges are heightened for defendants who have cases pending in districts that are far from where they live. This distance can also lead to unnecessary pretrial detention, as courts wrestle with how to ensure that defendants who live out of their districts can make required court appearances. This is a commonsense legislative initiative.

H.R. 2694 gives courts the ability to direct the U.S. marshals to provide for roundtrip travel and subsistence for indigent defendants or those who cannot otherwise afford those costs to attend court during the pendency of their cases.

This is an important step in our work on Federal pretrial reform, and, as I said, common sense in fairness of the system.

The second part of the bill promotes judicial economy by allowing magistrate judges to oversee the entirety of the cases in which they exercised trial jurisdiction. This administrative step is important for our overburdened Federal judiciary and our efforts to fairly administer justice to all individuals. That is certainly the responsibility of those of us on the House Judiciary Committee.

I thank Representative JEFFRIES for his work on this bill, which I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2694, the Criminal Judicial Administration Act of 2021. This legislation reflects another step in our ongoing work and commitment to ensure that justice is administered fairly and equally in this country.

The first part of the bill relates to our federal pretrial system.

As we work on changes to our pretrial system, we must also make certain that indigent defendants who are released on bail pending trial—but live far away from the courthouse in which they must appear—can make it to court for required appearances.

For out-of-custody defendants, the financial and emotional toll of making required court appearances is considerable. It can mean missing time off from sorely needed jobs, sometimes without compensation, or shifting scarce household resources to make it to court on time and to avoid re-arrest for failure to appear.

These challenges are heightened for defendants who have cases pending in districts that are far from where they live. This distance can also lead to unnecessary pretrial detention, as courts wrestle with how to ensure that defendants who live out of their districts can make required court appearances.

H.R. 2694 gives courts the ability to direct the U.S. Marshals to provide for roundtrip travel and subsistence for indigent defendants—or those who cannot otherwise afford these costs—to attend court during the pendency of their cases. This is an important step in our work on federal pretrial reform.

The second part of the bill promotes judicial economy by allowing magistrate judges to oversee the entirety of the cases in which they exercise trial jurisdiction. This administrative step is important for our overburdened federal judiciary, and our efforts to fairly administer justice to all individuals.

I thank Representative JEFFRIES for his work on this bill, which I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting today.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to improve the administration of justice through our court system by supporting this bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the Criminal Judicial Administration Act of 2021 would make several critical changes to improve the operation of our Federal criminal justice system.

I commend Representatives HAKEEM JEFFRIES and CHIP ROY for introducing the legislation, as well as their bipartisan cosponsors for their leadership in bringing these important issues to our attention.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan bill today.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2694, the Criminal Judicial Administration Act of 2021. This legislation reflects another step in our ongoing work and commitment to ensure that justice is administered fairly and equally in this country.

The first part of the bill relates to our federal pretrial system.

As we work on changes to our pretrial system, we must also make certain that indigent defendants who are released on bail pending trial—but live far away from the courthouse in which they must appear—can make it to court for required appearances.

For out-of-custody defendants, the financial and emotional toll of making required court appearances is considerable. It can mean missing time off from sorely needed jobs, sometimes without compensation, or shifting scarce

household resources to make it to court on time and to avoid re-arrest for failure to appear.

These challenges are heightened for defendants who have cases pending in districts that are far from where they live. This distance can also lead to unnecessary pretrial detention, as courts wrestle with how to ensure that defendants who live out of their districts can make required court appearances.

H.R. 2694 gives courts the ability to direct the U.S. Marshals to provide for roundtrip travel and subsistence for indigent defendants—or those who cannot otherwise afford these costs—to attend court during the pendency of their cases. This is an important step in our work on federal pretrial reform.

The second part of the bill promotes judicial economy by allowing magistrate judges to oversee the entirety of the cases in which they exercise trial jurisdiction. This administrative step is important for our overburdened federal judiciary, and our efforts to fairly administer justice to all individuals.

I thank Representative JEFFRIES for his work on this bill, which I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting today.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, everyone—regardless of their financial situation—should be able to fully and fairly defend themselves in court.

Unfortunately, however, many defendants who live very far away from the court trying their case cannot afford to get to and from their court appearances to defend themselves. The costs can be simply insurmountable.

This situation often makes poverty the difference between winning and losing a case, regardless of the facts.

That is not justice.

This bill helps make courtroom justice available to everyone by ensuring that travel and lodging costs are covered for low-income defendants.

This will help ensure justice for all defendants, not just those wealthy enough to afford it.

This bill also makes courtrooms more effective. It allows magistrate judges to rule on certain post-judgment issues that they previously could not adjudicate on cases that they handled at the trial level.

This is common sense. If a case has been with a judge through the entirety of the trial, that judge knows the case best and should be able to handle post-conviction issues.

As a former litigator, I believe this bill will help ensure that justice prevails and make our overburdened court system more efficient, and I thank Congressman JEFFRIES for introducing this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2694.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

ELDER ABUSE PROTECTION ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2922) to amend the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act to authorize the Elder Justice Initiative, to require that online resources of such initiative are made available in Spanish, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2922

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 ''Elder Abuse Protection Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. ELDER JUSTICE INITIATIVE.

Section 101(b) of the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act (34 U.S.C. 21711(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) ELDER JUSTICE INITIATIVE.—

''(1) PERMANENT INITIATIVE.—The Attorney General shall establish an Elder Justice Initiative to coordinate criminal enforcement and public engagement efforts to combat elder abuse, neglect, and financial fraud and scams that target elders, and to support and coordinate the efforts of the Elder Justice Coordinator designated under subsection (a).

''(2) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ELDER JUSTICE COORDINATOR.—The Attorney General shall designate an Elder Justice Coordinator within the Department of Justice who, in addition to any other responsibilities, shall be responsible for—

''(A) coordinating and supporting the law enforcement efforts and policy activities as the head of the Elder Justice Initiative for the Department of Justice on elder justice issues;

''(B) evaluating training models to determine best practices and creating or compiling and making publicly available replication guides and training materials for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, emergency responders, individuals working in victim services, adult protective services, social services, and public safety, medical personnel, mental health personnel, financial services personnel, and any other individuals whose work may bring them in contact with elder abuse regarding how to—

''(i) conduct investigations in elder abuse cases;

''(ii) address evidentiary issues and other legal issues; and

''(iii) appropriately assess, respond to, and interact with victims and witnesses in elder abuse cases, including in administrative, civil, and criminal judicial proceedings; and

''(C) carrying out such other duties as the Attorney General determines necessary in connection with enhancing the understanding, prevention, and detection of, and response to, elder abuse.

''(3) ONLINE PUBLIC RESOURCES.—The Elder Justice Initiative shall maintain and publish on the internet, information aimed at protecting elders from fraudulent schemes and contain resources aimed at preventing elder abuse.

''(4) TELEPHONE HOTLINE.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Elder Justice Coordinator and the Office of Victims of Crime, shall establish a national elder fraud telephone hotline to provide support to victims and resources to help victims, including referrals to federal, local and state law enforcement where appropriate.

''(5) TRIBAL CONSULTATION.—The Elder Justice Coordinator shall provide recommendations to the Office of Tribal Justice on a yearly basis on how to address elder abuse and elder fraud that takes place on federally recognized tribal reservations.

''(6) LEGAL AID.—The Elder Justice Coordinator shall consult with components of the Department of Justice to promote the provision of civil legal aid to victims of elder abuse and elder fraud.

''(7) SPANISH LANGUAGE RESOURCES.—The Attorney General shall ensure that Elder Justice Initiative online resources are available in Spanish and link linguistically appropriate resources to inform Spanish-speaking elders of Federal and State resources to combat fraud and abuse that targets the elderly, to include—

''(A) Spanish-language resources and links that help report instances of elder fraud and abuse to State and local law enforcement; and

''(B) resources that help prevent financial exploitation of elders.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2922.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2922, the bipartisan Elder Abuse Protection Act of 2021.

This bill would make permanent the Department of Justice's Elder Justice Initiative and would assign the initiative a number of critical responsibilities that would protect vulnerable seniors from fraud and abuse.

The bill includes critical elder abuse preventive measures, including an obligation to post elder abuse prevention resources online, to coordinate with the Office of Tribal Justice to address elder fraud on reservations, and to publish Spanish-language elder fraud and abuse materials. Additionally, the bill would authorize the Department's operation of the National Elder Fraud Hotline.

These changes are a testament to the importance this Congress places on elder justice and its continued commitment to address emerging elder fraud issues.

Sadly, tens of thousands of elderly Americans are abused and exploited every day. By one estimate, American seniors lose at least $2.9 billion each year due to financial abuse and exploitation. The U.S. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau similarly estimates that elder Americans suffer an average annual loss of $34,200 due to fraud.

Tragically, instances of elder fraud and abuse have only gone up. From 2013 to 2017, financial scams and other crimes targeting older Americans quadrupled. Elderly individuals are vulnerable to abuse on account of a myriad of factors, with social isolation and mental impairment, such as dementia or Alzheimer's disease, playing outsized roles.

By making permanent and expanding the Elder Justice Initiative's mandate, the Department of Justice can more effectively protect our Nation's seniors and prosecute instances of elder abuse. At a time when seniors are perhaps at their most vulnerable, it only makes sense that the government redouble its efforts to protect America's seniors.

It is particularly important that marginalized elder communities get the educational and preventive resources they need. The Elder Abuse Protection Act does exactly that by requiring that the Elder Justice Initiative coordinate with the Office of Tribal Justice on how to address elder abuse on reservations. This provision would mean fewer elder indigenous Americans will fall victim to exploitation.

The bill also makes permanent the elder abuse fraud hotline. With the hotline, concerned Americans can report instances of elder abuse directly to the Department of Justice, and victims can obtain support and resources that they need.

The Elder Abuse Protection Act also requires that the Elder Justice Initiative share their materials online and in Spanish. More Americans will have access to the DOJ's resources. Greater access to those materials is critical so that older Latinos, who comprise almost 4 million individuals, can also access these crucial resources.

In short, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2922 redoubles the government's commitment to preventing elder fraud and abuse, and to ensuring that seniors have access to the resources they need.

I thank Representatives GARCIA and SPARTZ, the sponsors of this bipartisan legislation, for their vision and their leadership on this important issue.

I strongly support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2922.

The Elder Abuse Protection Act builds on President Trump's strong record of protecting America's seniors and responding to elder abuse in America. In 2017, President Trump signed into law the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act to improve the justice system's response to victims of elder abuse and exploitation cases.

In 2018, President Trump signed an executive order that established a task force within the Justice Department that placed a new emphasis on the growing problems of cyber fraud and fraud targeting the elderly. Attorney General Barr appointed a National Elder Justice Coordinator to oversee the Department's work to combat elder fraud.

Because of the Trump administration's work, all 94 U.S. Attorney's offices now have a prosecutor dedicated to focus on the most pressing elder justice issues in each jurisdiction.

The Department also established an Elder Justice Initiative to support and coordinate the Department's enforcement and programmatic efforts to combat elder abuse, neglect, and financial fraud cases and scams that target our seniors.

This bill codifies the Trump administration's Elder Justice Initiative as a program within the Department of Justice. President Trump and his administration led on protecting American seniors. The bill before us today will make permanent the thoughtful and successful initiatives implemented by President Trump and Attorney General Barr.

I am pleased that my colleagues across the aisle recognize the leadership of President Trump and Attorney General Barr in these important areas. I thank the sponsor and cosponsor of this legislation.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan Elder Abuse Protection Act.

I proudly sponsored this legislation because, quite frankly, back in the day, when I was a geriatric social worker, I saw firsthand the abuse targeted against our seniors as consumers.

This bill will help ensure that our seniors today, the group that most disproportionately was impacted by COVID–19, are not continuing as targets of fraudulent crimes. I thank Representative SPARTZ for joining me in this legislation.

This March, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Internet Crime Complaint Center released its 2020 internet crime report, noting it received 105,301 complaints—over 100,000 complaints—from victims over the age of 60.

That was a whopping 54 percent increase from the 2019 numbers of 68,000 complaints. If you look at the cost and value of these complaints, it was $966 million, an approximate 15 percent increase from the 2019 number of $835 million.

What is worse, Mr. Speaker, is that these statistics reflect only those complaints in which the victim voluntarily provided their age range as over 60. So there may be even more.

Victims over the age of 60 are targeted by perpetrators because they are believed to have significant reliable financial resources.

The evidence is clear, as the United States ages, diversifies, and modernizes, the number of older adults experiencing elder abuse is, unfortunately, also projected to increase.

Elder abuse assessment measures and interventions are critical. This intervention is even more urgent for Latinos in our country who lack access to resources and information in their preferred language.

In 2017, the United States Department of Health and Human Services estimated that the Latino population in the United States age 65 and over was over 4 million people. By 2060, the Department projects the population of elderly Latinos in America to grow to 19.9 million, or 21 percent of the overall American elderly population. That is a huge number and growing.

Given these rapid growth rates and projected increases, public online resources should be made available to Americans with limited English proficiency. Providing Spanish language resources to the public will therefore reach an underserved population and will provide an important resource to millions of residents in the United States of America, especially to my home State of Texas.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNERNEY). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Unfortunately, due to the quarantine measures and limitations on visiting facilities and nursing homes, it has made it easier for abuse, neglect, and fraud to go undetected.

That is why this important legislation makes permanent a National Elder Fraud Hotline and requires the Elder Justice Coordinator to consult with the Office of Tribal Justice and designees on legal aid issues.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ).

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2922, the Elder Abuse Protection Act.

As we have seen through the recent pandemic, American seniors are among the most vulnerable population. As a former State senator, I dealt with many issues our elderly Hoosiers are facing in their lives.

The Trump administration made great strides in achieving justice for elderly Americans victimized by fraud and abuse. By standing up the Elder Justice Initiative, the administration charged nearly 1,000 defendants with fraud totaling over $2.2 billion.

The Elder Abuse Protection Act makes permanent this initiative, which will continue its important work under this bill to ensure criminals are held accountable.

This legislation is a very important step in the right direction to protect and take care of the people who used to care for us.

I thank my colleague, Representative SYLVIA GARCIA, for leading this critical effort, and I urge my colleagues to support this good legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I

thank the ranking member for his presentation and the gentlewoman for her presentation.

I am proud to support H.R. 2922, the Elder Abuse Protection Act, which has been supported by my colleague from Texas, the Honorable SYLVIA GARCIA.

As Chairman NADLER said and detailed, the sheer number of elder abuse cases is astounding and shameful, and the pandemic has only worsened the economic and emotional circumstances that so many seniors face.

This problem is particularly grave for linguistic minority groups. My hometown of Houston has a large Hispanic community, and I am particularly concerned with efforts to exploit my elder Spanish-speaking constituents.

In Texas, 20 percent of Hispanics are 65 years or older. One study of this population found that limited English proficiency was a barrier to accessing medical and social services.

That is why the thoughtful legislation offered by Congresswoman GARCIA is so very important, and its time is now.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of this bill because it would make permanent the Elder Justice Initiative in the Department of Justice and require it to translate into Spanish those resources the initiative makes available to the public. The cost of translating those educational materials is small compared to the benefit they would bring. It would be a modest undertaking for the Department of Justice, given that DOJ already has litigation translation services in place.

Lastly, this bill makes permanent the National Elder Fraud Hotline—very important. Since March 2020, the hotline has answered tens of thousands of calls from elder Americans who have called in need of support, offering a service to get information on how to prevent elder fraud for the many elder Americans who don't have access to the internet.

We all know the most vulnerable. These elders who have worked to build this country deserve to live their senior years in peace and tranquility and with respect and dignity. They do not deserve to be taken advantage of by fraudulent individuals, fraudulent schemes, and fraudulent practices. If we can do anything to help them, we should do it.

This legislation strongly helps them, and I commend Ms. GARCIA for championing this issue. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this much-needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 2922, the "Elder Abuse Protection Act."

As Chairman NADLER detailed, the sheer number of elder abuse cases is astounding and shameful, and the pandemic has only worsened the economic and emotional circumstances that so many seniors face.

This problem is particularly grave for linguistic-minority groups.

My hometown of Houston has a large Hispanic community, and I am particularly concerned with efforts to exploit my elder Spanish-speaking constituents.

In Texas, 20 percent of Hispanics are 65 years old or older. One study of this population found that limited English proficiency was a barrier to accessing medical and social services.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of this bill because it would make permanent the Elder Justice Initiative in the Department of Justice, and require it translate into Spanish those resources the initiative makes available to the public.

The cost of translating these educational materials is small compared to the benefit they would bring. It would be a modest undertaking for the Department of Justice, given that DOJ already has litigation translation services in place.

Lastly, this bill makes permanent the National Elder Fraud Hotline.

Since March 2020, the hotline has answered tens of thousands of calls from elder Americans who have called in need of support, offering a service to get information on how to prevent elder fraud for the many elder Americans don't have access to the internet.

I commend Ms. GARCIA for championing this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this much-needed legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very worthy bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 2922, the "Elder Abuse Protection Act."

As Chairman NADLER detailed, the sheer number of elder abuse cases is astounding and shameful, and the pandemic has only worsened the economic and emotional circumstances that so many seniors face.

This problem is particularly grave for linguistic-minority groups.

My hometown of Houston has a large Hispanic community, and I am particularly concerned with efforts to exploit my elder Spanish-speaking constituents.

In Texas, 20 percent of Hispanics are 65 years old or older. One study of this population found that limited English proficiency was a barrier to accessing medical and social services.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of this bill because it would make permanent the Elder Justice Initiative in the Department of Justice and require it translate into Spanish those resources the initiative makes available to the public.

The cost of translating these educational materials is small compared to the benefit they would bring. It would be a modest undertaking for the Department of Justice, given that DOJ already has litigation translation services in place.

Lastly, this bill makes permanent the National Elder Fraud Hotline.

Since March 2020, the hotline has answered tens of thousands of calls from elder Americans who have called in need of support, offering a service to get information on how to prevent elder fraud for the many elder Americans who don't have access to the internet.

I commend Ms. GARCIA for championing this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this much-needed legislation.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, reports estimate that as many as 1 in 10 elders are abused every year, but less than half of these incidents are actually reported, and the COVID pandemic has left seniors isolated and more vulnerable to fraud and abuse.

All over, we are seeing scammers deceive a grandparent that their grandchild is in trouble and needs money.

We see imposters pose as IRS agents to trick an elder into paying money they do not owe.

We see fraudsters offer tech support assistance and collect money for fraudulent services.

We must hold these criminals accountable for taking advantage of and abusing our seniors.

Protecting and caring for our loved ones—who once supported and cared for us—is one of our most honorable responsibilities.

The Elder Abuse and Protection Act promotes justice for vulnerable seniors by making the Elder Justice Initiative a permanent office within the Department of Justice, which works to combat elder abuse, neglect, and financial fraud and scams that target our nation's seniors.

I thank Congresswoman GARCIA for introducing this important legislation to protect our seniors, and I am proud to be a cosponsor and support it today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2922, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

JUSTICE FOR JUVENILES ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 961) to exempt juveniles from the requirements for suits by prisoners, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 961

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 "Justice for Juveniles Act".

SEC. 2. EXEMPTION OF JUVENILES FROM THE REQUIREMENTS FOR SUITS BY PRISONERS.

Section 7 of the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (42 U.S.C. 1997e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h), by striking "sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for," and inserting "or sentenced for"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) EXEMPTION OF JUVENILE PRISONERS.—This section shall not apply to an action pending on the date of enactment of the Justice for Juveniles Act or filed on or after such date if such action is—

''(1) brought by a prisoner who has not attained 22 years of age; or

''(2) brought by any prisoner with respect to a prison condition that occurred before the prisoner attained 22 years of age.''.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 961.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 961, the Justice for Juveniles Act.

This bipartisan bill would eliminate the administrative exhaustion requirement for incarcerated youth before they may file a lawsuit challenging the conditions of their incarceration.

By passing this bill today, the House would correct the manifest wrong currently present in Federal law and would continue bipartisan efforts to support incarcerated youth.

This bill recognizes the same conclusion that has been embraced by the Supreme Court and experts for decades, that incarcerated young people have different cognitive abilities than adults, are less mature, and have a higher chance of being assaulted while incarcerated.

In recent years, our Nation has finally come to the realization that youth and adults have fundamentally different decisionmaking abilities. The Supreme Court has repeatedly cited adolescents' lack of maturity as a reason why they are not as culpable as adults for their actions or able to recognize certain dangers.

Yet, in current law, there are no allowances for these differences in cognitive abilities when it comes to addressing deficiencies in conditions of confinement.

Complying with current law, which requires an understanding of detailed grievance procedures and timelines, is nearly impossible for most incarcerated youth. Compliance with grievance procedures not only requires an understanding of the grievance process but, on a more basic level, it requires that an incarcerated person be able to read, which, sadly, many incarcerated people cannot do.

According to one study, among incarcerated youth, 85 percent are functionally illiterate, and the baseline reading levels vary from grade one to grade six. In addition, approximately 70 percent of incarcerated juveniles have at least one learning disability.

Youth are, furthermore, less likely than adults to recognize as risks the circumstances they face in a correctional facility. Youth may not recognize the impending or imminent danger of some of the risks they face.

Compounding these challenges, incarcerated youth, as a group, experience extraordinarily high rates of mental illness. Nearly 50 percent of incarcerated 16- to 18-year-olds suffer from a mental illness. Juveniles housed with adults are 10 times more likely to have psychotic episodes, and they have a suicide rate that is 7.7 times higher than those housed in juvenile facilities.

In recent years, the public has become more aware of the many dangers that lurk in correctional facilities. Hurricanes have flooded facilities; cold snaps have left prisoners freezing to death; and heat waves have killed prisoners when they lacked proper ventilation or air conditions. These conditions pose a special danger to youth, who do not have the ability or experience to recognize that they are in immediate danger.

While natural disasters can pose an extraordinary risk to youth, prison life itself may also pose life-threatening dangers. Adolescents incarcerated with adults are also more prone to both physical and mental abuse. Youth are 50 percent more likely to be physically assaulted when they are housed in adult facilities than in juvenile facilities.

Taken together, most incarcerated youth are simply not able to recognize or to effectively communicate when their prison conditions become dangerous or unconstitutionally deficient.

There remains little doubt that the current process needs to be changed.

This bill proposes a modest reform to the Prison Litigation Reform Act. It simply exempts youth in correctional facilities from having to comply with technical grievance procedures before they can go to court to challenge the unconstitutional conditions of their confinement. While I would like to see us do much more to protect incarcerated youth, this bill is a necessary first step.

I thank Ms. SCANLON and Mr. ARMSTRONG for introducing this bipartisan legislation, and I urge all Members to support it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 961, the Justice for Juveniles Act. This bill eliminates some of the administrative hurdles for juvenile prisoners seeking relief in Federal court.

Juvenile offenders often lack the knowledge to pursue and exhaust all the complex administrative rules and grievance procedures in correctional facilities. H.R. 961 will address that problem by providing juvenile offenders with quicker access to courts when they feel they are being abused or mistreated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here today to advance the Justice for Juveniles Act. I thank Chairman NADLER, Leader HOYER, and my colleague, Congressman ARMSTRONG, for their support and partnership on this effort.

The Prison Litigation Reform Act, or PLRA, was passed in 1996 in an effort to decrease so-called frivolous lawsuits brought by prisoners. Chief among the PLRA's mandates was a requirement that before seeking relief for civil rights violations in court, a detained person must exhaust administrative remedies.

Whatever the merits of that underlying legislation, we now have broad bipartisan agreement that the language is overbroad in its application to juveniles.

Studies have consistently shown that juveniles are both more likely to be abused while in detention and less likely to navigate the administrative remedies that bar them from seeking relief.

For those of us who have kids or who have worked with children, it is easy to imagine the difficulty a young person in detention might have navigating complex legal systems necessary to raise a complaint.

Young people in the criminal or juvenile justice system are more likely than not to be functionally illiterate, and science has shown that the brain is not fully developed until a person is in their mid-twenties. It is one of the many reasons our justice system makes a distinction between juvenile and adult offenses.

That is what we hope to acknowledge with the Justice for Juveniles Act by exempting juveniles from the requirements of the PLRA.

In addition, the PLRA also limits the kind of relief that juveniles might seek for civil rights violations while in detention. They cannot seek relief now for emotional injuries without physical ones as well, but studies show that youth are especially prone to psychological injury and abuse, which they often face in detention.

Finally, the PLRA limits the recovery of attorney's fees in such cases. Again, juveniles are less likely to have

independent resources to fund an attorney, so that makes it harder for young people to find an attorney to vindicate their rights.

To those who might question whether we need to correct the PLRA, I offer the story of the Glen Mills Schools, which inspired this bill.

For almost 200 years, youth from across the United States were sent to Glen Mills when they ran afoul of the law. But the school's bucolic campus and renowned athletic teams masked serious daily violence inflicted upon children placed there.

An explosive 2019 report by The Philadelphia Inquirer revealed years of sexual, physical, and psychological abuse of the young residents, including broken bones, threats of retaliation, and sustained physical assaults at the hands of staff members. Although the stories from Glen Mills are heartbreaking, they are not unique.

□ 1615

Reports show that mistreatment of young people in juvenile facilities happens all the time across the country.

Just this past March, despite the recent example of Glen Mills, children were removed from yet another juvenile detention facility, just a few miles away, after horrifying new allegations of abuse.

This commonsense, bipartisan legislation passed unanimously on the House floor last Congress and has the support of over 60 organizations.

I, again, thank Chairman NADLER and the committee members and staff who helped advance this bill, and I thank the dedicated leadership team who brought the bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation again.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the manager and the chairman of the full committee, Committee on the Judiciary, and to the manager for our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 961, the Justice for Juveniles Act.

This is very close to my heart as the chair of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security working on these juvenile justice issues. And this is a necessary and important bipartisan bill that will save incarcerated young persons' lives.

As indicated, chairing the subcommittee, we recently held a hearing titled, ''Juvenile Justice Pipeline and the Road Back to Integration.'' I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for this very effective and important initiative.

During the hearing, we heard testimony from witness after witness who acknowledged the body of scientific research that has been embraced by experts and the Supreme Court—and that I have known and seen over the years as we have written legislation—demonstrating that juveniles do not have the same cognitive and emotional maturity as adults.

In fact, there is data that says that the brain does not fully mature until age 25. This bill makes a good change to the Prison Litigation Reform Act to take into account that the overwhelming majority of juveniles cannot comply with the law's complex grievance procedures by themselves. This bill is an important bipartisan step to ensuring incarcerated juveniles are rehabilitated and given the best chance possible to reintegrate into society.

Just some statistics that I saw recently when I received a note about a graduation of foster children from high school, saying about 60 percent of those children not having a complete opportunity in life did not graduate from high school. And so these children wind up in these facilities. They should not; they should have a life. And therefore, we should be able—not associating foster care children with those incarcerated—but we do know the susceptibility to these children and others who don't have a steady hand in their life. So this is an important step.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, Representative MARY GAY SCANLON, for authoring this bill.

As I worked on this legislation, it is important to note that to deal with a grievance system, it requires an understanding of the grievance process. But on a more basic level, it requires that an incarcerated person be able to read.

According to one study, we know that incarcerated youth are functionally illiterate in many instances, and the baseline reading levels vary from grade 1 to 6. That is a plague, if you will, on children in our society that can have a bright and wonderful life.

In addition, approximately 70 percent of incarcerated juveniles have at least one learning disability. And we know that because of what happens in schools in the recently changed State laws where juveniles have been sent from the schoolhouse to juvenile detention.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this alone justifies the changes in the bill, which simply allow incarcerated juveniles to go directly to court to have serious deficiencies in their incarceration, including allegations of assault, corrected.

As I said, I thank my colleague, Representative MARY GAY SCANLON. As I work on legislation to achieve more extensive juvenile justice reform, I support the passage of this bill—commonsense, overdue—and ask that my colleagues support this as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 961, the ''Justice for Juveniles Act.'' This is a necessary and important bipartisan bill that will save incarcerated young people's lives.

The Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee, which I chair, recently held a hearing titled the ''Juvenile Justice Pipeline and the Road Back to Integration.''

During the hearing, we heard testimony from witness after witness who acknowledged the body of scientific research, that has been embraced by experts and the Supreme Court, demonstrating that juveniles do not have the same cognitive and emotional maturity as adults.

This bill makes a modest change to the Prison Litigation Reform Act to take into account that the overwhelming majority of juveniles cannot comply with the law's complex grievance procedures.

These requirements not only require an understanding of the grievance process, but on a more basic level, require that an incarcerated person be able to read. According to one study, among incarcerated youth, 85 percent are functionally illiterate, and the ''baseline reading levels var[y] from grade 1 to grade 6.''

In addition, approximately 70 percent of incarcerated juveniles have at least one learning disability.

This alone justifies the changes in the bill, which simply allow incarcerated juveniles to go directly to court to have serious deficiencies in their incarceration, including allegations of assault, corrected.

This bill is a small but important bipartisan step to ensuring incarcerated juveniles are rehabilitated and given the best chance possible to reintegrate into society.

I thank my colleague on the Crime Subcommittee, Representative MARY GAY SCANLON, for authoring this bill.

As I work on legislation to achieve more extensive juvenile justice reform, I support passage of this bill today and ask that my colleagues do the same.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I take a moment to note my agreement with the gentlewoman from Texas' point, that the cognition of juveniles is not fully developed and that they should not be called upon to make unalterable, lifelong decisions under those circumstances.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. Speaker, our prison systems are ideally meant to rehabilitate, but all too often, they do exactly the opposite. They are frequently home to widespread, horrible abuse, including physical and sexual violence and unsanitary living conditions.

It is unacceptable to subject any person to such conditions—but, particularly, our youth to this kind of mistreatment. Our system makes it incredibly difficult for young people to

file a legal complaint with huge burdens imposed if they want to file a lawsuit, and major barriers to legal representation.

Mr. Speaker, I was a public defender here in Washington, D.C., at the start of my career, and I am certain that this is no way to treat children that we are trying to rehabilitate and prepare for society and prepare for success in their communities.

These circumstances only make it more difficult for young people and children and, in fact, they keep them in abusive and delinquency cycles.

This legislation, however, will remove some of those barriers for incarcerated juveniles to take their abusers to court and to seek remedies for mistreatment by their correctional institutions. This bill will take us one step closer to desperately needed reform in our criminal justice system and will help to protect our incarcerated youth.

Mr. Speaker, I really thank and applaud Congresswoman SCANLON for this important and bipartisan legislation, and it is my honor to support it today.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman in urging Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 961, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

MR. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

MAKING IMPROVEMENTS IN ENACTMENT OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE, INTO A POSITIVE LAW TITLE AND TO IMPROVE CODE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3239) to make improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3239

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

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Table of contents.
Sec. 2. Purpose.
Sec. 3. Title 2, United States Code.
Sec. 4. Title 5, United States Code.
Sec. 5. Title 6, United States Code.
Sec. 6. Title 7, United States Code.
Sec. 7. Title 8, United States Code.
Sec. 8. Title 10, United States Code.
Sec. 9. Title 12, United States Code.
Sec. 10. Title 14, United States Code.
Sec. 11. Title 15, United States Code.
Sec. 12. Title 16, United States Code.
Sec. 13. Title 18, United States Code.
Sec. 14. Title 19, United States Code.
Sec. 15. Title 20, United States Code.
Sec. 16. Title 21, United States Code.
Sec. 17. Title 22, United States Code.
Sec. 18. Title 23, United States Code.
Sec. 19. Title 24, United States Code.
Sec. 20. Title 25, United States Code.
Sec. 21. Title 26, United States Code.
Sec. 22. Title 28, United States Code.
Sec. 23. Title 29, United States Code.
Sec. 24. Title 30, United States Code.
Sec. 25. Title 31, United States Code.
Sec. 26. Title 33, United States Code.
Sec. 27. Title 35, United States Code.
Sec. 28. Title 38, United States Code.
Sec. 29. Title 40, United States Code.
Sec. 30. Title 41, United States Code.
Sec. 31. Title 42, United States Code.
Sec. 32. Title 43, United States Code.
Sec. 33. Title 44, United States Code.
Sec. 34. Title 45, United States Code.
Sec. 35. Title 46, United States Code.
Sec. 36. Title 48, United States Code.
Sec. 37. Title 49, United States Code.
Sec. 38. Title 50, United States Code.
Sec. 39. Title 51, United States Code.
Sec. 40. Title 52, United States Code.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to make improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code.

SEC. 3. TITLE 2, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) The paragraph under the heading ''GENERAL PROVISION, THIS CHAPTER'' in chapter 5 of title II of division B of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (2 U.S.C. 141a) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 114 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–53, 2 U.S.C. 471 note) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(3) Section 6(a) of the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (2 U.S.C. 475(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code''.

(4) Section 119(a)(6) of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1108(a)(6)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 3011(b)(4)(B) of the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31, 2 U.S.C. 1151 note) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(6) Section 1308(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008 (2 U.S.C. 1816a(a)) is amended by striking ''section 303M of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253m)'' and substituting ''section 3309 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(7) Public Law 96–558 (2 U.S.C. 1816b) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(8) Section 1201(a)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003 (2 U.S.C. 1821(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(9) Section 308(b) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 (2 U.S.C. 1964(b)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(10) Section 1(d) of Public Law 102–330 (2 U.S.C. 2021 note) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(11) Section 307E(b)(3) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 2146(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(12) Section 202(i)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(13) Section 195(b) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985 (2 U.S.C. 6157(b)) is amended by striking ''section 5 of title 41'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(14) Section 117(1) of Public Law 97–51 (2 U.S.C. 6599(1)) is amended by striking ''section 5'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

SEC. 4. TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 3(d)(2)(B) of the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act (Public Law 101–552, 5 U.S.C. 571 note) is amended by striking ''section 6(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(a))'' and substituting ''section 1121(b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 595(c)(10) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (41 U.S.C. 251–260)'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c) of title 41''.

(3) Section 206 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–174, 5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(B), by striking ''section 13 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 612)'' and substituting ''section 7108 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking ''the Contracts Dispute Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 601 note; Public Law 95–563)'' and substituting ''chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code''.

(4) Section 3109(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(5) Section 1110(e)(2)(G) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84, 5 U.S.C. 3702 note) is amended by striking ''section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code''.

(6) Section 4105 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(7) Section 4(b) of the Telework Enhancement Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–292, 124 Stat. 3173, 5 U.S.C. 6501 note) is amended by striking ''section 303 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253)'' and substituting ''sections 3105, 3301, and 3303 to 3305 of title 41, United States Code''.

(8) Section 7342(e)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''of subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

(9) Section 8709(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(10) Section 8714a(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(11) Section 8714b(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(12) Section 8714c(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(13) Section 8902(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(14) Section 8953 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(3)—

(i) before subparagraph (A), by striking ''the Contract Disputes Act of 1978'' and substituting ''chapter 71 of title 41'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''(after appropriate arrangements, as described in section 8(c) of such Act)''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''section 10(a)(1) of such Act'' and substituting ''section 7104(b)(1) of title 41''.

(15) Section 8983 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(3)—

(i) before subparagraph (A), by striking ''the Contract Disputes Act of 1978'' and substituting ''chapter 71 of title 41'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''(after appropriate arrangements, as described in section 8(c) of such Act)''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''section 10(a)(1) of such Act'' and substituting ''section 7104(b)(1) of title 41''.

(16) Section 9003(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

SEC. 5. TITLE 6, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 309(b)(6) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 189(b)(6)) is amended by striking ''section 303(b)(1)(C) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(b)(1)(C))'' and substituting ''section 3303(a)(1)(C) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(2) Section 833 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 393) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''section 32 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 428) the amount specified in subsections (c), (d), and (f) of such section 32'' and substituting ''section 1902 of title 41, United States Code, the amount specified in subsections (a), (d), and (e) of such section 1902'';

(B) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by striking ''section 32(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 428(c))'' and substituting ''section 1902(d) of title 41, United States Code'';

(C) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11))'' and substituting ''section 134 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(D) in subsection (d)(2), by striking ''section 31(a)(2) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 427(a)(2)) and section 303(g)(1)(B) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(g)(1)(B))'' and substituting ''sections 1901(a)(2) and 3305(a)(2) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(3) Section 851 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 421) is amended by striking ''section 4(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(1))'' and substituting ''section 133 of title 41, United States Code''.

(4) Section 853(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 423(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11))'' and substituting ''Section 134 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Section 309(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 259(d))'' and substituting ''Section 153 of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 854 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 424) is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 32 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 428)'' and substituting ''section 1902 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) by striking ''subsections (c), (d), and (f) of such section 32'' and substituting ''subsections (a), (d), and (e) of such section 1902''.

(6) Section 855 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 425) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''Sections 31 and 34 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 427, 430)'' and substituting ''Sections 1901 and 1906 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''Section 303(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(g))'' and substituting ''Section 3305 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) by striking ''section 31(a)(2) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 427(a)(2))'' and substituting ''section 1901(a)(2) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 303(g)(1)(B) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(g)(1)(B))'' and substituting ''section 3305(a)(2) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(7) Section 856(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 426(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949'' and substituting ''PROVISIONS REFERRED TO IN SECTION 171(C) OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE'';

(ii) before subparagraph (A), by striking ''title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c) of title 41, United States Code'';

(iii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''Paragraphs (1), (2), (6), and (7) of subsection (c) of section 303 (41 U.S.C. 253)'' and substituting ''Paragraphs (1), (2), (6), and (7) of section 3304(a) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(II) by striking ''(subject to subsection (e) of such section)'' and substituting ''(subject to section 3304(d) of title 41, United States Code)''; and

(iv) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''Section 303J (41 U.S.C. 253j)'' and substituting ''Section 4106 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''OFFICE OF FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY ACT'' and substituting ''PROVISIONS REFERRED TO IN SECTION 172(b) OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE''; and

(ii) by striking ''Paragraphs (1)(B), (1)(D), and (2) of section 18(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416(c))'' and substituting ''Paragraphs (1)(B), (1)(D), and (2)(A) of section 1708(b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(8) Section 604(g) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (6 U.S.C. 453b(g)) is amended by striking ''section 34 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 430)'' and substituting ''section 1906 of title 41, United States Code''.

(9) Section 692(c) of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 792(c)) is amended by striking ''section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)'' and substituting ''section 134 of title 41, United States Code''.

(10) Section 695 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 794) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''paragraph (2) of section 303(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c))'' and substituting ''paragraph (2) of section 3304(a) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)'' and substituting ''section 134 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 6. TITLE 7, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Subsection (f)(1)(G) of the United States Cotton Futures Act (7 U.S.C. 15b(f)(1)(G)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(2) Section 5(a) of the United States Cotton Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 55(a)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(3) Section 7(c) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(c)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(4) Section 10(a) of the Act of June 29, 1935 (ch. 338, 7 U.S.C. 427i(a)) (known as the Agricultural Research Act and the Bankhead-Jones Act) is amended by striking ''section 3709, Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 386 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1386) is amended by striking ''section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., 1934 edition, title 41, sec. 22)'' and substituting ''section 6306 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(6) Section 514(f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1514(f)) is amended by striking ''section 3741 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C., section 22)'' and substituting ''section 6306 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(7) Section 205(a) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1624(a)) is amended by striking ''section 3648 (31 U.S.C., sec. 529) and section 3709 (41 U.S.C., sec. 5) of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(8) Section 407(c)(2) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1736a(c)(2)) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(9) Section 335(c)(4) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1985(c)(4)) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(10) Section 716(a) of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–86, 7 U.S.C. 2208 note) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''BUY AMERICAN ACT'' and substituting ''CHAPTER 83 OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE''; and

(B) by striking ''sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c; popularly known as the 'Buy American Act')'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

(11) Section 921 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 2279b) is amended—

(A) in subsection (h)(4), by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (i), by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(12) Section 1472(e) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3318(e)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5), and the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code, and the provisions of section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code''.

(13) Section 6201(b)(2) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–171, 7 U.S.C. 5901 note) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code,''.

SEC. 7. TITLE 8, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 1248(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181, 8 U.S.C. 1157 note) is amended by striking ''section 4(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(1))'' and substituting ''section 133 of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 241(g)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(g)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 285(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1355(a)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5),'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(4) Section 294(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1363a(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''section 3732(a) of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 11(a))'' and substituting ''section 6301(a) and (b)(1) through (3) of title 41, United States Code'';

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''section 305 of the Act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 396; 41 U.S.C. 255)'' and substituting ''chapter 45 of title 41, United States Code'';

(C) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 22)'' and substituting ''section 6306 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(D) in subparagraph (G), by striking ''subsections (a) and (c) of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 395; 41 U.S.C. 254(a) and (c))'' and substituting ''section 3901 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 8. TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 2194(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''of subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

(2) Section 821 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398, §1 [H.R. 5408], 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''sections 6 and 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405 and 421)'' and substituting ''sections 1121 and 1303 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in subsection (e)(2), by striking ''section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12))'' and substituting ''section 103 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106, 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking ''section 26(f) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422(f))'' and substituting ''section 1502(a) and (b) of title 41, United States Code'';

(B) in subsection (e)(3)(B)(iii), by striking ''section 26(f) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422(f))'' and substituting ''section 1502(a) and (b) of title 41, United States Code'';

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) by striking ''section 26(f) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422(f))'' and substituting ''section 1502(a) and (b) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(ii) by striking ''such section 26(f)'' and substituting ''such section 1502(a) and (b)''; and

(D) in subsection (g)(2)(A), by striking ''section 34 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 430)'' and substituting ''section 1906 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(4) Section 9002(c) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355, 10 U.S.C. 2302c note) is amended by striking ''section 18(a)(3)(B) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 1708(e)(1)(B) of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 810(b)(2)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85, 10 U.S.C. 2405 note) is amended by striking ''the Contract Disputes Act of 1978'' and substituting ''chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(6) Section 2461(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 47)'' and substituting ''section 8503 of title 41''.

(7) Section 2562(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

(8) Section 2576(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

(9) Section 2664(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.)'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41''.

(10) Section 2667(g)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subsection (a)(2) or subtitle I of title 40 and title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (to the extent subtitle I and title III are inconsistent with this subsection)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40 (to the extent such chapter is inconsistent with this subsection) or subsection (a)(3)''.

(11) Section 2905(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Defense Base Closure and Reallignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–510, div. B, title XXIX, part A, 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(12) Section 204(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526, 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(13) Section 2691(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''of subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

(14) Section 2696(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40''.

(15) Section 2854a(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''Provisions of law referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

(16) Section 2878(e)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Subtitle I of title 40 and title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.)'' and substituting ''Chapter 5 of title 40''.

(17) Section 8304(5) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355, 10 U.S.C. 3452 note) is amended by striking ''the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48c)'' and substituting ''chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code''.

(18) Section 804(d) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261, 10 U.S.C. 3741 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''2324(l)'' and substituting ''3741(2)''; and

(B) by striking ''section 306(l) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C.256(l))'' and substituting ''section 4301(2) of title 41, United States Code)''.

(19) Section 8675(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

(20) Section 9494(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

(21) Section 9781(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of

subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

SEC. 9. TITLE 12, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 5153 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 90) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 502(c)(2) of the Housing Act of 1948 (12 U.S.C. 1701c(c)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 108(d) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701z(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 title 40, United States Code''; and

(B) by striking ''such Act'' and substituting ''such chapter''.

(4) Section 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (12 U.S.C. 1701z–2) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''; and

(ii) by striking ''such Act'' and substituting ''such chapter''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 2(c)(2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1703(c)(2)) is amended by striking ''Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''Section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(6) Section 204(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1710(g)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(7) Section 207(l) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1713(l)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(8) Section 604(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1739(g)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(9) Section 708(h) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1747g(h)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(10) Section 712 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1747k) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(11) Section 904(f) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1750c(f)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(12) Section 208(b) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1788(b)) is amended—

(A) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in the matter after paragraph (2), by striking ''Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States'' and substituting ''Section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(13) Section 17(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1827(g)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(14) Section 1316(h)(3) of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4516(h)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(15) Section 319 (matter before paragraph (1)) of the Enhancing Financial Institution Safety and Soundness Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5416 (matter before paragraph (1)) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.)'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(16) Section 1017(a)(5)(C) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5497(a)(5)(C)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 10. TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Effective January 4, 2011, section 5(c)(2) of Public Law 111–350 (124 Stat. 3847) is repealed.

(2) Section 501(d) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I of title 41'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40''.

(3) Section 504(a)(8) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40''.

(4) Section 901(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I of title 41'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40''.

(5) Section 1136(2) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 16 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414)'' and substituting ''section 1702 of title 41''.

SEC. 11. TITLE 15, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 4 of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 (15 U.S.C. 205c) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''section 403(6) of title 41, United States Code'' and substituting ''section 107 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking ''has the meaning given such terms in section 304A of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254b)'' and substituting ''has the meaning given the term 'cost or pricing data' in section 3501(a) of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 7(4) of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 (15 U.S.C. 205f(4)) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 14(a) of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 (15 U.S.C. 205*l*(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.)'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c) of title 41, United States Code'';

(B) by striking ''section 314B(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 264b(c))'' and substituting ''section 3307(d) of title 41, United States Code'';

(C) by striking ''section 314B of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''subsections (b) through (d) of section 3307 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(D) by striking ''2377 or 314B'' and substituting ''section 2377 or subsections (b) through (d) of section 3307''.

(4) Section 2 of the Act of June 16, 1948 (ch. 483, 15 U.S.C. 313 note), is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 417(a) of the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–135, 15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended by striking ''section 22 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 418b)'' and substituting ''section 1707 of title 41, United States Code''.

(6) Section 3(v)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(v)(1)) is amended by striking ''sections 303H through 303K of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253h through 253k)'' and substituting ''sections 4101, 4103, 4105, and 4106 of title 41, United States Code''.

(7) Section 5 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 634) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(4), by striking ''Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C., sec. 5),'' and substituting ''Section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C., sec. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(8) Section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(4)(F)(ii), by striking ''the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 601–613)'' and substituting ''chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code'';

(B) in subsection (d)(13)(E)—

(i) by striking ''section 25(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(a))'' and substituting ''section 1302(a) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 25 of such Act'' and substituting ''section 1303(a) of title 41, United States Code,'';

(C) in subsection (e)(2)(A)(i), by striking ''section 18(a)(7) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416(a)(7))'' and substituting ''section 1708(d) of title 41, United States Code''';

(D) in subsection (g)(2), by striking ''section 303(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c))'' and substituting ''section 3304(a) of title 41, United States Code,'';

(E) in subsection (h)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking ''section 16(3) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414(3))'' and substituting ''section 1702(c)(1) and (2) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.)'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c) of title 41, United States Code,'';

(F) in subsection (h)(2)—

(i) by striking ''section 303(f)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(f)(2))'' and substituting ''paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 3304(e) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 303(f)(1) of such Act or section 2304(f)(1) of such title'' and substituting ''section 3304(e)(1) of title 41, United States Code, or section 2304(f)(1) of title 10, United States Code'';

(G) in subsection (j), by striking ''section 4(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(1))'' and substituting ''section 133 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(H) in subsection (m)(1)(A), by striking ''section 27(f)(5) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423(f)(5))'' and

substituting ''section 2101(1) of title 41, United States Code''.

(9) Section 1321 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–240, 15 U.S.C. 637 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 25(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(a))'' and substituting ''section 1302(a) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) by striking ''section 25 of such Act'' and substituting ''section 1303(a) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(10) Section 304(b) of the Business Opportunity Development Reform Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–656, 15 U.S.C. 637 note) is amended by striking ''section 22 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 418b)'' and substituting ''section 1707 of title 41, United States Code''.

(11) Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)(8), by striking ''section 35(c)(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 1303(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (n)(2)(A), by striking ''section 25(c)(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 1303(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code''.

(12) Section 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(A), by striking ''the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to create a Committee on Purchases of Blind-made Products, and for other purposes', approved June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 46)'' and substituting ''section 8502 of title 41, United States Code'';

(B) in subsection (c)(2)(B), by striking ''section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to create a Committee on Purchases of Blind-made Products, and for other purposes', approved June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 47)'' and substituting ''section 8503 of title 41, United States Code'';

(C) in subsection (q)(2)(A)—

(i) by striking ''section 25(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 4219(a))'' and substituting ''section 1302(a) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 25 of such Act'' and substituting ''section 1303(a) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(D) in subsection (r)(2), by striking ''section 303J(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253j(b))'' and substituting ''section 4106(c) of title 41, United States Code''.

(13) Section 2353 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355, 15 U.S.C. 644 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code''.

(14) Section 133(c) of the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendment Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–590, 15 U.S.C. 644 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''affiars'' and substituting ''affairs''; and

(B) by striking ''the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to create a Committee on Purchases of Blind-made Products, and for other purposes', approved June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 46)'' and substituting ''section 8502 of title 41, United States Code''.

(15) Section 31(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657a(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 27(f)(5) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423(f)(5))'' and substituting ''section 2101(1) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)'' and substituting ''section 107 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code''.

(16) Section 604(d) of the Veterans Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–50, 15 U.S.C. 657b note) is amended by striking ''section 6(d)(4)(A) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(d)(4)(A))'' and substituting ''section 1122(a)(4)(A) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(17) Section 36(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657f(e)) is amended by striking ''the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code''.

(18) Section 44(a)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657q(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''United States Code'' and substituting ''United States Code,''.

(19) Section 8(b) of the Joint Resolution of December 30, 1947 (ch. 526, 15 U.S.C. 713d–2(b)) is amended by striking ''sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(20) Section 4(h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714b(h)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(21) Section 14 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714*l*) is amended by striking ''section 1 of the Act of February 27, 1877, as amended (41 U.S.C., 1940 edition, 22)'' and substituting ''section 6306(a) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(22) Section 21(b)(1) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2218(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(23) Section 8 of the Electric and Hybrid Vehicle Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 2507) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520; 41 U.S.C. 10a–10c)'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

(24) Section 10 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2609) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529, 14 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529, 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(25) Section 27(b) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2626(b)) is amended by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(26) Section 208 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5528) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)(B), by striking ''title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10d; popularly known as the Buy American Act) as amended by the Buy American Act of 1988'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''BUY AMERICAN ACT'' and substituting ''CHAPTER 83 OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE''; and

(ii) by striking ''title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10d; popularly known as the Buy American Act), as amended by the Buy American Act of 1988,'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code,''.

SEC. 12. TITLE 16, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 3 of Public Law 90–545 (16 U.S.C. 79c) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(2) Section 201(a)(2)(B)(ii) of Public Law 91–661 (16 U.S.C. 160b(a)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(3) Section 2 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (ch. 674, 16 U.S.C. 343b), is amended by striking ''section 355, as amended, section 1136, as amended, and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (except the last paragraph of said section 355, as amended'' and substituting ''sections 3111 and 3112 of title 40, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code (except said section 3112''.

(4) Section 317 of Public Law 98–146 (16 U.S.C. 396f) (known as the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1984) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(5) Section 9102(e) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1990 (Public Law 101–165, 16 U.S.C. 396f note) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''section 102 of title 40, United States Code''.

(6) Section 102(d) of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989 (16 U.S.C. 410r–6(d)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(7) Section 2 of Public Law 86–62 (16 U.S.C. 430a–2) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(8) Section 102(c) of Public Law 101–442 (16 U.S.C. 430h–7(c)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(9) Subparagraph (D) of the introductory provisions of section 3 of Public Law 90–468 (16 U.S.C. 441*l*) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(10) Section 2(a) of the Act of May 17, 1954 (ch. 204, 16 U.S.C. 450jj–1(a)) (known as the

Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Act) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(11) Public Law 87–313 (16 U.S.C. 459a–4 note) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(12) Section 2(a) of Public Law 92–237 (16 U.S.C. 460m–9(a)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat 377; 40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(13) Section 8(a) of Public Law 91–479 (16 U.S.C. 460x–7(a)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(14) Section 3(a) of Public Law 92–589 (16 U.S.C. 460bb–2(a)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(15) Section 108(c)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 460ee(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377; 40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(16) Section 2(d) of Public Law 93–555 (16 U.S.C. 460ff–1(d)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(17) Section 2(a) of Public Law 94–235 (16 U.S.C. 460hh–1(a)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(18) Section 102(b) of Public Law 95–344 (16 U.S.C. 460ii–1(b)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(19) Section 545(d)(1)(B) of The Land Between the Lakes Protection Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 460*lll*–45(d)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(20) The proviso relating to open purchase, without advertising, of seeds, cones, and nursery stock under the heading ''GENERAL EXPENSES, FOREST SERVICE'' under the heading ''FOREST SERVICE'' in the Act of June 30, 1914 (ch. 131, 38 Stat. 429, 16 U.S.C. 504), is amended by striking ''section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(21) The first section of the Act of July 26, 1956 (ch. 736, 16 U.S.C. 505a) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(22) Section 3 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (ch. 97, 16 U.S.C. 580c) is amended by striking ''section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(23) Section 302(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 590q–1) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(24) Section 5(c) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (ch. 717, 16 U.S.C. 590z–3(c)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(25) Section 9(d)(2)(A) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (known as the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act) (16 U.S.C. 669h(d)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)'' and substituting ''section 132 of title 41, United States Code''.

(26) Section 208(d) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670*o*(d)) is amended by striking ''title III (other than section 304) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251–260)'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in subsection 171(c) (except sections 3901 and 3905) of title 41, United States Code''.

(27) Section 3 of the Act of May 11, 1938 (ch. 193, 16 U.S.C. 757) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(28) Section 9(d)(2)(A) of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777h(d)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)'' and substituting ''section 132 of title 41, United States Code''.

(29) Section 2 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 793) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code''.

(30) Section 14 of the Whaling Convention Act of 1949 (16 U.S.C. 916*l*) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(e), by striking ''section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (U.S.C., title 44, sec. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5)'' and substituting ''section 501 of title 44, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(f), by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(31) Section 12 of the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 961) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (U.S.C., title 44, sec. 111), or section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5)'' and substituting ''section 501 of title 44, United States Code, or section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(32) Section 2(b)(1) of Public Law 87–758 (16 U.S.C. 1052(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(33) Section 114(a) of the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74, 16 U.S.C. 1336 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 304B of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254c)'' and substituting ''section 3903 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) by striking ''5-year term restriction in subsection (d)'' and substituting ''5-year term restriction in subsection (a)''.

(34) Section 8(f)(2) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2104(f)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(35) Section 10(c) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2106(c)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(36) Section 4(e)(1) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code,''.

SEC. 13. TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 443 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 103 of Title 41'' and substituting ''section 3 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (ch. 358, 58 Stat. 650)''.

(2) Section 819(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Public Law 90–351, 18 U.S.C. 1761 note) is amended by striking ''the first section of the Act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036; 41 U.S.C. 35), commonly known as the Walsh-Healey Act'' and substituting ''section 6502 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 3287 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 103 of title 41'' and substituting ''section 3 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (ch. 358, 58 Stat. 650)''.

(4) Section 3672 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(5) Section 118 of the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–553, section 1(a)(2) [title I], 18 U.S.C. 4013 note) is amended by striking ''section 4(d) of the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 353(d))'' and substituting ''section 6707(d) of title 41, United States Code''.

(6) Section 637 of division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447, 18 U.S.C. 4124 note) is amended by striking ''section 25(c)(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Act (41 U.S.C. 421(c)(1))'' and substituting ''section 1303(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code,''.

SEC. 14. TITLE 19, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 3131(a)(1) of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 (19 U.S.C. 2081(a)(1)) is amended by striking clauses (ii) through (v) of subparagraph (A) and substituting the following:

''(ii) sections 6301(a) and (b)(1) through (3) and 6306 of title 41, United States Code,

''(iii) chapter 45 of title 41, United States Code,

''(iv) section 8141 of title 40, United States Code, and

''(v) section 3901 of title 41, United States Code, and''.

(2) Section 302(c)(2)(B) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2512(c)(2)(B)) is amended by striking ''title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.), commonly referred to as the Buy American Act'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 303 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2513) is amended by striking ''title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.), popularly referred to as the Buy American Act,'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

(4) Section 1376(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Trade Act of 1988 (19 U.S.C. 3105(b)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a, et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a, et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code,''.

SEC. 15. TITLE 20, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 6(a) of the Act of March 4, 1927 (ch. 505, 20 U.S.C. 196(a)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et

seq.) and section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b)'' and substituting ''section 1302 of title 40, United States Code, and the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 142 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1018a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(2)(A), by striking ''section 18 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416)'' and substituting ''section 1708 of title 41, United States Code,'';

(B) in subsection (d)(3)(A), by striking ''sections 303A and 303B of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253a and 253b)'' and substituting ''sections 3306(a) through (e) and 3308, chapter 37, and section 4702 of title 41, United States Code'';

(C) in subsection (f)(1)(A), by striking ''section 18 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416)'' and substituting ''section 1708 of title 41, United States Code,'';

(D) in subsection (g)(5)(C), by striking ''section 18(b) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416(b))'' and substituting ''section 1708(c) of title 41, United States Code'';

(E) in subsection (g)(6), by striking ''section 303(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(f))'' and substituting ''section 3304(e) of title 41, United States Code,'';

(F) in subsection (l)(1), by striking ''section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12))'' and substituting ''section 103 of title 41, United States Code'';

(G) in subsection (l)(2), by striking ''section 309(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 259(b))'' and substituting ''section 152 of title 41, United States Code'';

(H) in subsection (l)(4), by striking ''section 303(g)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(g)(1)) and section 31 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 427)'' and substituting ''sections 1901 and 3305(a) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(I) in subsection (l)(5), by striking ''section 303(g)(1)(B) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(g)(1)(A)) and section 31(a)(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 427(a)(1))'' and substituting ''sections 1901(a)(1) and 3305(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 401(i) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a(i)) is amended by striking ''subtitle D of title V of Public Law 100–690'' and substituting ''chapter 81 of title 41, United States Code''.

(4) Section 402A(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a–11(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 13(a)(6) of the Harry S Truman Memorial Scholarship Act (20 U.S.C. 2012(a)(6)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(6) Section 7(a)(7) of the American Folklife Preservation Act (20 U.S.C. 2106(a)(7)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(7) Section 415(a) of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. 3475(a)) is amended by striking ''of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code''.

(8) Section 814(a)(6) of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Act (20 U.S.C. 4513(a)(6)) is amended by striking ''section 5 of title 41'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(9) Section 1411(a)(6) of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Act (20 U.S.C. 4710(a)(6)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(10) Section 12(a)(6) of the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation Act (20 U.S.C. 5608(a)(6)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(11) Section 1022(1) of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 6067(1)) is amended by striking ''sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1993 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the 'Buy American Act')'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

(12) Section 505(a) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 9275(a)) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''BUY AMERICAN ACT'' and substituting ''CHAPTER 83 OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE''; and

(B) by striking ''the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 16. TITLE 21, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 505(k)(4)(H) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(k)(4)(H)) is amended by striking ''section 4(5) of the Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 132 of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 520(k) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360j(k)) is amended by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529, 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 532(b)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ii(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(4) Section 502(b) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 872(b)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 17. TITLE 22, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 2(b)(1) of the Joint Resolution of June 30, 1948 (ch. 756, 22 U.S.C. 272a(b)(1)), is amended by striking ''section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 501 of title 44, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 103 of the American-Mexican Treaty Act of 1950 (22 U.S.C. 277d–3) is amended by striking ''sections 3679, 3732, and 3733 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''sections 1341, 1342, and 1349 through 1351 and subchapter II of chapter 15 of title 31, United States Code, and sections 6301(a) and (b) and 6303 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(3) Section 103 of the American-Mexican Boundary Treaty Act of 1972 (22 U.S.C. 277d–36) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(4) Section 804(c)(2)(N) of the Tijuana River Valley Estuary and Beach Sewage Cleanup Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 277d–44(c)(2)(N)) is amended by striking ''title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.)'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c) of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) The Act of August 27, 1935 (ch. 763, 22 U.S.C. 277e) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(6) Section 3(b) of the Joint Resolution of January 28, 1948 (ch. 38, 22 U.S.C. 280b(b)) is amended by striking ''section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 501 of title 44, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(7) Section 2(b) of the Joint Resolution of March 4, 1948 (ch. 97, 22 U.S.C. 280i(b)) is amended by striking ''section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 501 of title 44, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(8) Section 2(b) of the Joint Resolution of June 28, 1948 (ch. 686, 22 U.S.C. 280k(b)) is amended by striking ''section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 501 of title 44, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(9) Section 8 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287e) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(10) Section 6 of the Joint Resolution of July 30, 1946 (ch. 700, 22 U.S.C. 287r) is amended—

(A) in clause (f), by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in clause (k), by striking ''section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (U.S.C., title 44, sec. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5)'' and substituting ''section 501 of title 44, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(11) Section 4(a) of the Joint Resolution of July 1, 1947 (ch. 185, 22 U.S.C. 289c(a)) is amended by striking ''sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U.S.C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(12) Section 3(b)(1) of the Joint Resolution of June 14, 1948 (ch. 469, 22 U.S.C. 290b(b)(1)), is amended by striking ''section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 501 of title 44, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(13) Section 802(a)(2) of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1472(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 22)'' and substituting ''section 6306 of title 41, United States Code''.

(14) Section 5(c)(2) of the International Health Research Act of 1960 (22 U.S.C. 2103(c)(2)) is amended by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(15) Section 219(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2179(c)) is amended by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529 and 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States

Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(16) Section 608 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2358) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''; and

(ii) by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended,'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code,''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended,'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code,''.

(17) Section 632(e)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2392(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended (second and third paragraphs of 31 U.S.C. 203 and 41 U.S.C. 15)'' and substituting ''section 3727(b) (last sentence) and (c) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6305(b)(1) through (7) of title 41, United States Code''.

(18) Section 636(g)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2396(g)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 3733 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 12)'' and substituting ''section 6303 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(19) Section 10(d) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2509(d)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''sections 3101(a) and (c), 3104, 3106, 3301(b)(2), and 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(20) Section 401(a) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2581(a)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapters 1 through 11 of title 40, United States Code''.

(21) Section 2(h) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2669(h)) is amended by striking ''section 303(c)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''section 3304(a)(2) of title 41, United States Code''.

(22) Section 9 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2676) is amended by striking ''section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 22)'' and substituting ''section 6306 of title 41, United States Code''.

(23) Section 565(a)(1) of the Anti-Economic Discrimination Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 2679c(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11))'' and substituting ''section 134 of title 41, United States Code)''.

(24) Section 41(b)(2) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2713(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(25) Section 3101(c)(2) of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3861(c)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423)'' and substituting ''chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), other than section 10(a) of such Act (41 U.S.C. 609(a))'' and substituting ''chapter 71 (other than section 7104(b)) of title 41, United States Code''.

(26) Section 3102 of the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3862) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) by striking ''section 8 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 607)'' and substituting ''sections 7105(a), (c) through (e), and (g), 7106(a), and 7107(a) of title 41, United States Code'';

(ii) by striking ''the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(iii) by striking ''that Act'' and substituting ''that chapter''; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''section 10(a)(1) of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 609(a)(1))'' and substituting ''section 7104(b)(1) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 8(d) of such Act (41 U.S.C. 607(d))'' and substituting ''section 7105(e) of title 41, United States Code''.

(27) Section 704(a)(5) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4024(a)(5)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5) and section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 252)'' and substituting ''sections 3101(a) and (c), 3104, 3106, 3301(b)(2), and 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(28) Section 202(c)(1) of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5422(c)(1)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 and following)'' and substituting ''chapters 1 through 11 of title 40, United States Code''.

SEC. 18. TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 140 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(2) Section 502(c)(5) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''Section 6101''.

SEC. 19. TITLE 24, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 11 of the Saint Elizabeths Hospital and District of Columbia Mental Health Services Act (24 U.S.C. 225h) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''the Buy American Act of 1933, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code'';

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''the Buy American Act'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code,'';

(C) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''the Buy American Act'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code,'';

(D) in subsection (c), by striking ''the Buy American Act'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(E) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

(2) Section 2(a) of Public Law 86–571 (24 U.S.C. 322(a)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 4(a) of Public Law 86–571 (24 U.S.C. 324(a)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 20. TITLE 25, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) The Act of April 12, 1924 (ch. 93, 25 U.S.C. 190) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code,''.

(2) The fourth paragraph on p. 973 (39 Stat.) in the first section of the Act of March 2, 1917 (ch. 146, 25 U.S.C. 293) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code,''.

(3) Section 310 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1638b) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''the Buy American Act'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code,'';

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''the Buy American Act'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(C) by striking subsection (d).

(4) Section 105(a)(3) of the Indian Self-Determination Act (25 U.S.C. 5324(a)(3)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.)'' and substituting ''referred to in section 172(b) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(ii) by striking ''such Act'' and substituting ''such provisions,'';

(B) in subparagraph (C)(ii)(I), by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code'';

(C) in subparagraph (C)(ii)(II), by striking ''Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''Section 6101 of title 41, United States Code'';

(D) in subparagraph (C)(ii)(VIII), by striking ''Sections 1 through 12 of the Act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036 et seq. chapter 881)'' and substituting ''Chapter 65 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(E) in subparagraph (C)(ii)(IX), by striking ''The Service Control Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 351 et seq.)'' and substituting ''Chapter 67 of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 107(a)(1) of the Indian Self-Determination Act (25 U.S.C. 5328(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code''.

(6) Section 110(d) of the Indian Self-Determination Act (25 U.S.C. 5331(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''The Contract Disputes Act (Public Law 95–563, Act of November 1, 1978; 92 Stat. 2383, as amended)'' and substituting ''Chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) by striking ''Interior Board of Contract Appeals established pursuant to section 8 of such Act (41 U.S.C. 607)'' and substituting ''Civilian Board of Contract Appeals established pursuant to section 7105(b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(7) Section 403(e)(1) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5363(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''of the Office of Federal Procurement and Policy Act'' and substituting ''referred to in section 172(b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(8) Section 509(h) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5389(h)) is amended by striking ''of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''referred to in section 172(b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(9) Section 510 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5390) is amended by striking ''of the Office of Federal Procurement and Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.)'' and substituting ''referred to in section 172(b) of title 41, United States Code,''.

SEC. 21. TITLE 26, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 301(b)(3) of the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act of 2010 (Public

Law 111–347, 26 U.S.C. 5000C note) is amended by striking ''section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)'' and substituting ''section 133 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 22. TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) The last sentence of section 524(c)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I of title 41, section 6101(b) to (d) of title 41'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c) of title 41, section 6101 of title 41''.

(2) Section 115(a)(2) of the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277, div. A, §101(b) [title I], 28 U.S.C. 524 note) is amended by striking ''title II or IX of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''chapter 5 or 11 of title 40, United States Code, the provisions referred to in section 172(b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 102(b)(1)(A) of the Department of Justice and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–395, title I, 28 U.S.C. 533 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 3732(a) of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 11(a)), section 305 of the Act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 396; 41 U.S.C. 255), the third undesignated paragraph under the heading of 'Miscellaneous' of the Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 370; 40 U.S.C. 34)'' and substituting ''chapter 45 and section 6301(a) and (b)(1) through (3) of title 41 of the United States Code, section 8141 of title 40 of the United States Code''; and

(B) by striking ''section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 22), and subsections (a) and (c) of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 395; 41 U.S.C. 254(a) and (c))'' and substituting ''and sections 3901 and 6306(a) of title 41 of the United States Code''.

(4) Section 310(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–554, 28 U.S.C. 581 note) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, and title 31 of the United States Code'' and substituting ''title 31 of the United States Code and the provisions referred to in sections 171(b) and (c) and 172(b) of title 41 of the United States Code''.

(5) Section 604 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(10)(C), by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''; and

(B) in subsection (g)(4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''section 253l of title 41, United States Code'' and substituting ''section 3902 of title 41'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''section 254c of title 41, United States Code'' and substituting ''section 3903 of title 41''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''section 255 of title 41, United States Code'' and substituting ''chapter 45 of title 41''.

(6) Section 624(3) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(7) Section 753(g) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(8) Section 1491(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6 of that Act'' and substituting ''section 7103 (except subsection (c)(2)) of title 41''.

(9) Effective January 4, 2011—

(A) chapter 91 of title 28 is amended by inserting after section 1509 the following:

''§ 1510. Third party proceedings

''(a) The United States Court of Federal Claims, on motion of either of the parties, or on its own motion, may summon any and all persons with legal capacity to be sued to appear as a party or parties in any suit or proceeding of any nature whatsoever pending in said court to assert and defend their interests, if any, in such suits or proceedings, within such period of time prior to judgment as the United States Court of Federal Claims shall prescribe. If the name and address of any such person is known or can be ascertained by reasonable diligence, and if he resides within the jurisdiction of the United States, he shall be summoned to appear by personal service; but if any such person resides outside of the jurisdiction of the United States, or is unknown, or if for any other good and sufficient reason appearing to the court personal service cannot be had, he may be summoned by publication, under such rules as the court may adopt, together with a copy of the summons mailed by registered mail to such person's last known address. The United States Court of Federal Claims may, upon motion of the Attorney General, in any suit or proceeding where there may be any number of persons having possible interests therein, notify such persons to appear to assert and defend such interests. Upon failure so to appear, any and all claims or interests in claims of any such person against the United States, in respect of the subject matter of such suit or proceeding, shall forever be barred and the court shall have jurisdiction to enter judgment pro confesso upon any claim or contingent claim asserted on behalf of the United States against any person who, having been duly served with summons, fails to respond thereto, to the same extent and with like effect as if such person had appeared and had admitted the truth of all allegations made on behalf of the United States. Upon appearance by any person pursuant to any such summons or notice, the case as to such person shall, for all purposes, be treated as if an independent proceeding has been instituted by such person pursuant to sections 1491, 1496, 1501, 1503, and 2501 of this title, and as if such independent proceeding had then been consolidated, for purposes of trial and determination, with the case in respect of which the summons or notice was issued, except that the United States shall not be heard upon any counterclaims, claims for damages or other demands whatsoever against such person, other than claims and contingent claims for the recovery of money hereafter paid by the United States in respect of the transaction or matter which constitutes the subject matter of such case, unless and until such person shall assert therein a claim, or an interest in a claim, against the United States, and the United States Court of Federal Claims shall have jurisdiction to adjudicate, as between any and all adverse claimants, their respective several interests in any matter in suit and to award several judgments in accordance therewith.

''(b) The jurisdiction of the United States Court of Federal Claims shall not be affected by this section except to the extent necessary to give effect to this section, and no person shall recover judgment on any claim, or on any interest in any claim, in said court which such person would not have had a right to assert in said court if this section had not been enacted.''; and

(B) the analysis of chapter 91 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1509 the following:

''1510. Third party proceedings.''.

SEC. 23. TITLE 29, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 6(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(e)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 351–357)'' and substituting ''chapter 67 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''the Service Contract Act of 1965'' and substituting ''chapter 67 of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 13(d) of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 (29 U.S.C. 262(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''The term 'Wash-Healey Act' means the Act entitled 'An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036), as amended'' and substituting ''The term 'Walsh-Healey Act' means chapter 65 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) by striking ''the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings', approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1011), as amended'' and substituting ''sections 3141 through 3144, 3146, and 3147 of title 40, United States Code''.

(3) Section 4(b)(2) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 653(b)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''the Act of June 30, 1936, commonly known as the Walsh-Healey Act (41 U.S.C. 35 et seq.), the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 351 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 65 of title 41, United States Code, chapter 67 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) by inserting ''chapters or'' after ''such other''.

(4) Section 22(e)(7) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 671(e)(7)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 147(a)(2)(A) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2887(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''subsections (c) and (d) of section 303 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253)'' and substituting ''section 3304(a) through (c) of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 24. TITLE 30, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 2 of the Act of February 25, 1919 (ch. 23, 30 U.S.C. 4) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code,''.

(2) Section 6(b) of the Act of August 31, 1954 (ch. 1156, 30 U.S.C. 556(b)) is amended by striking ''section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C., sec. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 206 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 846) is amended by striking ''the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 65 of title 41, United States Code''.

(4) Section 101(c)(2) of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1711(c)(2)) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 252)'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 25. TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 743(i) of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111–117, division C, 31 U.S.C. 501 note) is amended by striking ''section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)'' and substituting ''section 133 of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 326 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84, 31 U.S.C. 501 note) is amended by striking ''section 303B(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

(41 U.S.C. 253b(f))'' and substituting ''section 3705 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 321(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417, 31 U.S.C. 501 note) is amended by striking ''section 16A of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414b)'' and substituting ''subchapter II of chapter 13 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(4) Section 739(a)(2)(C) of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161, division D, 31 U.S.C. 501 note) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 47)'' and substituting ''section 8503 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''that Act'' and substituting ''chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 647(f) of the Transportation, Treasury, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–199, division F, 31 U.S.C. 501 note) is amended by striking ''section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)'' and substituting ''section 133 of title 41, United States Code''.

(6) Section 1501(d) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161, div. H, 31 U.S.C. 702 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''The Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–563, 41 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), as amended'' and substituting ''Chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code'';

(B) by striking ''section 4, subsections 8(a), (b), and (c), and subsection 10(a)'' and substituting ''sections 7102(d), 7104(b), and 7105(a), (c), (d), and (e)(1)(C) of title 41, United States Code,'';

(C) by striking ''subsection 6(c)'' and substituting ''subsections (b) and (f) of section 7103 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(D) by striking ''the Contract Disputes Act of 1978'' and substituting ''chapter 71 of title 41, United States Code''.

(7) Section 781(c)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(8) Section 1(17) of Public Law 107–74 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) is amended by striking ''Section 303(c)(7) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c)(7))'' and substituting ''Section 3304(a)(7) of title 41, United States Code''.

(9) Section 1031(13) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65, 31 U.S.C. 1113 note) is amended by striking ''Section 3732 of the Revised Statutes, popularly known as the 'Food and Forage Act' (41 U.S.C. 11)'' and substituting ''Section 6301(a) and (b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(10) Section 865(d)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417, 31 U.S.C. 1535 note) is amended by striking ''section 4(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(1))'' and substituting ''section 133 of title 41, United States Code''.

(11) Section 3718(b)(1)(A) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c)''.

(12) Section 11 of the Prompt Payment Act Amendments of 1988 (Public Law 100–496, 31 U.S.C. 3903 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)(C), by striking ''section 303(g)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(g)(2))'' and substituting ''section 3305(b) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 22 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 418b)'' and substituting ''section 1707 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(13) Section 5114(a)(3) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.; commonly referred to as the Buy American Act)'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41''.

(14) Section 2(b)(1) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–282, 31 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended by striking ''Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.)'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 172(b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(15) Section 2455(c)(1) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355, 31 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended by striking ''section 35(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 431(c))'' and substituting ''section 104 of title 41, United States Code''.

(16) Section 9705(b)(3) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c)''; and

(B) by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

SEC. 26. TITLE 33, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 108(a) of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 578(a)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(2) Section 14 of the Act of May 15, 1928 (ch. 569, 33 U.S.C. 702m) (known as the Flood Control Act of 1928) is amended by striking ''section 3741 of the Revised Statutes being section 22 of title 41 of the United States Code'' and substituting ''section 6306(a) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(3) Section 606(a)(1) of the NOAA Fleet Modernization Act (33 U.S.C. 891d(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''United States Code and section 3732 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 11)'' and substituting ''United States Code, and section 6301(a) and (b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(4) Section 41(b)(5) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 941(b)(5)) is amended by striking ''section 5 of the Act of June 30, 1936 (ch. 881, 49 Stat. 2036), as amended'' and substituting ''section 6507(b) through (f) of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 204(c)(4)(D) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)(4)(D)) is amended by striking ''section 5 of title 41'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41''.

(6) Section 104 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1254) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(4), by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (g)(3)(A), by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(7) Section 508(f)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1368(f)(2)) is amended by striking ''section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12))'' and substituting ''section 103 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 27. TITLE 35, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 10102 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–508, 35 U.S.C. 1 note) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in sections 171(b) and (c) and 172(b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 2(b)(4)(A) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c)''.

SEC. 28. TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 1966(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(2) Section 2412(c)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41''.

(3) Section 3720(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c)''.

(4) Section 7317(f) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(5) Section 7802(f) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(6) Section 8122(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(7) Section 8201(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

SEC. 29. TITLE 40, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Effective January 4, 2011, section 5(*l*)(23) of Public Law 111-350 (124 Stat. 3852) is amended by striking ''Statutes'' and substituting ''Statues''.

(2) The item relating to section 111 in the analysis for chapter 1 of subtitle I of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c)''.

(3) The matter before paragraph (1) in section 102 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and in division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I of title 41''.

(4) Section 111 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''**division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I**'' and substituting ''**the provisions referred to in section 171(c)**''; and

(B) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c)''.

(5) Section 113(b) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''DIVISION B (EXCEPT SECTIONS 1704 AND 2303) OF SUBTITLE I'' and substituting ''THE PROVISIONS REFERRED TO IN SECTION 172(b)''; and

(B) by striking ''division B (Except Sections 1704 and 2303) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 172(b)''.

(6) Section 311 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c)''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c)''.

(7) Section 501(b)(2)(B) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''division B (except sections 1704 and 2303 of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 172(b)''.

(8) Section 503(b) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''division B (except sections 1704 and 2303) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 172(b)''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''SECTION 6101(b) TO (d)'' and substituting ''SECTION 6101''; and

(ii) by striking ''Section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''Section 6101''.

(9) Section 506(a)(1)(D) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''division B (except sections 1704 and 2303) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 172(b)''.

(10) Section 545(f) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Section 6101(b)–(d)'' and substituting ''Section 6101''.

(11) Section 1427(b) of the Services Acquisition Reform Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–136, div. A, title XIV, 40 U.S.C. 1103 note) is amended by striking ''sections 303H and 303I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253h and 253i)'' and substituting ''sections 4103 and 4105 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(12) Section 1305 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''this subtitle and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I of title 41'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of this title''.

(13) Section 1308 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c)''.

(14) Section 3148 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(15) Section 3304(d)(2) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c)''.

(16) Section 3305(a) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subtitle I of this title and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I of title 41'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of this title''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''subtitle I of this title and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I of title 41'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of this title''.

(17) Section 3308(a) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(18) Section 3313(g) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''BUY AMERICAN ACT'' and substituting ''CHAPTER 83 OF TITLE 41''; and

(B) by striking ''the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10c et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41''.

(19) Section 6111(b)(2)(D) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(20) Section 8711(d) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(21) Section 813 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398, §1 [div. A], title VIII, 40 U.S.C. 11302 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''sections 6 and 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405 and 421)'' and substituting ''sections 1121 and 1303 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''section 4(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(1))'' and substituting ''section 133 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 30. TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Effective January 4, 2011—

(A) section 7(b) of Public Law 111–350 (124 Stat. 3855) is amended, in the item relating to title III, §4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (ch. 212), temporarily renumbered §5 by section 7002(1) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–418, 102 Stat. 1545), by striking ''10b–1'' and substituting ''10c note''; and

(B) section 7(b) of Public Law 111–350 (124 Stat. 3855) is repealed insofar as it relates to sections 1 and 16 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–563, 41 U.S.C. 601 note), and those provisions are revived to read as if section 7(b) of Public Law 111–350 had not been enacted.

(2) Effective January 4, 2011—

(A) subtitle III of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 7109 the following:

''CHAPTER 73—FINALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS IN DISPUTES ARISING UNDER CONTRACTS NOT SUBJECT TO CHAPTER 71

''Sec.
''7301. Definitions.
''7302. Finality and conclusiveness of decisions.
''7303. Limitation on pleading.
''7304. Limitation on finality of decisions as to questions of law.

''§ 7301. Definitions

''In this chapter:

''(1) COVERED CONTRACT.—The term ''covered contract'' means a contract entered into by the United States that is not subject to chapter 71 of this title.

''(2) DECISIONMAKER.—The term ''decisionmaker'' means the head of a Federal agency, a representative of the head of the agency, or a board that makes a decision in a dispute arising under a covered contract,

''§ 7302. Finality and conclusiveness of decisions

''In a dispute arising under a covered contract, a decision by a decisionmaker is final and conclusive unless it is fraudulent, capricious, arbitrary, or so grossly erroneous as to necessarily imply bad faith or is not supported by substantial evidence.

''§ 7303. Limitation on pleading

''A provision of a covered contract relating to the finality or conclusiveness of decisions by a decisionmaker may not be pleaded in a civil action as limiting judicial review to a case in which fraud by the decisionmaker is alleged.

''§ 7304. Limitation on finality of decisions as to questions of law

''A covered contract may not contain a provision making the decision of a decisionmaker final as to questions of law.''; and

(B) the analysis for subtitle III of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 71 the following:

''73. Finality of Administrative Decisions in Disputes Arising Under Contracts Not Subject to Chapter 71 ... 7301''.

(3) The analysis for chapter 1 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 153 the following:

''154. Additional definitions.
''SUBCHAPTER IV—REFERENCES TO PROVISIONS FORMERLY CONTAINED IN OTHER LAWS
''171. References to provisions formerly contained in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.
''172. References to provisions formerly contained in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act.''.

(4) Chapter 1 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 153 the following:

''§ 154. Additional definitions

''In the provisions referred to in section 171(c) of this title, the terms 'executive agency', 'Federal agency', and 'property' have the meanings given those terms in section 102 of title 40.

''SUBCHAPTER IV—REFERENCES TO PROVISIONS FORMERLY CONTAINED IN OTHER LAWS

''§ 171. References to provisions formerly contained in Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

''(a) TRANSLATION OF OBSOLETE REFERENCES.—This section provides a convenient form for references to provisions formerly contained in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

''(b) PROVISIONS FORMERLY CONTAINED IN FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949 (OTHER THAN TITLE III).—Provisions formerly contained in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (other than title III) are restated in chapters 1 through 11 of title 40.

''(c) PROVISIONS FORMERLY CONTAINED IN TITLE III OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949.—Provisions formerly contained in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 are restated in the following provisions of this title:

''(1) Sections 102, 103, 105 through 116, and 151 through 153.

''(2) Chapter 31.

''(3) Sections 3301, 3303 through 3305, 3306(a) through (e), 3307(a) through (d), and 3308 through 3311.

''(4) Sections 3501(a) and 3502 through 3508.

''(5) Chapter 37.

''(6) Sections 3901 through 3903 and 3905.

''(7) Sections 4101, 4103, 4105, and 4106.

''(8) Chapter 43.

''(9) Chapter 45.

''(10) Sections 4701 through 4706 and 4709.

''§ 172. References to provisions formerly contained in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act

''(a) TRANSLATION OF OBSOLETE REFERENCES.—This section provides a convenient form for references to provisions formerly contained in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act.

''(b) PROVISIONS FORMERLY CONTAINED IN OFFICE OF FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY ACT.—Provisions formerly contained in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act are restated in the following provisions of this title:

''(1) Sections 102 through 105, 107 through 116, and 131 through 134.

''(2) Sections 1101, 1102, 1121(a) through (c)(1) and (c)(3) through (f), 1122, 1124 through 1127, 1130, and 1131.

''(3) Chapter 13.

''(4) Chapter 15.

''(5) Sections 1701, 1702, 1703(a) through (h), (i)(2) through (8), and (k), 1705, and 1707 through 1712.

''(6) Sections 1901 through 1903, 1905 through 1907, and 1908(b)(1) and (2), (c)(1) and (2), and (d) through (f).

''(7) Chapter 21.

''(8) Sections 2301, 2302, 2305 through 2310, and 2312.''.

(5) Section 502 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–394, 41 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.)'' and substituting ''as defined in section 133 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) by striking ''such Act'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 172(b) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(6) Section 414(a) of the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–135, 41 U.S.C. 1122 note) is amended by striking ''section 6(d)(4)(A) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(d)(4)(A))'' and substituting ''section 1122(a)(4)(A) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(7) Section 10004 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355, 41 U.S.C. 1122 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 6(d)(4)(A) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(d)(4)(A))'' and substituting ''section 1122(a)(4)(A) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11))'' and substituting ''section 134 of title 41, United States Code''.

(8) Section 808(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85, 41 U.S.C. 1127 note) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''section 306(l) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 256(l))'' and substituting ''section 4301(2) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 306(m) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''section 4301 of title 41, United States Code''.

(9) Section 1302(b)(1)(C) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the Administrator of National Aeronautics and Space'' and substituting ''the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration''.

(10) Section 1303(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''the Administrator of National Aeronautics and Space'' and substituting ''the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration''; and

(B) by striking ''the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 201 of title 51''.

(11) Section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65, 41 U.S.C. 1502 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''section 26(f) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422(f))'' and substituting ''section 1502(a) and (b) of title 41, United States Code,'';

(B) in subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii), by striking ''section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''chapter 15 of title 41, United States Code,'';

(C) by repealing subsection (g);

(D) in subsection (h), by striking ''section 26(f) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422(f))'' and substituting ''section 1502(a) and (b) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(E) in subsection (i)(2), by striking ''section 26(f) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422(f))'' and substituting ''section 1502(a) and (b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(12) Section 1703(i) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by adding at the end ''Amounts transferred under this paragraph shall be in addition to other amounts authorized for the Defense Acquisition University.''; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking ''Procurememt'' and substituting ''Procurement''.

(13) Section 5051(c)(2)(A) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355, 41 U.S.C. 1703 note) is amended by striking ''section 313(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as added by subsection (a)'' and substituting ''section 3103(b) of title 41, United States Code''.

(14) Section 6002(b) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355, 41 U.S.C. 1709 note) is amended by striking ''section 25(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(a))'' and substituting ''section 1302(a) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(15) Section 1332 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–240, 41 U.S.C. 1902 note) is amended by striking ''section 32 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 428)'' and substituting ''section 1902 of title 41, United States Code''.

(16) Section 2313(e)(1) of title 41, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) AVAILABILITY—

''(A) TO GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.—The Administrator of General Services shall ensure that the information in the database is available to appropriate acquisition officials of Federal agencies, other government officials as the Administrator of General Services determines appropriate, and, on request, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committees of Congress having jurisdiction.

''(B) TO THE PUBLIC.—The Administrator of General Services shall post the information in the database, excluding past performance reviews, on a publicly available website.''.

(17) The analysis for chapter 31 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 3103 and substituting the following:

''3103. Goals for major acquisition programs.''.

(18) Section 3103 of title 41, United States Code, is amended in the heading by striking ''**Acquisition programs**'' and substituting ''**Goals for major acquisition programs**''.

(19) Section 317(b)(3)(B) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (ch. 288, 41 U.S.C. note prec. 3901) is amended by striking ''this chapter applies'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c) of title 41, United States Code, apply''.

(20) Section 2192(b)(2) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355, 41 U.S.C. 4304 note) is amended by striking ''section 306(l) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (as added by section 2151)'' and substituting ''section 4301(2) of title 41, United States Code''.

(21) Section 6503(b) of title 41, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(b) LIQUIDATED DAMAGES.—In addition to damages for any other breach of the contract, the party responsible for a breach or violation described in subsection (a) is liable to the Federal Government for the following liquidated damages:

''(1) An amount equal to the sum of $10 per day for each individual under 16 years of age knowingly employed in the performance of the contract.

''(2) An amount equal to the sum of $10 per day for each incarcerated individual knowingly employed in the performance of the contract.

''(3) An amount equal to the sum of wage underpayments due employees engaged in the performance of the contract, including any underpayments arising from deductions, rebates, or refunds.''.

(22) Section 6504 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''each agency'' and substituting ''all agencies''; and

(ii) by inserting ''or firms'' after ''persons''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''described in section 6502 of this title''.

(23) Section 6506(b) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting ''rules and'' before ''regulations''; and

(B) by inserting ''may be'' before ''necessary''.

(24) Section 6507 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking ''included in a contract'' and substituting ''included in a proposal or contract''; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking ''an impartial'' and substituting ''a''.

(25) Section 6508 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''an agency'' and substituting ''the contracting agency'';

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''an agency'' and substituting ''the contracting agency''; and

(C) in subsection (c), by inserting ''rules and'' before ''regulations''.

(26) Section 6701(3)(A) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or the District of Columbia'' after ''Federal Government''.

(27) Section 6702(a) of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and'' after ''Columbia;'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2); and

(C) by renumbering paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(28) Section 6703 of title 41, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(A) The matter before paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

''A contract, and bid specification for a contract, that involves an amount exceeding $2,500 and that is subject to this chapter under section 6702 of this title shall contain the following terms:''.

(B) Paragraph (1) is amended by striking ''each class of service employee'' and substituting ''the various classes of service employees''.

(C) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) by striking ''each class of service employee'' and substituting ''the various classes of service employees''; and

(ii) by inserting ''rules and'' before ''regulations''.

(D) Paragraph (5) is amended by striking ''each class of service employee'' and substituting ''the various classes of service employees''.

(29) Section 6705 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''The total amount'' and substituting ''An amount'';

(B) in subsection (b)(2)—

(i) by striking ''a service employee'' and substituting ''all service employees''; and

(ii) by striking ''underpaid employee'' and substituting ''underpaid employees''; and

(C) in subsection (d)—

(i) by inserting ''rules and'' before ''regulations''; and

(ii) by striking ''a Federal agency'' and substituting ''the Federal agency''.

(30) Section 6706(b) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking ''a hearing examiner'' and substituting ''an administrative law judge''.

(31) Section 6707 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''6507'' and substituting ''6507(b) through (f)''; and

(ii) by inserting ''rules and'' before ''regulations'';

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting ''rules and'' before ''regulations'';

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the wages and fringe benefits the service employee would have received under the predecessor contract, including accrued wages and fringe benefits and any prospective increases in wages and fringe benefits provided for in a collective-bargaining agreement as a result of arm's-length negotiations'' and substituting ''the wages and fringe benefits provided for in a collective-bargaining agreement as a result of arm's-length negotiations to which the service employees would have been entitled if they were employed under the predecessor contract, including accrued wages and fringe benefits and any prospective increases in wages and fringe benefits provided for in the collective-bargaining agreement''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''under the predecessor contract'' and substituting ''established under the predecessor contract through collective bargaining''; and

(D) in subsection (d), by striking ''each class of service employee'' and substituting ''the various classes of service employees''.

(32) Section 7105 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(4)(A), by striking ''subsection (e)(1)(B)'' and substituting ''subparagraphs (B) and (D) of subsection (e)(1)''; and

(B) in subsection (e)(1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(ii) by adding after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY CONTRACTS.—

''(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term ''specified board'' means the Armed Services Board or the Civilian Board, whichever is specified by a contracting officer of the Central Intelligence Agency to hear an appeal from a decision being made by the contracting officer.

''(ii) APPEAL AND JURISDICTION.—An appeal from a decision of a contracting officer of the Central Intelligence Agency, relating to a contract made by the Central Intelligence Agency, may be filed with the specified board, and the specified board has jurisdiction to decide that appeal.''.

(33) Section 508 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100–371, 41 U.S.C. 8301 note) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''**BUY AMERICAN ACT**'' and substituting ''**CHAPTER 83 OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE,**''; and

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520; 41 U.S.C. 10a–10c), commonly known as the Buy American Act'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

(34) Section 856(a) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364, 41 U.S.C. 8501 note) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''JAVITS-WAGNER-O'DAY ACT'' and substituting ''CHAPTER 85 OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE''; and

(ii) by striking ''section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 47)'' and substituting ''section 8503 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''THE JAVITS-WAGNER-O'DAY ACT'' and substituting ''CHAPTER 85 OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE,'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''The Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46 et seq.)'' and substituting ''Chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''The Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act'' and substituting ''Chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(35) Section 848(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163, 41 U.S.C. 8501 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 48)'' and substituting ''chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code,'';

(B) by striking ''those Acts'' and substituting ''the Randolph-Sheppard Act and chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(C) by striking ''each Act'' and substituting ''the Randolph-Sheppard Act or chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 31. TITLE 42, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 244(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 238m(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(2) Section 306(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242k(f)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 308(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242m(f)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(4) Section 319F–1(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6a(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter before clause (i), by striking ''section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11))'' and substituting ''section 134 of title 41, United States Code'';

(II) in the matter before clause (i), by striking ''section 302A(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 252a(a))'' and substituting ''section 3101(b)(1)(A) of title 41, United States Code'';

(III) in clause (i), by striking ''section 303(g)(1)(A) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(g)(1)(A))'' and substituting ''section 3305(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(IV) in clause (ii), by striking ''section 302A(b) of such Act (41 U.S.C. 252a(b))'' and substituting ''section 3101(b)(1)(B) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (ii), by striking ''Subsections (a) and (b) of section 7 of the Anti-Kickback Act of 1986 (41 U.S.C. 57(a) and (b))'' and substituting ''Section 8703(a) of title 41, United States Code'';

(II) in clause (iii), by striking ''Section 304C of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254d)'' and substituting ''Section 4706 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(III) in clause (v), by striking ''Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254(a))'' and substituting ''Section 3901 of title 41, United States Code'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''section 303(c)(1) of title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c)(1))'' and substituting ''section 3304(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(II) by striking ''such section 303(c)(1)'' and substituting ''such section 3304(a)(1)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''such section 303(c)(1)'' and substituting ''such section 3304(a)(1)''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking ''subsections (c), (d), and (f) of section 32 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 428)'' and substituting ''section 1902(a), (d), and (e) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(5) Section 319F–2(c)(7)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–6b(c)(7)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (ii)(VII), by striking ''section 303(c)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c)(1))'' and substituting ''section 3304(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code'';

(B) in clause (iii)(I)—

(i) in the matter before item (aa), by striking ''section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11))'' and substituting ''section 134 of title 41, United States Code'';

(ii) in the matter before item (aa), by striking ''section 302A(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 252a(a))'' and substituting ''section 3101(b)(1)(A) of title 41, United States Code'';

(iii) in item (aa), by striking ''section 303(g)(1)(A) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(g)(1)(A))'' and substituting ''section 3305(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(iv) in item (bb), by striking ''section 302A(b) of such Act (41 U.S.C. 252a(b))'' and substituting ''section 3101(b)(1)(B) of title 41, United States Code,'';

(C) in clause (iii)(II)—

(i) in item (bb), by striking ''Subsections (a) and (b) of section 7 of the Anti-Kickback Act of 1986 (41 U.S.C. 57(a) and (b))'' and substituting ''Section 8703(a) of title 41, United States Code'';

(ii) in item (cc), by striking ''Section 304C of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254d)'' and substituting ''Section 4706 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(iii) in item (ee), by striking ''Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254(a))'' and substituting ''Section 3901 of title 41, United States Code'';

(D) in clause (iv)—

(i) in subclause (I)—

(I) by striking ''section 303(c)(1) of title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c)(1))'' and substituting ''section 3304(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(II) by striking ''such section 303(c)(1)'' and substituting ''such section 3304(a)(1)''; and

(ii) in subclause (III), by striking ''such section 303(c)(1)'' and substituting ''such section 3304(a)(1)''; and

(E) in clause (vii), by striking ''section 303A(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253a(a)(1)(B))'' and substituting ''section 3306(a)(1)(B) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(6) Section 319L(c)(5) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d–7e(c)(5)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting

''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''section 303(c)(3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c)(3))'' and substituting ''section 3304(a)(3) of title 41, United States Code''.

(7) Section 413(b)(8) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285a–2(b)(8)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(8) Section 421(b)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285b–3(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(9) Section 464H(b)(9) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285n(b)(9)) is amended by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(10) Section 494(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 289c(2)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(11) Section 496(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 289e(a)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(12) Section 504 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa–3) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 134 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 134 of title 41, United States Code''.

(13) Section 5101(f)(3) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 294q(f)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(14) Section 945(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 299c–4(d)) is amended by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529 and 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(15) Section 1132(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300c–22(d)) is amended by striking ''section 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(16) Section 1701(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300u(c)) is amended by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(17) Section 2354(a)(6) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300cc–41(a)(6)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(18) Section 1805(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395b–6(d)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(19) Section 1860D–11(g)(1)(B)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–111(g)(1)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking ''section 4(5) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(5))'' and substituting ''section 132 of title 41, United States Code''.

(20) Section 1866B(b)(4)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395cc–2(b)(4)(B)) is amended by striking ''section 5'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(21) Section 1874A(b)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kk–1(b)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''section 5'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(22) Section 1890(a)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395aaa(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''section 4(5) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(5))'' and substituting ''section 132 of title 41, United States Code''.

(23) Section 1900(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396(d)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(24) Section 1902(a)(4)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(4)(D)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423)'' and substituting ''chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) by striking ''subsection (a)(2) of such section of that Act'' and substituting ''section 2102(a)(3) of such title''.

(25) Section 1932(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u–2(d)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423)'' and substituting ''chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code''.

(26) Section 510(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1480(a)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(27) Section 302(b) of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (42 U.S.C. 1592a(b)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(28) Section 305(a) of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (42 U.S.C. 1592d(a)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(29) Section 309(a) of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (42 U.S.C. 1592h(a)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(30) Section 4(a) of the Federal Food Donation Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 1792(a)) is amended by striking ''section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421)'' and substituting ''section 1303 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(31) Section 11(c) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1870(c)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(32) Section 31 c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2051(c)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(33) Section 41 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2061(b)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(34) Section 43 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2063) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(35) Section 55 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2075) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(36) Section 66 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2096) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(37) Section 161 j. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2201(j)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, except section 207 of that Act'' and substituting ''chapter 5 (except section 559) of title 40, United States Code''.

(38) Section 170 g. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210(g)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5), as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(39) Section 6(e) of the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2295(e)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(40) Section 116 of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2310) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(41) Section 120 of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2349) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(42) Section 62 d. of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2362(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''provisions of section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) by striking ''comply with section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''comply with section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(43) Section 601(c) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3211(c)) is amended by striking ''Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''Section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(44) Section 7(i)(1) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3535(i)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(45) Section 1345(b) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4081(b)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(46) Section 1346(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4082(c)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statute (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(47) Section 1360(b) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101(b)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(48) The proviso under the heading ''SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY'' under the heading ''ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY'' in title III of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–7, div. K, 42 U.S.C.

4361c note) is amended by striking ''41 U.S.C. 5'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(49) Section 203(e) of the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4372(e)) is amended by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(50) Section 218 of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4638) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(51) Section 611(k) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5196(k)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(52) Section 306(a) of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 5206(a)) is amended—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''BUY AMERICAN ACT'' and substituting ''CHAPTER 83 OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE''; and

(B) by striking ''the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

(53) Section 604(a)(2)(B) of the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5403(a)(2)(B)) is amended by striking ''section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 132 of title 41, United States Code''.

(54) Section 111(b) of Public Law 95–39 (42 U.S.C. 5903 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$10,000'' and substituting ''$25,000''; and

(B) by striking '', which are excepted from the requirements of advertising by section 252(c)(3) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(55) Section 207(c)(3) of the Presidential Science and Technology Advisory Organization Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6616(c)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(56) Section 433(c) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140, 42 U.S.C. 6834 note) is amended by striking ''section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421)'' and substituting ''section 1302 of title 41, United States Code''.

(57) The first proviso in the paragraph under the heading ''ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION'' under the heading ''DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'' in title II of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (Public Law 104–134, title I, section 101(c), 42 U.S.C. 7135 note) is amended by striking ''section 4(d) of the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 353(d))'' and substituting ''section 6707(d) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(58) Section 104(i) of the Alaska Power Administration Asset Sale and Termination Act (Public Law 104–58, 42 U.S.C. 7152 note) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code,''.

(59) Section 103(b)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7403(b)(4)) is amended by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(60) Section 104(a)(2)(D) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7404(a)(2)(D)) is amended by striking ''sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 3324(a) and (b) of title 31, United States Code, and section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(61) Section 112(r)(6)(N) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(r)(6)(N)) is amended by striking ''section 5'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(62) Section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)(D)(iii), by striking ''section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421)'' and substituting ''section 1303 of title 41, United States Code,'';

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by striking ''section 25(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 1302(a) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(C) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''section 303J(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253j(d))'' and substituting ''section 4106(d) of title 41, United States Code''.

(63) Section 119(c)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9619(c)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 3732 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 11)'' and substituting ''section 6301(a) and (b) of title 41 of the United States Code''.

(64) Section 2(a) of Public Law 95–84 (42 U.S.C. 10301 note) is amended by striking ''41 U.S.C. 504 et seq. (the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977; Public Law 95–224)'' and substituting ''chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code''.

(65) Section 104(h)(1)(C) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(h)(1)(C)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(66) Section 104(c)(3) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12114(c)(3)) is amended by striking ''the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988 (41 U.S.C. 701 et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 81 of title 41, United States Code''.

(67) Section 501 of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–82, 42 U.S.C. 12501 note) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''**BUY AMERICAN ACT**'' and substituting ''**CHAPTER 83 OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE**''; and

(B) by striking ''sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the 'Buy American Act')'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

(68) Section 184 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12644) is amended by striking ''sections 5153 through 5158 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (41 U.S.C. 702–707)'' and substituting ''sections 8101 and 8103 through 8106 of title 41, United States Code''.

(69) Section 196(b) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12651g(b)) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''provisions of section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code''.

(70) Section 206(e)(7) of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–74, 42 U.S.C. 12701 note) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(71) Section 525(e)(7) of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–74, 42 U.S.C. 12701 note) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(72) Section 3021(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13556(a)) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.)'' and substituting ''provisions of section 171(b) and (c) title 41, United States Code''.

(73) Section 1002(e)(3)(C) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16392(e)(3)(C)) is amended by striking ''section 25(c)(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(c)(1))'' and substituting ''section 1303(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code''.

(74) Section 136(j)(3) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013(j)(3)) is amended by striking ''section 31 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 427)'' and substituting ''section 1901 of title 41, United States Code''.

(75) Section 435(c) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17091(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''section 6(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(a))'' and substituting ''section 1121(b) and (c)(1) of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421)'' and substituting ''section 1302(a) of title 41, United States Code,''.

(76) Section 1334(a)(1) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18054(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 5'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

SEC. 32. TITLE 43, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) The last proviso in the paragraph under the heading ''ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS'' under the heading ''UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY'' in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–113, div. B, §1000(a)(3) [title I], 43 U.S.C. 50d) is amended by striking ''41 U.S.C. 5'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

(2) Section 115 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–113, div. B, §1000(a)(3) [title I], 43 U.S.C. 1451 note) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''provisions of section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) Section 205 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1993 (43 U.S.C. 1475a) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(1988)'' after ''Appendix'';

(B) by striking ''the Federal Procurement Integrity Act (41 U.S.C. 423 (1988))'' and substituting ''chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(C) by striking ''18 U.S.C. 201 et seq. (1988)'' and substituting ''chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code''.

(4) Section 12(b)(7)(v) of Public Law 94–204 (43 U.S.C. 1611 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 40 U.S.C. sec. 471 et seq.'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code'';

(B) by striking ''that Act'' and substituting ''that chapter''; and

(C) by striking ''40 U.S.C. 485(b), as amended'' and substituting ''40 U.S.C. 572(a)''.

(5) Section 306(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1736(a)) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377, as amended)'' and substituting ''provisions of section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 33. TITLE 44, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) The item relating to section 311 in the analysis for chapter 3 of title 44, United

States Code, is amended by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

(2) Section 311 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the section catchline, by striking ''**subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I**'' and substituting ''**the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c)**'';

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''; and

(C) in subsection (c), by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(3) Section 210(i) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347, 44 U.S.C. 3501 note) is amended by adding ''(41 U.S.C. note prec. 3901)'' before ''(as added by subsection (b))''.

SEC. 34. TITLE 45, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 11(c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (45 U.S.C. 361(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5)'' after ''without regard to'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(B) by striking ''section 3709 of Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 41, sec. 5)'' after ''*Provided*, That'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(2) Section 613(b) of the Alaska Railroad Transfer Act of 1982 (45 U.S.C. 1212(b)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484)'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code,''.

SEC. 35. TITLE 46, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 51703(b)(2) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(2) Section 55305(d)(2)(D) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 25(c)(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(c)(1)'' and substituting ''section 1303(a)(1) of title 41''.

SEC. 36. TITLE 48, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 108 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1953 (48 U.S.C. 1685) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code,''.

SEC. 37. TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Effective January 4, 2011, section 5(*o*)(1) of Public Law 111–350 (124 Stat. 3853) is amended by striking ''section 103(e)'' and substituting ''section 103(i)''.

(2) Section 103(i) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''of subtitle I of title 40 and division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''referred to in section 171(b) and (c)''.

(3) Section 1113(b)(1)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''section 6101''.

(4) Section 123(a) of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Authorization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–311, 49 U.S.C. 5101 note) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''BUY AMERICAN ACT'' and substituting ''CHAPTER 83 OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE''; and

(B) by striking ''sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c; popularly known as the 'Buy American Act')'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

(5) Section 10721 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''Section 6101''.

(6) Section 13712 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''Section 6101''.

(7) Section 15504 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''Section 6101''.

(8) Section 110(b) of the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–134, 49 U.S.C. 24301 note) is amended by striking ''Section 303B(m) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253b(m))'' and substituting ''Section 4702 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(9) Section 40110(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''Division C (except sections 3302, 3501(b), 3509, 3906, 4710, and 4711) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''Provisions referred to in section 171(c)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''Division B (except sections 1704 and 2303) of subtitle I'' and substituting ''Provisions referred to in section 172(b)''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''OF DIVISION B (EXCEPT SECTIONS 1704 AND 2303) OF SUBTITLE I'' and substituting ''REFERRED TO IN SECTION 172(b)'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 172(b) of title 41'';

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 172(b) of title 41''; and

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''section 27(e)(3)(A)(iv) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 2105(c)(1)(D) of title 41''.

(10) Section 351(b) of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–205, 49 U.S.C. 40110 note) is amended by striking ''section 4(6) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(6))'' and substituting ''section 107 of title 41, United States Code''.

(11) Section 5063 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355, 49 U.S.C. 40110 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (f)(2), by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and substituting the following:

''(B) Sections 107, 1708, 3105, 3301(a), (b)(1), and (c), 3303 through 3306(e), 3308, and 3311, chapter 37, and section 4702 of title 41, United States Code.''; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking ''section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 103 of title 41, United States Code''.

(12) Section 47305(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Section 6101(b) to (d)'' and substituting ''Section 6101''.

(13) Section 305(b) of the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–305, 49 U.S.C. 50101 note) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''BUY AMERICAN ACT'' and substituting ''CHAPTER 83 OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a through 10c, popularly known as the 'Buy American Act')'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 38. TITLE 50, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 4(c)(2) of the Helium Act (50 U.S.C. 167b(c)(2)) is amended by striking ''the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code''.

(2) Section 502(a) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1651(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Act of June 30, 1949 (41 U.S.C. 252)'' and substituting ''Provisions of law referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''Section 3737 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 15)'' and substituting ''Section 6305 of title 41, United States Code''.

(3) The Sudan Accountability and Divestment Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–174, 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(A) in section 2(3), by striking ''section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)'' and substituting ''section 133 of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) in section 6—

(i) in subsection (b)(4), by striking ''section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421)'' and substituting ''section 1303 of title 41, United States Code,''; and

(ii) in subsection (d), by striking ''section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421)'' and substituting ''section 1303 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(4) Section 802(a)(4) of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1902(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code,''.

(5) Section 102A(q)(4)(B) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(q)(4)(B)) is amended by striking ''section 4(9) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 403(9))'' and substituting ''section 109 of title 41, United States Code''.

(6) Section 505(a)(2)(B)(i) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3095(a)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''provisions referred to in section 171(b) and (c) of title 41 of the United States Code''.

(7) Section 506C(e)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3099(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''section 4(10) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(10))'' and substituting ''section 108 of title 41, United States Code''.

(8) Section 107(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (ch. 932, 50 U.S.C. 4517(b)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking ''section 303(b)(1)(B) or section 303(c)(3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949'' and substituting ''section 3303(a)(1)(B) or section 3304(a)(3) of title 41, United States Code''.

(9) Section 704(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (ch. 932, 50 U.S.C. 4554(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 1303(a) of title 41, United States Code''; and

(B) by striking ''section 6 or 25 of that Act'' and substituting ''section 1121(b) and (d) or 1303(a)(1) of that title''.

(10) Section 709(c) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (ch. 932, 50 U.S.C. 4559(c)) is amended by striking ''section 22 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act'' and substituting ''section 1707 of title 41, United States Code''.

SEC. 39. TITLE 51, UNITED STATES CODE.

(1) Section 20113(c)(4) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''in accordance with title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.)'' and substituting ''the provisions referred to in section 171(c) of title 41''.

(2) Section 30704(2) of title 51, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.)'' and substituting ''chapter 83 of title 41''.

SEC. 40. TITLE 52, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 205(e) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20925(e)) is amended by striking ''section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5)'' and substituting ''section 6101 of title 41, United States Code''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Speaker, keeping track of the new laws Congress passes every session is a formidable challenge, but it is an essential part of maintaining the rule of law in our country and it is a duty we take seriously in the House.

The body of Federal law is so large and complex at this point that it would be almost completely unmanageable without the United States Code. Currently consisting of 54 titles, the Code compiles the general and permanent laws of the United States into coherent subject areas. The Code makes our Federal laws accessible, both to the government officials who work to fairly administer them and to the private citizens who seek the benefits or relief the laws provide them.

The Code did not appear magically out of thin air. Congress created it in 1926. And since that time, it has been painstakingly constructed and updated by expert lawyers working under the supervision of the House. We all owe a great debt to the Office of the Law Revision Counsel, whose attorneys ably carry out this statutory mandate ''to develop and keep current an official and positive codification of the laws of the United States,'' while maintaining strict impartiality as to legislative policy.

Pursuant to the law governing their work, the Office of the Law Revision Counsel has submitted this legislation containing amendments related to title 41, which Congress recently enacted into positive law. It contains purely technical changes that update the U.S. Code to reflect the new status of these titles.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that this bill does not change the meaning or effect of existing laws in any way. It is part of an ongoing effort to maintain the Code as an authoritative, accurate source of Federal law.

I thank Mr. FITZGERALD for introducing this important legislation, and I urge all Members to support the bill.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3239 introduced by my friend from Wisconsin, Representative FITZGERALD.

Public Law 111–350, which was signed into law on January 4, 2011, enacted title 41 of the United States Code by restating existing laws relating to public contracts. H.R. 3239 makes clarifying and technical improvements by updating statutory references to title 41. Article I, Clause 18 of the Constitution tasks Congress with making all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution its vested powers.

The clarity of legislation is imperative for the other branches to implement and the citizen to follow. The Office of the Law Revision Counsel prepares the titles of the U.S. Code and other technical updates to the Code by combining enacted laws by the same subject matter.

H.R. 3239 is a product of that effort. Providing clarity in the Federal Government public contracting process allows for transparency and lowers potential barriers to entry, which will give more businesses the opportunity to compete in the bidding process.

I appreciate the work of OLRC and Representative FITZGERALD on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3239.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

MAKING IMPROVEMENTS IN ENACTMENT OF TITLE 54, UNITED STATES CODE, INTO A POSITIVE LAW TITLE AND TO IMPROVE CODE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3241) to make improvements in the enactment of title 54, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3241

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

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Table of contents.
Sec. 2. Purpose.
Sec. 3. Title 15, United States Code.
Sec. 4. Title 16, United States Code.
Sec. 5. Title 43, United States Code.
Sec. 6. Amendments to Public Law 113–287 and Title 54, United States Code.
Sec. 7. Transitional and savings provisions.
Sec. 8. Repeals.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to make improvements in the enactment of title 54, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code.

SEC. 3. TITLE 15, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 107(a)(3)(D) of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (15 U.S.C. 720e(a)(3)(D)) is amended by striking ''the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.);'' and inserting ''division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code;''.

SEC. 4. TITLE 16, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 815(4) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3125(4)) is amended by striking ''section 100101(b)(1)'' and inserting ''section 100101(a)''.

SEC. 5. TITLE 43, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 4(b) of the Abandoned Shipwreck Act of 1987 (43 U.S.C. 2103(b)) is amended by striking ''title I of the National Historic Preservation Act,'' and inserting ''chapter 3029 of title 54, United States Code,''.

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 113–287 AND TITLE 54, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) SECTION 7 OF PUBLIC LAW 113–287.—Effective December 19, 2014, the Schedule of Laws Repealed in section 7 of Public Law 113–287 (128 Stat. 3273) is amended as follows:

(1) NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT.—The item relating to section 401 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Public Law 89–665, 16 U.S.C. 470x) (128 Stat. 3276) is stricken and that section is revived to read as if that item had not been enacted.

(2) PUBLIC LAW 91–383.—The item relating to section 3 of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–2) (128 Stat. 3277) is amended to read as follows and subsection (g) (words after 1st sentence) is revived to read as if that item had been enacted as follows:

''Schedule of Laws Repealed

''Act	Section	United States Code Former Classification
	''3 (less (g) (words after 1st sentence)).	1a–2 (less(g) (words after 1st sentence)).''.

(3) URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY ACT.—The items relating to title X, §§1004 through 1015 of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–625, 92 Stat. 3538) (128 Stat. 3277) are amended to read as follows:

''Schedule of Laws Repealed

''Act	Section	United States Code Former Classification
''Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95–625)	title X, §1004	16 U.S.C. 2503.
	''title X, §1005	16 U.S.C. 2504.
	''title X, §1006	16 U.S.C. 2505.
	''title X, §1007	16 U.S.C. 2506.
	''title X, §1008	16 U.S.C. 2507.
	''title X, §1009	16 U.S.C. 2508.
	''title X, §1010	16 U.S.C. 2509.
	''title X, §1011	16 U.S.C. 2510.
	''title X, §1012	16 U.S.C. 2511.
	''title X, §1013	16 U.S.C. 2512.
	''title X, §1014	16 U.S.C. 2513.
	''title X, §1015	16 U.S.C. 2514.''.

(b) SECTION 100507.—The heading for subsection (h)(3) of section 100507 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking ''(b), (c), and (g)'' and inserting ''(B), (C), AND (G)''.

(c) SECTION 100903.—The heading for subsection (a) of section 100903 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking ''GENERAL'' and inserting ''GENERAL.''.

(d) CHAPTER 1013.—Chapter 1013 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending section 101331 to read as follows:

''§ 101331. Purposes; definitions

''(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this subchapter are—

''(1) to develop where necessary an adequate supply of quality housing units for field employees of the Service in a reasonable timeframe;

''(2) to expand the alternatives available for construction and repair of essential Government housing;

''(3) to rely on the private sector to finance or supply housing in carryout out this subchapter, to the maximum extent possible, to reduce the need for Federal appropriations;

''(4) to ensure that adequate funds are available to provide for long-term maintenance needs of field employee housing; and

''(5) to eliminate unnecessary Government housing and locate such housing as is required in a manner such that primary resource values are not impaired.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this subchapter:

''(1) FIELD EMPLOYEE.—The term 'field employee' means—

''(A) an employee of the Service who is exclusively assigned by the Service to perform duties at a field unit, and the members of the employee's family; and

''(B) any other individual who is authorized to occupy Federal Government quarters under section 5911 of title 5, and for whom there is no feasible alternative to the provision of Federal Government housing, and the members of the individual's family.

''(2) PRIMARY RESOURCE VALUES.—The term 'primary resource values' means resources that are specifically mentioned in the enabling legislation for that field unit or other resource value recognized under Federal statute.

''(3) QUARTERS.—The term 'quarters' means quarters owned or leased by the Federal Government.

''(4) SEASONAL QUARTERS.—The term 'seasonal quarters' means quarters typically occupied by field employees who are hired on assignments of 6 months or less.''; and

(2) in the chapter table of contents, by amending the item relating to section 101331 to read as follows:

''101331. Purposes; definitions.''.

(e) CHAPTER 1015.—Chapter 1015 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 101521 through 101524 as sections 101522 through 101525;

(2) by inserting before section 101522, as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following:

''§ 101521. Purpose

''The purpose of this subchapter is to make the System more accessible in a manner consistent with the preservation of parks and the conservation of energy by encouraging the use of transportation modes other than personal motor vehicles for access to and in System units with minimum disruption to nearby communities through authorization of a pilot transportation program.'';

(3) in section 101522(b)(2)(B), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking ''ACQUISTION'' and inserting ''ACQUISITION'';

(4) in section 101524(a), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking ''101521'' and inserting ''101522''; and

(5) in the chapter table of contents—

(A) by redesignating the items relating to sections 101521 through 101524 as items relating to sections 101522 through 101525; and

(B) by inserting before the item relating to section 101522, as redesignated by subparagraph (A), the following:

''101521. Purpose.''.

(f) SECTION 101913.—The heading for paragraph (4)(C) of section 101913 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking ''MIMIMUM'' and inserting ''MINIMUM''.

(g) SECTION 102302.—The heading for subsection (d) of section 102302 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking ''RESPONSBILITIES'' and inserting ''RESPONSIBILITIES''.

(h) CHAPTER 2003.—Chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending section 200301 to read as follows:

''§ 200301. Purposes; definitions

''(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this chapter are—

''(1) to assist in preserving, developing, and assuring accessibility to all citizens of the United States and visitors who are lawfully present in the United States such quality and quantity of outdoor recreation resources as may be available and are necessary and desirable for individual active participation in that recreation; and

''(2) to strengthen the health and vitality of the citizens of the United States by—

''(A) providing funds for and authorizing Federal assistance to the States in planning, acquisition, and development of needed land and water areas and facilities; and

''(B) providing funds for the Federal acquisition and development of certain land and other areas.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this chapter:

''(1) FUND.—The term 'Fund' means the Land and Water Conservation Fund established under section 200302 of this title.

''(2) STATE.—The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.'';

(2) in section 200310(a), by striking ''section 9503(c)(3)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9503(c)(3)(B))'' and inserting ''section 9503(c)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9503(c)(3)(A))''; and

(3) in the chapter table of contents, by amending the item relating to section 200301 to read as follows:

''200301. Purposes; definitions.''.

(i) CHAPTER 2005.—Chapter 2005 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending section 200501 to read as follows:

''§ 200501. Purposes; complement to existing Federal programs; definitions

''(a) PURPOSES.— The purposes of this chapter are—

''(1) to authorize the Secretary to establish an urban park and recreation recovery program that would provide Federal grants to economically hard-pressed communities specifically for the rehabilitation of critically needed recreation areas, facilities, and development of improved recreation programs;

''(2) to improve recreation facilities and expand recreation services in urban areas with a high incidence of crime and to help deter crime through the expansion of recreation opportunities for at-risk youth; and

''(3) to increase the security of urban parks and to promote collaboration between local agencies involved in parks and recreation, law enforcement, youth social services, and juvenile justice system.

''(b) COMPLEMENT EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—The urban park and recreation recovery program is intended to complement existing Federal programs such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Community Development Grant Programs by encouraging and stimulating local governments to revitalize their park and recreation systems and to make long-term commitments to continuing maintenance of these systems. The assistance shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate and in the public interest to carry out the purposes of this chapter.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.— In this chapter:

''(1) AT-RISK YOUTH RECREATION GRANT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'at-risk youth recreation grant' means a grant in a neighborhood or community with a high prevalence of crime, particularly violent crime or crime committed by youthful offenders.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'at-risk youth recreation grant' includes—

''(i) a rehabilitation grant;

''(ii) an innovation grant; and

''(iii) a matching grant for continuing program support for a program of demonstrated value or success in providing constructive alternatives to youth at risk for engaging in

criminal behavior, including a grant for operating, or coordinating, a recreation program or service.

''(C) ADDITIONAL USES OF REHABILITATION GRANT.—In addition to the purposes specified in paragraph (8), a rehabilitation grant that serves as an at-risk youth recreation grant may be used for the provision of lighting, emergency phones, or any other capital improvement that will improve the security of an urban park.

''(2) GENERAL PURPOSE LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'general purpose local government' means—

''(A) a city, county, town, township, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State; and

''(B) the District of Columbia.

''(3) INNOVATION GRANT.—The term 'innovation grant' means a matching grant to a local government to cover costs of personnel, facilities, equipment, supplies, or services designed to demonstrate innovative and cost-effective ways to augment park and recreation opportunities at the neighborhood level and to address common problems related to facility operations and improved delivery of recreation service, not including routine operation and maintenance activities.

''(4) MAINTENANCE.—The term 'maintenance' means all commonly accepted practices necessary to keep recreation areas and facilities operating in a state of good repair and to protect them from deterioration resulting from normal wear and tear.

''(5) PRIVATE, NONPROFIT AGENCY.—The term 'private, nonprofit agency' means a community-based, nonprofit organization, corporation, or association organized for purposes of providing recreational, conservation, and educational services directly to urban residents on a neighborhood or communitywide basis through voluntary donations, voluntary labor, or public or private grants.

''(6) RECOVERY ACTION PROGRAM GRANT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'recovery action program grant' means a matching grant to a local government for development of local park and recreation recovery action programs to meet the requirements of this chapter.

''(B) USE.—A recovery action program grant shall be used for resource and needs assessment, coordination, citizen involvement and planning, and program development activities to—

''(i) encourage public definition of goals; and

''(ii) develop priorities and strategies for overall recreation system recovery.

''(7) RECREATION AREA OR FACILITY.—The term 'recreation area or facility' means an indoor or outdoor park, building, site, or other facility that is dedicated to recreation purposes and administered by a public or private nonprofit agency to serve the recreation needs of community residents. Emphasis shall be on public facilities readily accessible to residential neighborhoods, including multiple-use community centers that have recreation as 1 of their primary purposes, but excluding major sports arenas, exhibition areas, and conference halls used primarily for commercial sports, spectator, or display activities.

''(8) REHABILITATION GRANT.—The term 'rehabilitation grant' means a matching capital grant to a local government for rebuilding, remodeling, expanding, or developing an existing outdoor or indoor recreation area or facility, including improvements in park landscapes, buildings, and support facilities, but excluding routine maintenance and upkeep activities.

''(9) SPECIAL PURPOSE LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'special purpose local government' means a local or regional special district, public-purpose corporation, or other limited political subdivision of a State.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'special purpose local government' includes—

''(i) a park authority;

''(ii) a park, conservation, water, or sanitary district; and

''(iii) a school district.

''(10) STATE.—The term 'State' means a State, an instrumentality of a State approved by the Governor of the State, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.'';

(2) in section 200503(c), by striking ''transferree'' and inserting ''transferee''; and

(3) in the chapter table of contents, by amending the item relating to section 200501 to read as follows:

''200501. Purposes; complement to existing Federal programs; definitions.''.

(j) SECTION 302302.—The heading for subsection (a) of section 302302 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking ''OCCCUR'' and inserting ''OCCUR''.

(k) SECTION 302701.—Section 302701(e) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Preservations'' and inserting ''Preservation''.

(l) SECTION 302902.—The heading for paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 302902 of title 54, United States Code is amended by striking ''In general'' and inserting ''IN GENERAL''.

(m) SECTION 302908.—Section 302908(a) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''the'' before ''Government of Palau''.

(n) CHAPTER 3083.—Chapter 3083 of title 54, United States Code is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 308301 through 308304 as sections 308302 through 308305;

(2) by inserting before section 308302, as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following:

''§ 308301. Purposes

''The purposes of this chapter are—

''(1) to recognize the importance of the Underground Railroad, the sacrifices made by those who used the Underground Railroad in search of freedom from tyranny and oppression, and the sacrifices made by the people who helped them; and

''(2) to authorize the Service to coordinate and facilitate Federal and non-Federal activities to commemorate, honor, and interpret the history of the Underground Railroad, its significance as a crucial element in the evolution of the national civil rights movement, and its relevance in fostering the spirit of racial harmony and national reconciliation.'';

(3) in section 308302, as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking ''308302'' and inserting ''308303'';

(4) in section 308305(a), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''308302'' and inserting ''308303''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking '308303'' and inserting ''308304''; and

(5) in the chapter table of contents—

(A) by redesignating the items relating to sections 308301 through 308304 as items relating to sections 308302 through 308305; and

(B) by inserting before the item relating to section 308302, as redesignated by subparagraph (A), the following:

''308301. Purposes.''.

(o) SECTION 308704.—Section 308704(a)(1) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''subsection (c) of this section or'' after ''sold under''.

(p) SECTION 309101.—The heading for subsection (d) of section 309101 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking ''ACQUISTION'' and inserting ''ACQUISITION''.

(q) CHAPTER 3111.—Chapter 3111 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending section 311101 to read as follows:

''§ 311101. Purpose; definitions

''(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to authorize the Preserve America Program, including—

''(1) the Preserve America grant program in the Department of the Interior;

''(2) the recognition programs administered by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; and

''(3) the related efforts of Federal agencies, working in partnership with State, tribal, and local governments and the private sector, to support and promote the preservation of historic resources.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this chapter:

''(1) COUNCIL.—The term 'Council' means the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

''(2) HERITAGE TOURISM.—The term 'heritage tourism' means the conduct of activities to attract and accommodate visitors to a site or area based on the unique or special aspects of the history, landscape (including trail systems), and culture of the site or area.

''(3) PROGRAM.—The term 'program' means the Preserve America Program established under section 311102(a)''; and

(2) in the chapter table of contents, by amending the item relating to section 311101 to read as follows:

''311101. Purpose; definitions.''.

(r) SECTION 312304.—The heading for paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of section 312304 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking ''COMMISISON'' and inserting ''COMMISSION''.

SEC. 7. TRANSITIONAL AND SAVINGS PROVISIONS

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) RESTATED PROVISION.—The term ''restated provision'' means a provision of law that is enacted by section 6.

(2) SOURCE PROVISION.—The term ''source provision'' means a provision of law that is replaced by a restated provision.

(b) CUTOFF DATE.—The restated provisions replace certain provisions of law enacted on or before May 6, 2021. If a law enacted after that date amends or repeals a source provision, that law is deemed to amend or repeal, as the case may be, the corresponding restated provision. If a law enacted after that date is otherwise inconsistent with a restated provision or a provision of this Act, that law supersedes the restated provision or provision of this Act to the extent of the inconsistency.

(c) ORIGINAL DATE OF ENACTMENT UNCHANGED.—A restated provision is deemed to have been enacted on the date of enactment of the source provision.

(d) REFERENCES TO RESTATED PROVISIONS.—A reference to a restated provision is deemed to refer to the corresponding source provision.

(e) REFERENCES TO SOURCE PROVISIONS.—A reference to a source provision, including a reference in a regulation, order, or other law, is deemed to refer to the corresponding restated provision.

(f) REGULATIONS, ORDERS, AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—A regulation, order, or other administrative action in effect under a source provision continues in effect under the corresponding restated 54 provision.

(g) ACTIONS TAKEN AND OFFENSES COMMITTED.—An action taken or an offense committed under a source provision is deemed to have been taken or committed under the corresponding restated provision.

(h) LEGISLATIVE CONSTRUCTION.—An inference of legislative construction is not to be drawn by reason of a restated provision's location in the United States Code or by reason of the heading used for the restated provision.

SEC. 8. REPEALS.

The following provisions of law are repealed, except with respect to rights and duties that matured, penalties that were incurred, or proceedings that were begun before December 19, 2014:

Schedule of Laws Repealed

Act	Section	United States Code Former Classification
Act of May 15, 1896 (ch. 182)	1	16 U.S.C. 411.
	2	16 U.S.C. 412.
Act of March 3, 1897 (ch. 372)	1	16 U.S.C. 413.
	2	16 U.S.C. 414.
	4	16 U.S.C. 416.
	5	16 U.S.C. 413, 414, 416.
Act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 355 (last paragraph under heading ''NATIONAL MILITARY PARKS'' at 37 Stat. 442)	1	16 U.S.C. 421.
Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (Pub. L. 88–578)	title I, §1(b)	16 U.S.C. 460*l*–4.
Public Law 95–344	title III, §301(b)	16 U.S.C. 2301(b).
Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95–625)	title X, §1003	16 U.S.C. 2502.
National Park System Visitor Facilities Fund Act (Pub. L. 97–433)	1	16 U.S.C. 19gg note.
	2	16 U.S.C. 19aa note.
	3	16 U.S.C. 19bb note.
	4	16 U.S.C. 19cc note.
	5	16 U.S.C. 19dd note.
	6	16 U.S.C. 19ee note.
	7	16 U.S.C. 19ff note.
	8	16 U.S.C. 19gg note.
Omnibus Parks and Public Land Management Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104–333)	div. I, title VIII, §814(a)(1).	16 U.S.C. 17*o*(1).
	div. I, title VIII, §814(g)(4, (5)).	16 U.S.C. 1f.
National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105–203)	2(b)	16 U.S.C. 469*l*(b).
Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Pub. L. 111–11)	title VII, §7302(a)	16 U.S.C. 469n(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3241.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, just like H.R. 3239, this bill has been prepared by the Office of the Law Revision Counsel, and it makes a number of technical changes to update title 54 of the United States Code while making no substantive changes in law.

I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH) for introducing this legislation, and I urge all Members to support it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3241, introduced by Representative BUSH, which makes technical changes to title 54 of the United States Code relating to National Park Service and related programs.

Title 54 was enacted by Public Law 113–287 on December 19, 2014. Laws to codify titles of the Code do not create new law. They simply restate the many laws that Congress has already created in a more organized and readable manner.

After codifying a new title in the Code, often other technical corrections through the rest of the Code are needed to update cross references to that new title. This bill does just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3241, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3241, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

ARTISTIC RECOGNITION FOR TALENTED STUDENTS ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 704) to amend section 708 of title 17, United States Code, to permit the Register of Copyrights to waive fees for filing an application for registration of a copyright claim in certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 704

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 ''Artistic Recognition for Talented Students Act'' or the ''ARTS Act''.

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF FEES FOR WINNERS OF CERTAIN COMPETITIONS.

Section 708 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) In this subsection, the term 'covered competition' means—

''(A) an art competition sponsored by the Congressional Institute that is open only to high school students; and

''(B) the competition described in section 3 of H. Res. 77, as adopted by the 113th Congress.

''(2) With respect to a work that wins a covered competition, the Register of Copyrights—

''(A) shall waive the requirement under subsection (a)(1) with respect to an application for registration of a copyright claim for that work if that application is filed not later than the last day of the calendar year following the year in which the work claimed by the application wins the covered competition (referred to in this paragraph as the 'covered year'); and

''(B) may waive the fee described in subparagraph (A) for an application filed after the end of the covered year if the fee would

have been waived under that subparagraph had the application been submitted before the last day of the covered year.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 704, a bill that would help introduce promising young students who have won either the Congressional Art Competition or the Congressional App Challenge to the intellectual property system by waiving the fee for those students to apply for a copyright registration for their winning work.

I applaud Mr. JEFFRIES for introducing this bipartisan, bicameral legislation with Ms. MACE, along with their bipartisan cosponsors.

Many of us in this Chamber know just how important intellectual property rights are to our country and to our economy, yet studies show that awareness of intellectual property is lacking among the country's students, even if they pursue fields that are IP-intensive.

The ARTS Act helps close this awareness gap early on and allows these students to participate in the intellectual property system without a financial burden.

It builds on Congress' work to encourage the creativity of our Nation's youth with the establishment of the Congressional Art Competition nearly 40 years ago and the Congressional App Challenge more recently in 2013.

In the art competition, Members host a districtwide contest in which high school students compete to have their artwork hang in the Halls of Congress. In the app challenge, middle and high school students show off their computer coding skills and compete against others in their district.

Year after year, in both of these competitions, the talent our students display is remarkable. Through both, we continue to see our youth encouraged to develop their artistic and technology talents, as Congress intended.

The ARTS Act makes these competitions even more impactful. Under the bill, students may apply to register a copyright for their winning artwork and winning app for free. This introduces these students to the intellectual property system and the benefits of copyright protection.

Under current law, the Register of Copyrights cannot waive these fees on her own. The ARTS Act amends the Copyright Act to allow such a fee waiver for these specific circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I again applaud Mr. JEFFRIES and Ms. MACE for bringing forward this important bipartisan legislation, which will aid the next generation of creators and innovators, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 704, the Artistic Recognition for Talented Students Act, or ARTS Act.

The Constitution authorizes Congress to promote the progress of science and the useful arts by securing, for limited times, to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

Our copyright system is designed to help fulfill that mandate by promoting the work of authors, musicians, artists, and other creators. Creative industries contribute hundreds of billion of dollars to the U.S. economy each year.

This bill makes it easier for some of our brightest, young creators to obtain copyrights on their award-winning work. Promoting and encouraging the next generation of American creators ensures that our creative economy will remain strong for decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in me supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee from New York (Mr. NADLER) for yielding and his support, as well as the distinguished Member from the great State of North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) for his support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 704, the ARTS Act, a bipartisan, bicameral effort to support the student creators of America, help ignite their passions, and allow them to dream big.

The Framers of our Constitution and the Founders of our great country understood that society would benefit if we incentivize creativity and innovation. That is why Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution gives Congress the power to create a robust intellectual property system to promote the progress of science and useful arts. Many of our Founders, of course, were authors and inventors themselves.

The ARTS Act seeks to build upon this principle and practice by helping to introduce the next generation of creators from around the country to copyright and intellectual property.

Specifically, it would permit the Register of Copyrights to waive application filing fees to register a copyright for those talented high school students who win the Congressional Art Competition or the Congressional App Competition each year.

By doing so, student creators will be incentivized to register their works, allowing them to gain experience with the copyright process and insight into its subsequent benefits and familiarize themselves with our intellectual property system, which is in the fabric of the U.S. Constitution.

We have often worked together in a bipartisan fashion to carry out our constitutional mandate in this space, as we are doing today. In the last Congress, this bill unanimously passed the Senate, and it has bipartisan support in both Chambers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to particularly thank the original co-lead on this bill, Representative NANCY MACE, for her leadership and partnership on this legislation, as well as Senators TILLIS and LEAHY for leading this effort in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support our Nation's next generation of creators and to vote ''yes'' on this straightforward bipartisan, bicameral legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 704, the ''Artistic Recognition For Talented Students Act,'' or Arts Act,'' bicameral, bipartisan legislation that directs the Register of Copyrights to waive the filing fee for an application to register a copyright for a student's work that has won the Congressional Art Competition or the Congressional App Challenge.

The Congressional Art Competition (''Art Competition'') and the Congressional App Challenge (''App Challenge'') are annual district-by-district contests that recognize students' achievements in the visual arts and in the science, technology, engineering, and math (''STEM'') fields.

The Art Competition began in 1982 to encourage students' artistic creativity.

High school students are eligible to participate by submitting two-dimensional artwork, which is typically judged by a panel of local artists.

The App Challenge stems from H. Res. 77, adopted in the 113th Congress, which recognized both the importance of STEM achievement to the country and the importance of encouraging students to appreciate and pursue career paths in STEM and established an academic STEM challenge to further those goals.

Middle and high school students are eligible to participate in the App Challenge by creating a software app using any programming language and any platform.

Winners of the Art Competition have their work hung in the Cannon Tunnel for one year, and in the App Challenge, winning apps may be displayed in the Capitol or on the House's website.

H.R. 704 would add another element to the award winners' prizes—winning students will be able to file an application to register a

copyright for their winning artwork or app without paying a filing fee.

H.R. 704's filing fee waiver complements the related aims of both contests by introducing young artists and innovators to the intellectual property system and the benefits of copyright protection.

Intellectual property rights like copyright allow artists and innovators to protect and benefit economically from their work, incentivizing them to continue to pour time and resources into further creations and innovations.

Industries that rely on intellectual property have a significant economic impact and are integral to the U.S. economy.

Despite intellectual property's importance, studies show that students have low awareness of intellectual property, even if they are likely to encounter intellectual property later in their careers.

H.R. 704 helps close this awareness gap early on by introducing students who have shown interest in the arts and STEM to the possibilities of copyright registration and removing the economic barrier for pursuing such registration.

As part of the copyright application process, the winning works may also become a part of the Library of Congress' collections and archives, 75 further spreading the reach of these students' creations.

Under current law, the Register of Copyrights does not have authority to waive filing fees for winning students on her own.

Section 708(a)(1) of the Copyright Act prescribes that fees be paid to the Copyright Office for filing an application for registration of a copyright, and the Register has only limited authority to waive fees involving the United States government.

H.R. 704 amends this section to allow such waivers for the student winners of the Art Competition and App Challenge.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 704, "Artistic Recognition For Talented Students Act," or Arts Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 704.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

ADVANCING MUTUAL INTERESTS AND GROWING OUR SUCCESS ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2571) to include Portugal in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E–1 and E–2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of Portugal and to otherwise modify the eligibility criteria for E visas, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2571

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLES.

This Act may be cited as the "Advancing Mutual Interests and Growing Our Success Act" or the "AMIGOS Act".

SEC. 2. NONIMMIGRANT TRADERS AND INVESTORS.

For purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) of section 101(a)(15)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(E)), Portugal shall be considered to be a foreign state described in such section if the Government of Portugal provides similar nonimmigrant status to nationals of the United States.

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR E VISAS.

Section 101(a)(15)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(E)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(A) by inserting "(or, in the case of an alien who acquired the relevant nationality through a financial investment and who has not previously been granted status under this subparagraph, the foreign state of which the alien is a national and in which the alien has been domiciled for a continuous period of not less than 3 years at any point before applying for a nonimmigrant visa under this subparagraph)" before ", and the spouse"; and

(B) by striking "him" and inserting "such alien"; and

(2) by striking "he" each place such term appears and inserting "the alien".

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2571.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2571, the Advancing Mutual Interests and Growing Our Success Act, or AMIGOS Act, would allow citizens of Portugal to participate in the E–1 and E–2 visa programs for traders and investors if Portugal provides reciprocal treatment to U.S. citizens.

The E–1 Treaty Trader program provides temporary visas to individuals or employees of firms that engage in substantial trade with the United States.

The E–2 Treaty Investor program provides visas to individuals so that they can develop and direct the operations of an enterprise in which they have invested a substantial amount of capital.

The United States became Portugal's largest trading partner outside the European Union in 2015. Bilateral trade between our counties is growing at a rapid pace, from $4.2 billion in 2015 to $8.9 billion in 2019.

Unlike most European Union countries, Portugal did not have a bilateral treaty with the United States before joining the European Union. Now, despite being one of our closest allies and closest economic partners, they are one of only five European Union countries whose citizens are not eligible for E–1 and E–2 visas.

This is a bipartisan measure that we can all support. The bill simply would expand opportunities for Portuguese citizens to invest in the United States, facilitate trade, and create jobs for U.S. workers.

The bill also strengthens the E visa programs by ensuring that individuals who obtain the nationality of a treaty country through an investment-based visa have sufficient ties to their new country of nationality before they can qualify for an E–1 or E–2 visa.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for championing this issue and working across the aisle to build consensus on this legislation. H.R. 2571 will improve our economy and strengthen our ties with an important and longstanding ally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2571, the Advancing Mutual Interests and Growing Our Success Act, or the AMIGOS Act.

The bill makes nationals of Portugal eligible for E–1 and E–2 nonimmigrant visas, as long as Portugal allows reciprocal visas for U.S. nationals. E–1 visas are temporary visas available for treaty traders, and E–2 visas are available for treaty investors.

As stated in the Immigration and Nationality Act, these visas are available to aliens who are "entitled to enter the United States under and in pursuance of the provisions of a treaty of commerce and navigation between the United States and the foreign state of which the alien is a national, and their spouse and children solely to either carry on substantial trade, including trade in services or trade in technology, principally between the United States and the foreign state of which the alien is a national, or to develop and direct the operations of an enterprise in which the alien has invested a substantial amount of capital."

Alien employees of treaty traders and treaty investors may receive visas if they are coming to the United States ''to engage in duties of an executive or supervisory character; or, if employed in a lesser capacity, if they have special qualifications that make the services to be rendered essential to the efficient operation of the enterprise.''

E–1 and E–2 visa holders may be admitted initially for a period of 2 years, and can apply for extensions in 2-year increments.

The U.S. has entered into treaties of commerce since at least 1815, when we entered into a Convention to Regulate Commerce with the United Kingdom. Currently, the nationals of 82 countries are eligible for E–1 and/or E–2 visa status.

□ 1645

During fiscal year 2020, almost 26,800 E–1 and E–2 visas were issued, down because of the pandemic from roughly 50,000 during fiscal year 2019.

While the AMIGOS Act passed the House last Congress, the version we are considering today is somewhat different. The updated text includes language, added at the request of Senator LEE from Utah, aimed at preventing abuse of the E visa program whereby an individual essentially purchases citizenship in a U.S. trade treaty country simply to be eligible to get a U.S. E visa. Specifically, the language requires that an alien be domiciled in the U.S. trade treaty country for at least 3 years before the individual can apply for an E visa.

I thank Senator LEE for his commitment to ensuring the integrity of our visa programs.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, the chair of the Judiciary Committee, for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2571, the Advancing Mutual Interests and Growing Our Success Act, or the AMIGOS Act.

The AMIGOS Act is a bipartisan bill that I introduced along with my colleagues Mr. COSTA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. KHANNA to encourage greater investment and trade between the United States and Portugal.

H.R. 2571 makes Portuguese nationals eligible for E–1 and E–2 nonimmigrant investor visas. Extending visas to Portugal not only gives Portuguese businesses an opportunity to invest in the United States, but it is a mutually beneficial relationship that promotes jobs in both countries and growth in United States businesses and our economy.

The United States has no better friend than the country of Portugal. As one of the first countries to recognize the United States after the Revolutionary War, Portugal is one of our closest economic partners and strongest allies. Today, the United States maintains that longstanding relationship as the fifth-largest export market for Portugal and its largest trading partner outside of the European Union.

I am proud to represent the First District of Rhode Island, home to one of the country's largest and most vibrant Portuguese communities, a community that has made outstanding contributions in the arts, culture, business, and public service in this country for many decades.

The United States is Portugal's largest trading partner outside the European Union, with bilateral trade reaching $6.6 billion in 2019. There are currently over 130 American companies operating in Portugal in a wide range of economic sectors, including pharmaceutical, chemical, technology, banking, and health sectors.

In 2019, the United States' direct investment position in Portugal was $2.3 billion, an increase of 6 percent from 2018. The direct investment position from Portugal in the United States, however, experienced a 1 percent decrease to $1.4 billion from 2018 to 2019.

Portugal is one of only five EU countries whose citizens are not currently eligible for E–1 or E–2 visas. In the absence of a bilateral treaty, which Portugal cannot enter due to the rules of the European Union, Congress has the power to authorize E–1 and E–2 visa benefits to other countries. We have exercised our authority to do so for both Israel in 2012 and New Zealand in 2018.

I am proud to lead this effort to support our ally and friend, Portugal. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2571, the AMIGOS Act, and I again thank Mr. NADLER for bringing the bill to the floor.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the AMIGOS Act is bipartisan legislation that would improve our economy and strengthen our ties with an important and longstanding ally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2571, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

REDEFINING EASTERN AND MIDDLE JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1340) to amend title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is 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''; 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), Rockingham, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1340.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 1340 would redefine the boundaries of the middle and eastern districts of North Carolina to place Fort Bragg and Camp Mackall, a subinstallation of Fort Bragg located roughly 40 miles away, entirely within the eastern district, a very smart and instructive decision.

After having been introduced by both Senators from North Carolina, S. 1340 passed the Senate last week. H.R. 2746, the identical House companion to S. 1340, which recently passed the Judiciary Committee, was introduced by a friend and colleague, Congresswoman ROSS, and Congressman HUDSON and was cosponsored by every member of the North Carolina House delegation.

This is bipartisan, bicameral legislation that will improve the administration of justice in North Carolina.

Currently, even though Fort Bragg sits on the outskirts of Fayetteville, which is in the eastern district, the base straddles both judicial districts. The result of this split means that a Federal case arising on one part of Fort Bragg will be heard at the Fayetteville courthouse, which is roughly 20 minutes away, while a case arising on another part of the base could be heard at courthouses more than 2 hours away.

The logistical difficulties resulting from Fort Bragg's split jurisdiction can extend beyond the inconvenience of unnecessarily long travel times. In criminal cases, for example, courts have had difficulty ensuring that defendants have received notice of their rights. S. 1340 will fix that and fix it now.

I want to thank Ms. ROSS for her bipartisan work on this issue and for her enormous leadership in championing this legislation in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill. I urge my colleagues to support it as well, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1340 will improve judicial economy by redefining the judicial districts of my home State of North Carolina.

Fort Bragg, which is located in North Carolina, is one of the U.S. Army's largest military installations. It spans six counties and is approximately 250 square miles large. Fort Bragg is located in two judicial districts, the middle district and the eastern district of North Carolina. This has led to inconvenience for both defendants and the courts system.

S. 1340 redefines the judicial districts so that Fort Bragg and a sub-installation, Camp Mackall, are located in a single judicial district, the eastern district. This change will streamline and improve judicial administration and efficiency.

I want to thank Senator TILLIS and Senator BURR for their work on this bill. I also want to thank the former member from North Carolina, Mr. Holding. And I also want to thank my law school classmate, Representative ROSS, for sponsoring and the rest of the North Carolina delegation for joining me in cosponsoring the House companion, H.R. 2746.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS), who is the House sponsor of this very important legislation.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today also to highlight this critical bill that will help North Carolinians.

This commonsense legislation will revise North Carolina's judicial district lines to place Fort Bragg, one of the largest military installations in the world, entirely within the eastern district. Currently, the district lines bisect the base, resulting in unnecessary administrative and logistical problems for the people of our State.

This legislation will ease the burden of traveling miles to Durham, Greensboro, or Winston-Salem and, instead, let servicemembers resolve court matters in nearby Fayetteville or Raleigh. A similar redistricting occurred several years ago when Congress moved Butner into the eastern district.

This bipartisan piece of legislation will benefit our servicemembers and their families.

I am honored to work with my North Carolina colleagues, Congressman HUDSON, Senator TILLIS, and Senator BURR, my colleague from law school class, and the entire delegation to get this bill across the finish line. I am pleased it passed out of the Senate, and I look forward to passing it in the House and having it signed into law by the President.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is sensible and prudent to the administration of justice in my home State.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a good day on the floor of the House. S. 1340 will improve the administration of justice in the Federal courts of North Carolina.

This is not only a bipartisan, bicameral effort, but it is also evidence of Republicans and Democrats working together for the uplifting of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of Representative ROSS in bringing this bill forward, and I hope all of my colleagues will enthusiastically support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1340 would redefine the boundaries of the Middle and Eastern Districts of North Carolina to place Fort Bragg and Camp Mackall (a sub-installation of Fort Bragg located roughly 40 miles away) entirely within the Eastern District.

After having been introduced by both Senators from North Carolina, S. 1340 passed the Senate last week. H.R. 2746, the identical House companion to S. 1340, which recently passed the Judiciary Committee, was introduced by Congresswoman ROSS and Congressman HUDSON and was cosponsored by every member of the North Carolina House Delegation.

This is bipartisan, bicameral legislation that will improve the administration of justice in North Carolina.

Currently, even though Fort Bragg sits on the outskirts of Fayetteville, which is in the Eastern District, the base straddles both judicial districts.

The result of this split means that a federal case arising on one part of Fort Bragg will be heard at the Fayetteville courthouse, which is roughly 20 minutes away, while a case arising on another part of the base could be heard at courthouses more than two hours away. The logistical difficulties resulting from Fort Bragg's split jurisdiction can extend beyond the inconvenience of unnecessarily long travel times—in criminal cases, for example, courts have had difficulty ensuring that defendants have received notice of their rights. S. 1340 will fix that.

I want to thank Ms. ROSS for her bipartisan work on this issue, and for championing this legislation in the House. I am pleased to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1340 will improve the administration of justice in the federal courts in North Carolina.

I appreciate the leadership of Representative Ross in bringing this bill forward, and I hope all my colleagues will support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1340.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROSENDALE. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

FOUNDATION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION CHARTER AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2679) to amend title 36, United States Code, to revise the Federal charter for the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2679

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 ''Foundation of the Federal Bar Association Charter Amendments Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION.

Section 70501 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

SEC. 3. MEMBERSHIP.

Section 70503 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in this chapter, eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members are as provided in the bylaws.''; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

SEC. 4. GOVERNING BODY.

Section 70504 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 70504. Governing body

''(a) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—The board of directors is the governing body of the corporation. The board may exercise, or provide for the exercise of, the powers of the corporation. The board of directors and the responsibilities of the board are as provided in the bylaws.

''(b) OFFICERS.—The officers and the election of the officers are as provided for in the bylaws.''.

SEC. 5. RESTRICTIONS.

Section 70507 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 70507. Restrictions

''(a) STOCK AND DIVIDENDS.—The corporation may not issue stock or declare or pay a dividend.

''(b) POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—The corporation or a director or officer in his or her corporate capacity may not contribute to, support, or participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

''(c) DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME OR ASSETS.—The income or assets of the corporation may not inure to the benefit of, or be distributed to, a director, officer, or member during the life of the charter granted by this chapter. This subsection does not prevent the payment, in amounts approved by the board of directors, of—

''(1) reasonable compensation; or

''(2) reimbursement for expenses incurred in undertaking the corporation's business, to officers, directors, or members.

This subsection does not prevent the award of a grant to a Federal Bar Association chapter of which an officer, director, or member may be a member. This subsection also does not prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the corporation's employees for services undertaken on behalf of the corporation.

''(d) LOANS.—The corporation may not make a loan to a director, officer, member, or employee.

''(e) IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY.—Members and private individuals are not liable for the obligations of the corporation.

''(f) CLAIM OF GOVERNMENTAL APPROVAL OR AUTHORITY.—The corporation may not claim congressional approval or the authority of the United States Government for any of its activities; it may, however, acknowledge this charter.''.

SEC. 6. PRINCIPAL OFFICE.

Section 70508 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia,'' and inserting ''a United States location decided by the board of directors and specified in the bylaws,''.

SEC. 7. SERVICE OF PROCESS.

Section 70510 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 70510. Service of process

''The corporation shall comply with the law on service of process of the State or District in which it is incorporated.''.

SEC. 8. DEPOSIT OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR FINAL LIQUIDATION.

Section 70512 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 70512. Deposit of assets on dissolution or final liquidation

''On dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, any assets of the corporation remaining after the discharge of all liabilities shall be distributed as provided by the board of directors, but in compliance with the charter and bylaws.''.

SEC. 9. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2679.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2679, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association Charter Amendments Act of 2021, makes important changes to the Federal charter for the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association.

This legislation is intended to give the Federal Bar Association the flexibility it needs to operate well into the future without the need for further congressional amendment.

Among other things, the legislation makes the following changes to the association's charter:

It requires the board of directors to decide, and specify in the bylaws, the location of the principal office.

It specifies that the bylaws, not the charter, must provide for the terms of membership, the responsibilities of the board of directors, and the election of officers.

It prohibits a director or officer in his or her corporate capacity from contributing to, supporting, or participating in political activities.

It expands a prohibition on loans for directors and officers to include members and employees.

It specifies that on dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, any remaining assets must be distributed as provided by the board of directors instead of deposited in the Treasury.

I thank Mr. CHABOT for introducing this important bipartisan legislation, along with Mr. RASKIN.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2679 and, as well, support this insight and new look at justice, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2679, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association Charter Amendments Act of 2021.

The Federal Bar Association was founded in 1920 as a nonprofit organization seeking to strengthen the Federal legal system and administration of justice. In 1954, Congress chartered the Federal Bar Association as a congressionally chartered organization under title 36 of the United States Code.

□ 1700

The FBA serves the Federal legal community and public by promoting standards of professional competence and ethical conduct, providing educational programs, and facilitating the administration of justice.

The FBA is also committed to bringing civics education programs to classrooms across the country. As a congressionally chartered organization, it takes an act of Congress to make changes to the FBA's charter. The FBA has not amended or updated its charter since 1954.

H.R. 2679 amends the FBA's current charter to allow the organization to choose the location of its principal office, restrict its officers from engaging in political activity, and change its charter language to conform with language used in other congressional charters. In addition, this legislation will allow the FBA to make simple changes to its bylaws without an act of Congress.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. CHABOT from Ohio, for his diligent work on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the distinguished gentleman who is the cosponsor of this legislation here in the House. We thank him so much for his leadership.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to serve as the lead Democratic cosponsor of the bill introduced by my friend from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association Charter Amendments Act of 2021.

The Federal Bar Association is the primary voluntary bar association for attorneys, both in the private and public sectors, who practice in the Federal courts. The bill will permit the foundation to better fulfill its role as the only institution chartered in America by Congress to promote the Federal administration of justice, the advancement of Federal jurisprudence, and the practice of law in the Federal courts by providing it with the organizational flexibility that it needs to grow and to adapt to its contemporary mission.

The original charter created a framework that has served FBA well for the last six decades. During these years, the foundation has, indeed, strengthened Federal jurisprudence and promoted legal education and understanding at the Federal level, and it

has improved the lives of a lot of people.

One community outreach program I know about through a number of my constituents is the Wills for Veterans initiative, which is a pro bono project where the FBA chapters provide the drafting of wills and signing services for veterans in our communities.

Another initiative set up the Dr. J. Clay Smith Jr. Diversity in the Legal Profession Scholarship program, which aims to promote diversity in the profession and to promote the inclusion of racially and ethnically diverse students in law schools and in the work of the Federal Bar Association.

All of these programs and initiatives broaden and strengthen the legal community and need to be bolstered in the years ahead. To allow the FBA greater flexibility to operate and grow as the legal community changes, the current charter must be amended.

In its current iteration, the existing charter codifies strict membership and governance requirements that constrain member development and nimble governance of the organization. This rigidity presents serious challenges as the organization seeks to expand its critical educational and charitable work.

H.R. 2679 makes technical fixes to the charter that will give the FBA the needed flexibility to advance its mission in the 21st century. In the place of legislatively fixed membership criteria, it permits FBA to establish and update membership criteria through the bylaws process itself. Similar provisions authorize enhanced flexibility in the composition and duties of the members of its board.

In general, the measure would enable the FBA to swiftly meet the needs and the priorities of the organization and improve the administration of Federal justice. I urge all colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, we have found ourselves striking a chord for justice and clarification to an important organization that stands for justice, the Federal Bar Association. I thank the sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation makes a number of important changes to strengthen the charter of the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2679, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association Charter Amendments Act of 2021, makes important changes to the federal charter for the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association.

This legislation is intended to give the Federal Bar Association the flexibility it needs to operate well into the future, without the need for further congressional amendment.

Among other things, the legislation makes the following changes to the Association's charter:

It requires the board of directors to decide, and specify in the bylaws, the location of the principal office;

It specifies that the bylaws—not the charter—must provide for the terms of membership, the responsibilities of the board of directors, and the election of officers;

It prohibits a director or officer, in his or her corporate capacity, from contributing to, supporting, or participating in political activities;

It expands a prohibition on loans for directors and officers to include members and employees; and

It specifies that on dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, any remaining assets must be distributed as provided by the board of directors instead of deposited in the Treasury.

I thank Mr. CHABOT for introducing this important bipartisan legislation, along with Mr. RASKIN.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation makes a number of important changes to strengthen the charter of the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association.

I urge all Members to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2679, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GRIFFITH. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3239.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS FOR CUSTOMER EDUCATION INITIATIVES AND NON-AWARDS EXPENSES OF COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION WHISTLEBLOWER PROGRAM

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 409) to provide for the availability of amounts for customer education initiatives and non-awards expenses of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Whistleblower Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 409

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

SECTION 1. COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION WHISTLEBLOWER PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is established in the Treasury a separate account (referred to in this section as the ''account''), the amounts in which shall be available for the sole purposes of—

(1) carrying out the activities described in section 23(g)(2)(B) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 26(g)(2)(B)) (referred to in this section as ''customer education initiatives''); and

(2) funding the administrative, programmatic, and personnel expenses of the Whistleblower Office and the Office of Customer Education and Outreach of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'') in carrying out section 23 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 26) (referred to in this section as ''non-awards expenses'').

(b) TRANSFERS FROM FUND INTO ACCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission shall transfer up to $10,000,000 from the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Customer Protection Fund established under section 23(g)(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 26(g)(1)) (referred to in this section as the ''Fund'') into the account.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall be available for obligation without further appropriation and remain available until October 1, 2022.

(3) REMAINING AMOUNTS.—Amounts remaining in the account that are unobligated on October 1, 2022, shall be returned to the Fund.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR OBLIGATIONS.—The Commission may make obligations from the account only when the unobligated balance of the Fund is insufficient to pay non-awards expenses and expenses for customer education initiatives due to awards that the Commission has ordered under section 23(b) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 26(b)).

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Commission shall include in each report required under section 23(g)(5) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 26(g)(5)) the same information with respect to the account as the Commission includes in the report with respect to the Fund, to the extent the information is relevant to the account.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 409.

S. 409 provides a bipartisan, short-term legislative solution to address a funding shortage in CFTC's Customer Protection Fund. The Consumer Protection Fund is used to pay whistleblower awards that fund the salaries and expenses of the Whistleblower Office and the Office of Customer Education and Outreach.

Without this critical funding, CFTC would have to suspend some operations and furlough employees in the Whistleblower Office and the Office of Customer Education and Outreach.

This short-term solution is by no means a replacement for the much-needed comprehensive CFTC reauthorization. It will still, though, be a positive step to ensure that the CFTC can accomplish the important mission to promote the integrity, resilience, and vibrancy of the U.S. derivatives markets.

The Committee on Agriculture passed a committee print equivalent of this measure unanimously by voice vote last Wednesday.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 409. I want to second what my colleague, the gentleman from California, has said about the importance of the CFTC Whistleblower Office and the Office of Customer Education and Outreach, and, of course, the employees who work in those offices.

These offices help the Commission meet its mission to promote integrity, resilience, and vibrancy of the U.S. derivatives markets. I am proud to support today's legislation to avoid unnecessary disruptions to these activities and needless staff furloughs.

The work in these offices, particularly the Whistleblower Office, helps to root out violations of the law which harm individuals and undermine derivatives markets. Fraud and market manipulation can steal customer funds, distort prices, disrupt orderly trading and settlement, and sap confidence in the fairness of our markets. Whistleblowers are a critical source of information which helps the Commission protect the integrity of our commodity markets.

I also want to emphasize that today's legislation does not spend any new money or create any new programs. Rather, it sets aside existing funds to meet existing obligations. S. 409 ensures that funds to support the functioning of the whistleblower and customer education offices are temporarily prioritized over the funds to pay whistleblower awards in order to keep the offices fully functional. In the end, both obligations will be fully met as Congress intended.

As the ranking member of the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee, I feel a particular responsibility to make sure that the CFTC has the best tools at its disposal to meet its mission.

As we move forward in the coming months, I am looking forward to digging deeper into the work of the Commission and coming together to craft a responsible CFTC reauthorization bill which makes permanent improvements to the Whistleblower Office funding mechanism and meets the needs of the 21st century financial regulator.

I want to take a moment to thank Chairman SCOTT and Ranking Member THOMPSON for their willingness to involve the whole committee in this legislative effort. As a new member of the committee, I appreciated the opportunity to act as a body in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say simply that I am proud to support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support S. 409.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 409.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GRIFFITH. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DEUTCH) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ENHANCING STATE ENERGY SECURITY PLANNING AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1374) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide Federal financial assistance to States to implement, review, and revise State energy security plans, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 21, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—398

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Eshoo
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C. Scott
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul

McClain
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—21

Bowman
Brooks
Bush
Escobar
Espaillat
García (IL)
Good (VA)
Greene (GA)
Harris
Herrell
Huffman
Jones
Massie
Meng
Omar
Perry
Pressley
Roy
Tlaib
Velázquez
Weber (TX)

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Allen
Babin
Burchett
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Fulcher
Hollingsworth
Mrvan
Pingree
Salazar

□ 1900

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Messrs. ROY, BROOKS, ESPAILLAT, WEBER of Texas, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mses. HERRELL and ESCOBAR changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. LONG, HIGGINS of New York, and HERN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 173 and H.R. 1374, I mistaken recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no."

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Balderson)
Clarke (NY) (Jeffries)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Espaillat (Jeffries)
García (IL) (Garcia (TX))
Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kelly (IL) (Jeffries)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Kuster (Blunt Rochester)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Lynch (Clark (MA))
Maloney, Carolyn (Rice (NY))
McCaul (Arrington)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moulton (Beyer)
Mullin (Cole)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (McGovern)
Pappas (Clark (MA))
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Levin (CA))
Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Suozzi (Panetta)
Thompson (MS) (Butterfield)
Torres (Clark (MA))
Vela (Gomez)
Velázquez (Jeffries)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

PREVENTING CRIMES AGAINST VETERANS ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 983) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 5, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

YEAS—416

Adams
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C. Scott
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)

Wilson (SC)	Womack	Young
Wittman	Yarmuth	Zeldin

NAYS—5

Bowman	Ocasio-Cortez	Pressley
Bush	Omar	

NOT VOTING—9

Aderholt	Davis, Danny K.	Mrvan
Brady	Fulcher	Pingree
Burchett	Hollingsworth	Salazar

□ 1923

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Balderson)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Neal (McGovern)
Clarke (NY) (Jeffries)	Kuster (Blunt Rochester)	Pappas (Clark (MA))
Cooper (Clark (MA))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Payne (Pallone)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))	Lieu (Beyer)	Porter (Levin (CA))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Espaillat (Jeffries)	Lynch (Clark (MA))	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Garcia (IL) (Garcia (TX))	Maloney, Carolyn (Rice (NY))	Rush (Underwood)
Hoyer (Brown)	McCaul (Arrington)	Sewell (DelBene)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Meng (Clark (MA))	Suozzi (Panetta)
Kelly (IL) (Jeffries)	Moulton (Beyer)	Thompson (MS) (Butterfield)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)	Mullin (Cole)	Torres (Clark (MA))
	Napolitano (Correa)	Vela (Gomez)
		Velázquez (Jeffries)
		Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

THERE IS STILL WORK TO BE DONE

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of our newest Federal holiday. Juneteenth marks the critical point in our Nation's history when the final enslaved Americans were freed from the evil bondage of slavery 156 years ago.

Honestly, as a student growing up in Rhode Island, surrounded by mostly White classmates, I was never taught about Juneteenth. As much as I hate to admit it, Juneteenth was simply not a part of my education.

Some of my colleagues have suggested that we should ignore our history, as inconvenient or uncomfortable as it may be. Well, that is wrong. As a nation, we must own up to our mistakes and celebrate our ability to overcome them, not attempt to sweep them under the rug.

Juneteenth is every bit a part of American history. It is a time to honor those who fought so hard to end slavery and to reflect on the work that remains before true racial justice is achieved.

As we celebrate last week's vote, let us recommit ourselves to rooting out the systemic racism that still plagues our Nation.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, the Declaration of Independence says that our God-given freedoms are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As Members of Congress, we made a commitment to uphold those freedoms equally for everyone, but Democrats and their radical allies are chipping them away.

Let's be clear. The Hyde amendment is not discriminatory. Instead, it is an essential safeguard that not only protects Americans' right of conscience, but also has saved more than two million lives from abortion since its first enactment in 1976.

Until recently, it was also overwhelmingly bipartisan. In fact, one of the most vocal supporters in Congress was then-Senator Joe Biden. He told one of his constituents in 1994, ''The government should not tell those with strong convictions against abortion, such as you and I, that we must pay for them.''

Well said, Mr. President.

Since then, the purpose of Hyde hasn't changed. The strong convictions of American people against abortion hasn't changed. In poll after poll, they tell us they strongly support a wall of separation between abortions and taxpayers.

And the science hasn't changed. If anything, it has proven beyond a shadow of doubt that human life begins at conception.

One thing, however, has changed: The Democrats. By putting Hyde on the chopping block, the message they are sending is clear and chilling; that the radical demands of the socialist left drown out common sense, science, and the views of most Americans; that the party of ''safe, legal, and rare'' is now the party of abortion on demand, until or even after the point of birth, and funded by taxpayers; and that the government will compel taxpayers to violate their strongest convictions.

Madam Speaker, the question before us today is a simple and straightforward moral issue. To represent the values of all Americans, Congress must respect their rights of conscience and not disregard them.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

□ 1930

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, on the Republican side, it is cleared, so there is only one party denying it.

CALLING ON NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE MENTAL HEALTH LEGISLATION

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to call my colleagues' attention to the dire need for Congress to continue building upon recent progress to unlock the mysteries of the human brain and serious mental illness. Along with other legislation we are working on in the field of health, we have to create and pass robust mental health legislation.

Alongside other members of our Congressional Mental Health Caucus and the Bipartisan Addiction and Mental Health Task Force, we are pulling together legislation to establish a comprehensive Mental Health Crisis Response Act.

I invite all of our colleagues to please work with our bipartisan working group. America has waited too long. The fundamentals of our social economy depend on the good health of our citizenry, and their ability to access quality and affordable behavioral health services has for too long been ignored.

Countless constituents face insurance barriers when accessing mental health services, and we must address the negative social and physical determinants of health that cause trauma and tragic illnesses.

It is time for us to take meaningful action. Again, I invite my colleagues to join us in preparing this important legislation.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act to codify the Hyde amendment language, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

CONSTITUENTS ARE FRUSTRATED

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share a letter to the editor from a constituent published this morning. Here is what he said:

I worked the polls for 10 years, which included 20 elections and over 25 hours of training. As the years passed, technology improved, training got more efficient, and communications were state of the art. I am so proud to be an American and contributing to our system of democracy.

At my poll, five of us work together. There are also two watchers from each party. The results are posted on the door of the polling place immediately for residents to see. Votes are checked against duplications and death certificates. We have a paper ballot that can be matched to a voter machine. The machines are not hooked up to the internet, preventing interference and hacking.

My heart breaks with every utterance of voter fraud. Please don't let the GOP erode voting rights.

Signed: Former Republican.

I share this constituent's frustration. We are both fed up with people repeating lies about the security of our elections in order to justify voter suppression.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, as a new mom expecting a child this fall, I will never forget my husband and I hearing our child's heartbeat for the first time, truly the greatest miracle of life. But sadly, that culture and value of life are under attack.

The Hyde amendment has historically been supported by both Republicans and Democrats for more than 40 years.

American taxpayers should never be forced to pay for abortions, and since 1976, this Chamber has agreed and passed the Hyde amendment with bipartisan support. But now, President Biden and House Democrats caving to the far left are trying to reverse course and strip the Hyde amendment from the budget.

It is unacceptable that President Biden is destroying a policy that has saved over 2.4 million innocent American lives.

Every President since Carter has signed the Hyde amendment into law. It is a critical lifesaving protection that goes beyond party-line politics. It is about human life and protecting the most innocent among us.

The majority of Americans agree that taxpayer dollars should never be used to fund abortions. Democrats should listen.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DANIEL DELGADO TORRES

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

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life of one of my constituents, an Anaheim resident, Specialist Daniel Delgado Torres, who suddenly passed away on February 16 in an automobile accident.

The son of immigrants, I recently had the opportunity to meet with his mother and father, who told me a story. They said from the early days that they could remember, Daniel dreamed of being an American soldier. In 2016, he had the opportunity when he joined the United States Army, and he became the first of his family to join the military.

He was deployed to Afghanistan and was awarded the Army Achievement Medal for helping save the lives of seven of his fellow soldiers.

Daniel was just 22 when he passed away. He is survived by his parents, Teresa and Aurielo; his sister, Yasiry; his girlfriend, Noelia; and their young son, Joaquin.

Madam Speaker, I thank Daniel for his service to our country.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, 166 Members of Congress have cosponsored H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, to make the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions permanent and to ensure that the Affordable Care Act conforms with the Hyde amendment.

According to public opinion polls, most Americans, almost 60 percent, according to the Marist poll, agree that taxpayers should not be forced against their conscience to fund abortion.

Years ago, then-Senator Biden wrote to constituents, explaining his support for the Hyde amendment, and said it would ''protect both the woman and her unborn child. . . .'' He said: ''I have consistently—on no fewer than 50 occasions—voted against Federal funding for abortions. . . . Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them.'' So said Senator Biden. I totally agree.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

INFRASTRUCTURE IN AMERICA NEEDS OVERHAUL

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

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise to support acting, taking up and passing the American Jobs Plan and the American Families Plan.

Our infrastructure is in dire need of an overhaul, and it can't be put off any longer.

We also need to invest in the human infrastructure in our country, and we don't have to choose one over the other.

Americans across the Nation rely on sustainable infrastructure to get their children to school, to get to work, to facilitate commerce. We need to build on the investments that this Congress has already made through the American Rescue Plan, including dollars that are flowing to our communities.

Madam Speaker, $2 million has recently been sent to Milwaukee for the East-West Bus Rapid Transit project in my district, a green public transit option.

I support the American Jobs Plan, bold investment to get every lead pipe in our country out from underneath our ground.

I also support investments in paid leave, childcare, and expanded access to affordable and quality health insurance.

I urge my colleagues to support these measures.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, today, the House debated several bills to address the health and safety of children and newborns, including those that would ban crib bumpers and mandate stability standards for furniture that could fall on children.

Unfortunately, this body did not consider any legislation that would continue to ensure that precious taxpayer dollars are not used to fund abortions that intentionally kill babies. At a time when this protection of the unborn may be stripped from Federal funding bills for the first time in nearly 50 years, it should be pointed out that abortion ends exponentially more lives than crib bumpers or furniture.

Madam Speaker, I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for

Abortion Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

CONGRESS MUST STOP VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart with the extended amount of violence in this country that has taken hold of us through the pandemic, and now we seem to be under siege.

No, it is not one isolated issue or community. It is not one isolated reason. But it is a heavy burden on our children. Our children have experienced an enormous amount of violence.

I intend, in my subcommittee, to discuss and have a briefing on both gun violence and the impact on children, as well as violence, and to be able to work with the administration on collaborative ways of dealing with the ending of gun trafficking that has been a source of the mass spreading of guns.

Laws like permitless guns, though I know they are in 12 States, create a synergism of opportunity for guns to be spread everywhere, and then the lack of respect for the dignity of our children so that guns are not stored. I intend to introduce a gun storage bill.

I ask that if you see something, say something. We must, as a Congress and America, stop the violence.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Hyde amendment, which is the longest prolife precedent in American history. This amendment prevents our taxpayer dollars from ending the lives of society's most vulnerable, the unborn.

Madam Speaker, for over 40 years, Congress, both Republican and Democrat administrations, have supported the Hyde amendment to prohibit publicly funded abortions. That tradition seems to have ended with this current administration.

Protecting life is not and should not be a partisan issue. The President and congressional Democrats need to listen to the American people, who overwhelmingly support life and continue to uphold this important protection.

We as a country believe in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which is why we must defend that vital first tenet of life and support the Hyde amendment.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

□ 1945

A TRIBUTE TO BRADLEY KARMEN

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a truly great public servant. Mr. Bradley Karmen served 41 years at the Department of Agriculture, most recently as associate deputy administrator of Farm Programs at the Farm Service Agency.

Put in perspective, President Lincoln established the Department of Agriculture in 1862, and Brad Karmen worked there for nearly one-third of the Department's entire existence.

Ironically, Brad is a city kid, having grown up on Long Island. He would be the first to tell you he knew nothing about agriculture or the Federal farm policy that he would help fashion over the course of nearly a half century. It is not an exaggeration to say that no regulation cleared the Farm Service Agency or farm law was enacted without Brad's careful eye and wise counsel.

Madam Speaker, I don't know how a Long Island kid with no knowledge of agriculture or farm policy came to dedicate his professional career to helping the American farmer, but I am sure grateful he did.

Thank you, Brad, for your distinguished career of public service. Godspeed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HUGH BROWN McNATT

(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 the life of Hugh Brown McNatt, who passed away on June 1, 2021.

Hugh was known throughout Georgia for his remarkable career as a trial lawyer for over 50 years. Born on June 23, 1946, in Uvalda, Georgia, Hugh learned the importance of hard work, humility, and dedication to helping others. He flourished in law school and immediately began trying cases all over Georgia and throughout the southeast.

After advocating for others his entire life, he won several awards, including the Tradition of Excellence Award and the Thomas O. Marshall Professionalism Award.

Outside the courtroom, he was a member of many organizations, including the American College of Trial Lawyers, the American Board of Trial Advocates, and the International Society of Barristers.

He left a lifelong impact on his community, Georgia politics, his countless friends, and his family.

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

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, since 1976, the Hyde Amendment has protected American taxpayers from being complicit in the atrocity that is abortion on demand. And since 1976, the Hyde Amendment has been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis, signed into law by both Republican and Democrat Presidents, and supported by most Americans, until now, as President Biden's proposed budget eliminates it altogether.

Madam Speaker, we are treading in dangerous territory. Democrats have completely abandoned millions of prolife Americans just like me, who vehemently oppose using taxpayer dollars to fund abortion. And even worse, they have done it for no other reason than to appease their own radical base.

President Biden said it best in 1994: ''Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them.'' And in 2006, he said: ''Won't support public funding of abortion.''

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S UNIFIED AGENDA

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I rise today to note an odd philosophy that I have seen amongst my Democrat colleagues, and it is this: The belief that if one regulation is good, then ten must be better. Of course, that is not true, but it is actually worse than that. The Biden administration is proposing 2,500 new regulations; they call this ''the unified agenda.'' I am not sure what is unifying about suffocating American businesses and workers under D.C. bureaucrats.

We are killing our economy by the death of a thousand cuts. Our products will be more expensive, and that is if

their manufacturing isn't just immediately shipped off to China.

Biden said he wouldn't ban fracking outright, but will make it impossible to build new projects, build pipelines, or export our clean American natural gas that would decrease global carbon emissions.

These new regulations will take away our choices on healthcare, encourage illegal immigration, discourage the enforcement of our immigration laws, and more than that, this philosophy of regulate at any cost will result in silly regulations like this: Reducing disturbances to Hawaiian spinner dolphins from human interaction.

This is not how we govern.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM JAMES LEAVY

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

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of my godfather and uncle, William James Leavy—a life very well-lived, he passed away February 16, 2021.

Bill Leavy was married to his wife, my aunt, Gloria, for 67 years. They had three children: Cynthia, Cheryl, and Colleen, and one grandchild, Jonathan.

Bill Leavy served in the United States Army in Korea in combat for two full years, and the horrors that he must have seen.

In his later years, he worked as a letter carrier for the post office and was awarded a 50-year gold membership in the National Association of Letter Carriers.

His favorite pastime was poetry, and he was extremely proud of that; and his family knew him as an ''Irish poet.''

I look back on a life very well-lived. He was my godfather; he was my uncle; and he married the love of his life.

He fought for this country because he loved this country.

And if we could all honor all our veterans, and, tonight, Bill Leavy. Thank you.

FUND THE POLICE FOR PEACEFUL STREETS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, in June of last year, the city of Portland, Oregon, cut $16 million from their police budget, and shut down a unit of the police which was designed to reduce violence in the city.

As Republicans predicted—and a lot of others—this has not led to peaceful streets. Portland Mayor Ted Wheeler has been forced to ask for more funding for police.

This is not unique to Portland. Major cities across the U.S. have seen a spike in violent crime as they cut police budgets. Last year, New York City defunded their police department budget by about $1 billion, or 9.2 percent. The result? Murder is up 17 percent; shooting incidents are up 77 percent. In Los Angeles, homicides are now up 23 percent after a defunding.

How much more evidence will the defund the police movement need before they admit they were wrong and innocent people are indeed being killed? On top of this, prosecutors in some areas are refusing to charge perpetrators and putting criminals back on our streets to continue their crimes.

We must push back against these radicals who want to defund the police and stop this crime wave.

WOKENESS

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

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the state of affairs here in the people's House and the extent to which the majority has been using the time on the floor of this valuable body, the people's House, to promote wokeness first rather than America first. And this is what we see every single day.

Madam Speaker, I have a few of my colleagues here tonight with me because this is such an important time in our country's history. We have so many important issues we need to be addressing, ought to be addressing, and yet, the people's House is not addressing them. And instead, the people's House is focusing on advancing wokeness first instead of America first.

I have got a number of things I am going to get into and talk about addressing these particular issues, but I would just note that my good friend's—and someone I admire a great deal—birthday is tomorrow, and that is Justice Clarence Thomas.

And for those who know his story and have read his biography, his autobiography, written through the eyes of his relationship with his grandfather—''My Grandfather's Son''—Justice Thomas, I think represents all that is great and good about this country.

He represents all that is great and good about overcoming the devastating impact of Jim Crow laws in the South, the discrimination that we saw rampant in his native hometown of Savannah, and watching his life story and walking through his life story, and the progression of what that meant and where he ended up and what he achieved.

And then what we witnessed in that fall of 1991 with the obscene, absurd actions by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary—chaired, by the way, by then-Senator Joe Biden—attacking this good man, Clarence Thomas, attacking his integrity, attacking his character.

And yet, what do we see out of the life and service of Clarence Thomas but the embodiment of the fulfillment of the American Dream and a recognition of what you can achieve when you fight for it, when you work for it, and you overcome the odds against you. And what a beautiful story it is.

And why do I raise that now? Because in a world of wokeness, in a sea of wokeness, all driving an agenda—purposeful, by the way, by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—to divide this country by race, to divide this country, and to highlight issues of division and separation, as Justice Roberts fairly eloquently stated, he said: ''It's a sordid business, this divvying us up by race.'' And we see it every single day. And it is highlighted by this body. I am going to go through that in a minute.

Madam Speaker, every single thing this administration, every single thing this Democrat-led House of Representatives, everything that the Democrat-led United States Senate is doing, is designed very purposely to divide us by race, and we should be better than that.

And I think there are things that we all know that are on the minds of the American people, whether it is increasing prices, because we spent $6 trillion and lumber prices are going up, and housing prices are going up. We have a border that is under assault; cartels who run our border. And we are turning the keys of the kingdom over to Iran and China instead of siding with Israel. And we are flooding the economy with dollars and driving up inflation, but also racking up mountains of debt. All of these things are occurring.

And the regulations that my friend from Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, was just talking about, the regulation-strangling business, we are paying people more not to work than to work.

And all of our small businesses are at home going, ''stop it. Please stop it.'' I have introduced legislation set up to end those unemployment benefits.

Will we debate those here in this Chamber?

No. No, sir.

Why? Because we are going to advance woke legislation. We are going to talk about woke bills. We are not going to talk about all the small businesses—by the way, often owned by minorities, often owned by people who need to be able to hire people and they can't because this institution spent $6 trillion and doled it out to destroy the American Dream by paying people more to work than to not work. It is absolutely astounding.

And that is what we have. This Chamber is empty. What have we done today? We have voted on a couple of random bills—I don't know if they are suspension bills or what we did today. What are we even going to do this week? The American people don't know, because we are not doing anything. They're looking at this Chamber and they are saying: What are you doing?

We have an obligation to fight and defend the American people and to do

our job, and I am delighted to have my friends from Texas here.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for having this Special Order on such a crucial time in our history.

You don't have to look hard to see the devastation left behind from the wokeism movement currently plaguing our beloved country. Our schools and our universities, our esteemed and feared military, our government on every level, and our history itself are being contaminated by those pushing socialism and division under the guise of being morally woke.

□ 2000

Webster's dictionary defines the word ''woke'' as being ''aware of and actively attentive to imparted facts and issues, especially issues of racial and social justice.''

Well, I can tell you with absolute certainty that I am woke to the following:

First, I am woke to the fact that innocent men, women, and children across the country are being hurt and killed because of the left's call to defund the police around this Nation.

I am woke to the fact that Democrats are more than willing to spend your hard-earned tax dollars on housing and free handouts for illegal aliens, but cannot be bothered to care for our homeless and our veterans.

I am woke to the fact that the Critical Race Theory is racist in itself.

And, lastly, I am woke to the fact that painting America as a racist nation is wrong on every level and a slap in the face to those of every color, every ethnicity, and creed who courageously paid the ultimate sacrifice so Old Glory could wave boldly and freely for years to come. Now I am hearing calls from the far left and those who are woke to replace our beloved Old Glory.

Where has common sense gone?

If the left truly wants to discuss social justice, I encourage them to talk to the countless minority business owners who watch their life's work be looted and burned in front of their very eyes last year because of woke ideologies.

Go talk to the engineer who was fired and can't pay his bills now because President Biden has foolishly blocked the Keystone pipeline. Go talk to the migrant woman who was assaulted and raped during her trek to the southern border of the United States because Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS told her to come here and invited her here.

I could go on, but here is the bottom line: If we don't stand firmly against this movement, America, whose mighty wings have fought to defeat evil tyrants, communism, and Nazism in order to lift freedom-loving people out of the hands of oppressors all over this world, could soon be a socialist dictatorship herself and completely unrecognizable to all who love her and fought for her and died for her. And a world without a free America is a dark world indeed.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I appreciate his remarks and his comments very much.

Madam Speaker, in just a minute I am going to turn it over to the other gentleman from Texas—in just a minute—and I know he has got some issues he wants to talk about involving border security.

Because, as three representatives from Texas here, I think I can speak on behalf of the entire delegation, at least the Republican side of the delegation, that our State is under siege. Our State is under siege in a way that it has not been for upwards of almost 180 years.

And you think about what is happening at the border and the extent to which cartels have operational control of our border, the extent to which we have attacks on American citizens, ranchers who are getting their fences torn down, ranches that are being ransacked.

We have people who are struggling. We have migrants who are dying in these ranches, migrants who are dying on the rivers. We have migrants who are being abused on the journey. We have little girls who are being abused.

If you spend a minute, a minute on the Rio Grande, instead of pontificating in this godforsaken Chamber, and you go talk to these migrants who are coming across the Rio Grande, then you see what is actually happening to these human beings all in the false name of compassion.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), and I would ask what his views are about the current state of things with respect to the border.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman ROY for not only standing in tonight to speak forthrightly to the American people, but also including other Members of the Texas delegation to have conversations with the American people not just about the topic of being woke, but actually the things that are actually happening to the United States of America.

The Congressman is exactly right, there is a crisis in America today. There is a crisis that takes place because of such a rapid and swift transition to the ultraleft. The transition that has taken place began immediately upon President Biden accepting the oath of office and walking, driving, going back to the White House after he had taken an oath of office, where he raised his hand and he repeated, among the other words, to ''well and faithfully execute the laws of the United States.''

Well, there is a little bit more than just ''well and faithfully execute the laws of the United States.'' I believe the American people want and need a stable person who will recognize that they need someone to work in their best interest, in the best interest of their community, in the best interest of their job, in the best interest of safety, in the best interest of trying to give every single person in this country a better opportunity to have a better life. That is what I believe is behind the ''well and faithfully execute the laws of the United States.''

In fact, what has happened is there is a sweeping revolution that is going on in the United States of America by the elected officials. Elected officials who have turned a blind eye to the things in the past that were seen as stable, as reasonable, and something that was in the best interest to protect the people that they represent.

Day after day we have watched what happened down at the southern border of this country. I, too, went down. I am no stranger to the border. I previously lived in El Paso, Texas, for a number of years. My father served as the chief judge of the Western District of Texas and had to deal with not just the crime, but some of the circumstances that happened along the border. They came home to roost, so to speak, within the United States of America.

And as a Federal district judge, he tried his best to deal favorably, fairly, with people who violated the law. But where there were people who were criminals, who were not here to serve in the best interest of the United States of America, those who would become enemies of the State because what they did is they would import drugs, drugs which would kill Americans.

We have just been through a terrible epidemic in this country of opioid abuse. Opioid abuse that we all recognize, much of it was inherently begun and started here in the United States, but that has taken hold with other drugs now, fentanyl, methamphetamines, heroin, cocaine.

And in that process, we look to where this comes from. This comes from other countries, by and large, other countries who have people who want to kill and make money off the demise of the American people.

Yet the President of the United States, at the time he served as Vice President—because I know because the Drug Enforcement Administration senior officials have repeatedly said that the intelligence that was given to the then-Vice President, now President of the United States, they understood firsthand the danger that came from an open border.

The dangers that came when we did not have active law enforcement and intelligence would cause the deaths of thousands of Americans because of the illicit drugs. Illicit drugs that not only are addicting, but many times mixed in a way that a user never knew they were taking them. The availability of fentanyl, as an example.

Yet the President of the United States, with this vast knowledge of understanding from his service to the

country as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, as Vice President of the United States, he already knew the story.

The story that he wanted to project was that he is a kid from Pennsylvania, who knew what real America is. But what has happened is that he personally, and the radical left, have created a circumstance in this country that, we, as Republicans, are talking about tonight. That we are supposed to be woke to understanding the social implications. The enormous implications to people that we represent.

Yet, seemingly, it is the police that are the problem. Seemingly, it is the border that is the problem by enforcing the law. Seemingly, it is the ability that they want for criminals to run rampant throughout not just our neighborhoods, but across this country.

Madam Speaker, I would say to the young Congressman from Texas that we need his voice, his voice of compassion, his voice of common sense that says we need to move this country back to where it was simply a few months ago. Where we respect members of law enforcement, men and women of law enforcement who make house calls because they are asked to come and make dispute resolution many times, and then to take care of the law as it applies to a circumstance.

We need to get back to where we understand that the men and women of not just the U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Border Patrol are back on their job instead of being moved over to take care of 1 million people who, in the first 6 months, have come through illegally.

We need to go back to elected officials who actually understand that the people who elected them aren't for woke. What they are for is this body to come together to where we understand that we have an obligation to protect the men and women and children and seniors and disabled people of this country. We have an obligation to stand behind our law enforcement and to provide them with better training and the things that they need, equipment, to properly do their job.

Instead, we are watching our country, whether it is Chicago or Los Angles or New York City where criminals run rampant because of woke, that says we are supposed to defund the police department. We are supposed to defund those activities that would offer safety and security and opportunity for the most vulnerable of our society, and then blame others when people of color or of different races are harmed by criminals and thugs.

I watched this morning on TV of the murder that took place in Chicago of the young couple that came to a stoplight and were accosted and killed by thugs, criminal thugs.

I watched about a young man walking down the street in broad daylight in New York City and was stabbed repeatedly by a criminal this weekend.

No wonder this happens. We have already run the police out of town. We have already run people out of town who legitimately can stand up and have that obligation.

Madam Speaker, I come here tonight to join my two Texas colleagues to say, woke may be a term that we are supposed to get about enlightenment that we need to be good and better to each other, that we need to understand that there are people who might not agree with me, and I might not agree with them.

□ 2015

But ''woke'' has taken on a different theme. It has taken on a theme of taking on responsibility and respect. It has taken away the ability that we have in this body to effectively even be heard by each other. It has taken away the ability of millions of Americans to where they no longer feel the safety and security of their own home, of their own city street, or even their ability to stand up to those who have a different opinion.

Madam Speaker, I think what Congressman ROY is doing tonight is more than just standing up and expressing an opinion. It actually is an opinion that I believe millions of Americans support and respect by this gentleman doing this Special Order tonight.

I would call on this House of Representatives and all of its Members to understand that this phase we are going through will have a very difficult, difficult conclusion for many people who cannot effectively get through what is happening to them, to people who live in cities where police will no longer be, to small businesses that are burned to the ground, and to judges who are no longer judging based upon the rule of law but rather fear.

Madam Speaker, we as the Republican Party are not standing up and yelling and screaming. We have much resolve to us. But we ask tonight that the American people hear us that we condemned what happened on January the 6th. We condemn what is happening when people take advantage of law enforcement, take advantage of people, and take advantage of this great country.

Let us hope that tonight in our resolve of speaking forthrightly and honestly that we want to be that great country with shining cities on the hill where people work together, where people have a common interest and goals for their communities, and generations of people can work together whether you be a retired senior citizen, Madam Speaker, or whether you be a young child who knows not except that you live in a great country.

We need to speak plainly, but we are not yelling and screaming. We are not blaming someone else for the problems. But we will say this: The Republican Party of this House of Representatives stands for people to be safe in their own homes, for women who are in their own homes with their own children who will not be taken advantage of because they do know they have a backup and that is the police departments, that they know that the rule of law will effectively provide them with the needs that they have to live in the greatest country in the world, that our law enforcement agencies will know that they can continue to evolve into professionalism, that they will be able to effectively heal themselves and make the changes.

I call on law enforcement to continue to make these changes. My Republican Party has these conversations with law enforcement every day. But I call on the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Christopher Wray, just as when my father, Judge William Sessions, was Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to stand up for law enforcement and expect them and want them to become professional.

Madam Speaker, we must heal what has happened.

Sunday, at church, I heard no less than 50 times the word redemption, the words that we are sinners, that we make mistakes, that we need to look at each other with the faithfulness of a great nation. I heard words of love and respect for those even that we disagree with.

But, Madam Speaker, we are not down pounding on tables tonight. We are simply trying to say what we believe is true, and that is that I believe that there are tens of millions of Americans who want and need this country to be safe. They want and need our elected officials, whether they be Republican or Democrat, that they need their elected officials to understand that their life and their family are important, and that until we get back to the standards of performance of expectations where law enforcement is allowed to effectively and professionally be there as the backup, where our military knows that we are there to support them and that our elected officials will stand on the side of righteousness, we are going to continue to wander through this terrible time that I call chaos.

It is my hope, as we drop to our knees this evening, that we do offer a prayer for our President, President Biden. I know him, and I know he has been through difficult times in his life. But, Madam Speaker, I would ask tonight that we give respect and prayer and ask that the President please understand that the most vulnerable who are there still need others to be of assistance, and we need to make sure that this country heals itself with love, respect, and admiration for each other.

I want to thank the young Congressman for tonight, for his bringing forth this opportunity to speak about where our country is. I want him to know that I personally admire him, respect him, and appreciate his sound call for a voice of reason and opportunity for America's future.

May God bless our country.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas. I particularly thank him for referring to me as young. I will take it.

Interestingly, and I will probably have more to say about this, but it was 10 years ago in July that I was diagnosed with Hodgkin's lymphoma, with a 4-month-old daughter and a not quite 2-year-old son, not 100 percent sure whether I was going to be able to do like I did last weekend and go see my son play Little League baseball and see my daughter go off to camp last week.

Madam Speaker, that will shift your world view a little bit, as they say, about what is important and what is not important. I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that my dedication to public service was fully renewed after getting through that.

I was very blessed that I got through cancer-free in a matter of months, and Lord willing, I am still cancer-free. There is plenty of wood around here, but I knocked on my head instead.

I am honored the gentleman took the time to come down here and join me and say such nice things. I know the gentleman knows that part of the purpose here is our collective desire in this body to do what is right for this country.

What I cannot for the life of me understand is why my Democratic colleagues continue to insist on using this body to stoke division and to separate us by race, by sex, and by wherever we come from—all the different ways they could possibly come up with to divide us rather than finding ways for us to unite together to protect, defend, secure, and advance this country going forward.

My colleagues from Texas know—I know my friends from Texas know—it has been a full 90 days since the Vice President of the United States was tapped by the President of the United States to be in charge of the border, yet the Vice President has not taken a second to come to the Rio Grande, to come to the Rio Grande Valley, to come to the border.

Now, it wouldn't be enough just to come. By the way, if the Vice President is listening, it is not enough just to go. But it sure would be nice if she could find the southern border on a map, get in her taxpayer-funded airplane, take a direct flight down to the border, and go take the time to meet with Texans, to go take the time to meet with migrants, to take the time to meet with local leaders, and to see what is actually happening in real time at the border.

I know the gentleman knows full well that we just had 180,000 apprehensions in May. We have had over 700,000 apprehensions this year, and we have had over 200,000 got-aways. The Border Patrol estimates 1,000 got-aways every single day coming through between the ports of entry because our Border Patrol is now running processing centers in McAllen.

We all know this. I believe the Vice President knows this. I sent the Vice President a memo outlining this just in case she doesn't know.

But it is happening to us in real time. It is happening to migrants in real time, and it is happening to ranchers in real time. I know my friends from Texas know that we have had 7,500 pounds of fentanyl that have been intercepted by Border Patrol. Fentanyl is killing our children.

What are we going to vote on this week? What are we going to do this week? I don't even know.

I flew back here from Texas, and I have half my colleagues still voting by proxy even though we are not wearing masks. We are still voting by proxy by saying: I am voting proxy because of the pandemic.

We are not even having half of our committee meetings because we are doing them virtually. We are doing them when we are home in our work periods.

Why aren't we here? Why aren't we here when there are 7,500 pounds of fentanyl pouring into our border? That is just the stuff we are capturing, by the way.

Do you know how many children are dying with marijuana that has been laced with fentanyl? It is happening right now, Madam Speaker.

You hear about the 80,000, 90,000 opioid deaths last year. Madam Speaker, do you know where this stuff is coming from?

Why did Governor DeSantis send resources to Texas to help secure our border? People said: Why would you do that? That is Texas. Because the map and the drugs that are coming into Florida are coming through the Southwest border, and anybody who follows it knows that to be true.

Why is that? Because the cartels that are now running the border profit immensely by moving human beings for profit and by moving fentanyl for profit.

The Cartel Jalisco New Generation just absorbed the Laredo faction and just absorbed the Cartel del Noreste of Los Zetas in Nuevo Laredo. They now have operational control of Tamaulipas. That is a dangerous cartel.

They are moving fentanyl for profit and moving human beings for profit, millions of dollars a day. We know this to be true. We know this from law enforcement agents on the ground—Texans, Federal authorities, Border Patrol, and ICE.

But they are not able to do their job because they are running processing facilities, processing facilities for human beings who we say we are helping because we are saying that we are giving them asylum. By the way, they are not claiming asylum under the statute that the asylum laws were meant to provide.

They come across the river, and there is a sign on trees at the Rio Grande.

By the way, the Vice President and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would know this if they bothered to go to the Rio Grande.

If you walk down to the river, Madam Speaker, there is a sign. It says ''asilo'' with an arrow, and it points to a bunch of bright lights sitting under the bridge, saying go over there.

When I was at the river, I met about 50 migrants at about midnight. There was a group of them, and they were lost. They were going around in circles. So, I drove my truck down the path so they would have light in the dark, so they could get to the processing center.

These are good people seeking a better life. Ask every single one of them why they are coming here, and it is for a job and opportunity. It wasn't for asylum under our laws. We are making a mockery of our laws by saying that anyone who wants to come to our country for opportunity—God bless them, I understand why; I probably would too. If you look at the opportunity you have here, Madam Speaker, as opposed to El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras right now, I understand. But we are turning our laws upside down. That is not what asylum laws are for.

Why don't we just sit down and figure it out? Madam Speaker, you can't just say wide-open borders. You can't. It is irresponsible.

Listen to the leaders of Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. They say it is irresponsible because it is devastating their own countries.

People say: Why don't they fix it? We should have policies to work with them to try to fix it.

But do you know what would fix it the most, Madam Speaker? If we didn't have a wide-open border. If we actually stood up and said: Sorry, you can't just come in unless you actually qualify under our asylum laws, which is a fraction, a tiny fraction, of the 700,000-plus apprehensions that we have apprehended since January 1.

But why aren't we here debating that? Why aren't we coming up with a solution to this problem so that migrants aren't being abused as I speak by cartels so they can make money?

□ 2030

This is the greatest country in the history of the world, but we allow that to occur. We allow that to occur, and we do so in the name of compassion. We do so when people stand up and say: Oh, well, we want to make sure these folks will get here.

Meanwhile, we have people screaming: Kids in cages.

Anybody remember that? Anybody remember the kids in cages? How many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle ran to the cameras, sat in hearings, and screamed: Kids in cages?

The very structures put in place by the Obama-Biden administration. It is a fact. Everybody knows that that is who created the chain-link barriers in these facilities at the border. Nobody blamed Obama and Biden for doing that.

Air flow, ability to see the migrants, protect them. Oh, no, everybody went out and said: Kids in cages.

Why?

Because we had a massive influx.

But they said: Oh, they are drinking out of toilets.

It was a lie. They weren't drinking out of toilets. They were drinking out of a device that had the water fountain on the top with the toilet down below. We have them in facilities all over, in prisons facilities, where we have people coming in. The water supply in the bathroom right off of this floor is connected to the same water supply between the toilet and the sink. It is a pipe behind the drywall.

Yet they went around saying: Kids drinking out of toilets.

It is shameful. We can't have a rational conversation about what is actually happening in Texas. It is bad. There are children in stash houses right now.

Why are we sitting here doing nothing? Why are we going to have a vote this week on two suspension bills in a quest to go after more wokeness for, I think it is, some LGBTQ small business bill or something on a suspension that failed to get through on the two-thirds vote?

Okay. Debate that. Have it out. They tried to get it through on suspension. It didn't get through. So we are going to do a rule. We won't have any real debate on it, by the way. Everything that the American people see in here is all a sham. There is no actual debate on the floor of this body. And anybody who wants to come debate me on that, I am happy to debate it. There is no debate on the floor of the people's House, ever.

We haven't had an amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives, the people's House, since May of 2016, that was in order on open debate on the floor of the House so that any one of my colleagues could walk down here and say: Hey, I have got an idea. There is a bill. You know what I would like to do? I would like to change something in the bill. Here is an amendment. I would like to send it to the desk, offer my amendment. Hey, what do you think about my amendment? It might make the bill better.

Do you know when I would have liked to have had a debate on that?

Last Friday.

I would have liked to have had a debate on the Juneteenth bill.

Why?

Because the purpose of that bill was excellent. The fulfillment of the Declaration of Independence with the ending of slavery, which we recognize in Texas because of Juneteenth, I didn't support the bill because I didn't think the title was good. There were some other factors. But I didn't support it, and I would have liked to have amended it. Never got a chance to do it, ever. I would have liked to have had the ability to amend it, but couldn't do it.

All right. So you are forced with an up or down vote. We have 2,000-page bills that are $2 trillion. They are dropped on the floor and they say take it or leave it. And I say, you know what? I would like to cut something or add something. Can't do it.

I can go up to the Rules Committee and say: Here is my thing. And it gets voted down in the Rules Committee.

If you see amendments on the floor of the House, it is all a fraud. It is all a fraud. They are hand-picked amendments designed to make it look like we are amending, but we are not.

You know, 15 amendments from the majority, 5 amendments from the minority, bam. Hey, look at that. That is debate. We are killing our country by partisan dropping of bills, no matter who is in the majority, by the way.

I said that we haven't had an amendment on the floor since 2016. Guess who was in control of the House for 2 years of that?

Republicans.

When are we actually going to sit down and debate this stuff and do the things that matter?

Again, I go home to Texas and everybody is saying: How can you possibly be allowing this to be occurring on our border?

It is the fundamental duty of the Federal Government to secure the border of the United States, yet we have fentanyl pouring in. We have cartels who run the border. We have Mexico becoming a narco-terrorist state. We have danger to citizens in our country actually occurring.

We have human trafficking and sex trafficking occurring in San Antonio, Austin, all the way up I–35, going over to Houston. We stopped cars in the San Antonio suburbs that have nine immigrants in them going to a stash house in Houston, driven by an American citizen employee of a cartel.

I offered an op-ed explaining that to the San Antonio Express-News, along with the district attorney of Kendall County, Texas, and the San Antonio Express-News wouldn't print it, a fact-based op-ed. We ended up printing it in National Review or someplace online.

Who wants to have a conversation about this stuff?

The American people do. Everybody I talk to in Texas knows this is real. But here we are, and we have a House body and, frankly, an administration that is more interested in advancing wokeness every single day than addressing a wide open border that endangers us and the migrants who seek to come here.

I can't emphasize that enough: a wide open border that endangers American citizens, endangers our children, and endangers the migrants who seek to come here, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle pat themselves on the back in the false name of compassion that open borders is somehow good for migrants. And it is a lie. It is a blatant lie.

Instead, what are we going to get?

We are going to get a so-called infrastructure bill next week, which will come through here on partisan lines. And what are we going to have in there?

There are the provisions and programs that prioritize funding based on race, ethnicity, gender, and socially disadvantaged status. One provision, it finds that race and gender-neutral efforts alone are insufficient.

The bill includes a study on how Federal infrastructure planning exacerbated systemic racial, regional, social, environmental, and economic injustices.

We have a bill that establishes 41 new Federal programs, $20 million a year for implicit bias research and training grants related to racial profiling; $5 million a year for a program to increase transportation job awareness and diversity; a carbon pollution reduction program.

On the international stage, what do we see?

Our own diplomats are undermining the greatness of America. We have got Linda Thomas-Greenfield, the Ambassador to the United Nations, who said that racial equity is her top focus, and that white supremacy is woven into our founding documents and principles.

Our adversaries, like Russia and China, are weaponizing the leftist agenda. At the summit in Alaska, Secretary Blinken brought up China's imprisonment of millions of Uighur Muslims, and China responded by arguing that the U.S. is not much different, mentioning Black lives matter. The Uighurs.

Military and veterans: Instead of working to develop a lethal, battle-ready force that will kill people and destroy things when called up to do so, which is the purpose of a military, under the guise of reviewing extremism within the ranks of the military in March, Special Operations Command hired its first chief diversity and inclusion officer.

We have seen examples of West Point cadets forced to attend critical race theory presentations. A Space Force officer was fired for saying, ''The diversity, inclusion and equity industry and the trainings we are receiving in the military . . . is rooted in critical race theory which is rooted in Marxism.''

The Biden VA will now be using American taxpayer dollars to cover sex reassignment surgery.

I had multiple parents of the kids that I was able—or 18-year-olds I was able to nominate to go to academies, and we had a celebration in San Antonio, and every single one of the parents were coming up to me and showing me these videos from the Air Force Academy, West Point Academy, talking about, you know, people having two moms and two dads and all of this woke training. For heaven's sake, it is the military.

I mean, China and Russia is just looking at us and saying: What in the world? Well, they are licking their chops.

You have got critical race theory in education. We are seeing a large-scale effort to impose tyranny over the minds of our children through taxpayer-funded indoctrination.

In Evanston, Illinois, students listened to ''Not My Idea: A book about

Whiteness,'' which states that ''whiteness is a bad idea,'' and ''always was,'' and that ''you can be white without signing onto whiteness.''

In Cupertino, California, third graders were required to deconstruct their racial identities and then rank themselves according to their ''power and privilege.''

In Oregon, ''ethnic standards'' will require kindergartners to ''understand their own identity groups, including but not limited to race, gender, family, ethnicity, culture, religion, and ability.''

An advisory board linked to Virginia's Loudoun County Public School District demanded that teachers be dismissed if they criticize the district's equity training, inspired by critical race theory.

We saw the fellow who was removed or told that he had to be suspended in Loudoun County—I think he was finally restored—because he dared to speak up about this.

Meanwhile, we have got woke corporations all across America and their corporate boards moving the Major League Baseball All-Star Game from Atlanta, Georgia, which is 50 percent Black, to 10 percent Denver. I bet all of those White Coloradans driving around in their Subarus, patting themselves on the back when they go hiking with a rainbow flag on the back of their car or something, feel good about themselves, instead of celebrating Hank Aaron in Atlanta, Georgia.

Why?

Because Georgia was moving an election reform bill with laws that were almost identical to Colorado.

The Major League Baseball said: Oh, no, we are going to go join the woke brigade and we are going to go forward and we are going to move everything to Colorado.

Nothing was proved by that other than Major League Baseball's wokeness.

I talked about border security because it is so critical to the people of Texas. We can talk about the other things that are critical, all of these programs I just talked about.

People asked: Well, Congressman ROY, why do you come down here and often vote ''no''?

Because every single bill dropped on the floor of this House spends money we don't have, adds regulations that are going to kill small businesses, divides us by race, or adds more laws to the books.

Does anybody think we need more laws, more spending when we are $30 trillion in debt?

I just once would like to see an actual debate with the 435 Members representing the American people in this Chamber about what in the world we are going to do about $30 trillion in debt.

But we got nothing. We have got an empty Chamber. The American people can hear my voice echoing. We are not going to actually have a debate about it. We are just going to spend more money. It is just a race to see who can spend more money.

Does anybody have any belief that we are not endangering our kids and grandkids?

I mean, if somebody wants to come down here and expound on modern monetary theory about how spending all this money is absolutely fine, I am happy to listen. Most people in America don't believe it. We will have $30 trillion in debt soon; $6 trillion spent in the last year.

Do you know how much it cost to win all of World War II?

It was $4.1 trillion in current dollars.

We just spent $6 trillion in a year—appropriated. We will spend it out in a little over a year; $6 trillion.

We are shutting down small businesses, closing our schools. We have 100,000 small businesses closed, 100,000. And now we are paying people more not to work than to work.

Why do you suppose the Vice President of the United States refuses to come to the southern border? Why do you suppose the Vice President of the United States, or the President, refuses to go to the southern border and refuses to take me up on my offer to debate the Vice President anywhere, any time about the border?

Because she knows and the President knows they have zero defense for our current border policies. There is literally no ability to defend the current border policies of the United States. It is laughable. A high school debate team would destroy the President or the Vice President in a debate about our current border because it is so unbelievably unforgivable to turn our borders over to cartels.

But that is what this administration has done. And, again, look, it is all tied back together. This is all in the name of supposed compassion for people and a continued desire to try to drive a wedge and say: Oh, Republicans just don't want those Brown people to come here across our river. That is what it is about. That is the purpose of the fight and the divide.

Meanwhile, ask any Border Patrol agent, ask anybody along the Rio Grande, ask anybody who is being affected by it, ask any of the migrants about what is happening, how it is happening, about the journey. I am not saying the migrants who come here don't want to be here. They do.

But look in the eyes of the little 7-year-old girl on the border that I looked into, who had no mom, no dad, no uncle, no aunt, no brother, no sister, nobody with her. But we don't care. It is all fine. It is all fine for us to have a system in which a 7-year-old girl takes a journey by herself from Guatemala through Mexico in the hands of the cartels to get to our border. We say that is fine.

□ 2045

I can't state enough—and the reason I am using this time, and I went a little longer than the time I thought I was going to use, is because my friend from Texas used a little more time, and I appreciated his being here.

Every single person I talk to in Texas views this through the lens of an existential crisis, and yet it is absolute silence from the administration and this body.

People wonder why Governor Abbott is starting to say he is going to take it upon himself and the State to build a wall or to fund resources at the border.

We have had to do it for years, by the way. Basically, a billion dollars a year, or at least per session, Texas has been funding technology.

Do you know how often the Border Patrol is using technology funded by Texans? Cameras—because their Border Patrol cameras weren't working—radios. Now the Governor is going down there saying he is going to do a lot of this, and Texas has got to figure out how to fund it.

It is our border; they are our communities. Yet crickets, absolute crickets, devastating crickets, from the Democrat-led House of Representatives and the Democrats in the White House, President Biden and Vice President Harris, who refuse to even come to the border.

I don't know, the longer this goes on—I get why the Vice President won't go to the border. How can you look any American in the eye and say you are doing your constitutional duty to defend the United States of America and secure our borders?

Does anybody understand in this Chamber and comprehend how bad it is for our future and the future of our neighbors to the south to empower cartels the way we are empowering them?

Instead of being able to compete with China, by having a robust free trade throughout the Western Hemisphere, to be able to have a strong Mexico that isn't a narco-terror state, that we can partner with, that we can partner with countries throughout the Western Hemisphere and compete against China and not have this pressure valve coming to our border; instead, we are damaging these countries and empowering the narco-terror state in Mexico, empowering cartels, weakening our country, and endangering Americans.

My friend from the House Judiciary Committee is here, and I am about to give my time up. I will give you a little warning here. In a couple of minutes, I am about to yield.

I appreciate the work that he is doing, with my friend from Colorado, trying to navigate the complexity of antitrust laws with respect to the size of massive companies, particularly massive big tech companies. We are going to have a pretty robust day tomorrow in the House Judiciary Committee. I do want to thank him, since we are here in the Chamber together, for the work that he is doing to try to address that.

I don't know if I will agree with every bill tomorrow. I know I am going

to support at least one or two. We will see what happens during the process of amending and debating.

What I would say to my friend is that it would be great if we could address every issue with both sides of the aisle engaging and offering amendments and restore regular order so that we can try to get to the heart and the truth of these issues.

We are never going to deal with our spending issues in this country if we don't sit down and roll our sleeves up, like a family or small business has to do. We are never going to address something like the border if we don't sit down and give and take and offer solutions that will work. We are never going to solve healthcare; we are never going to be able to have a strong national defense, without, by the way, being involved in endless conflicts.

I joined with my Democrat friends last week on a measure involving our presence in Iraq. I think we can find agreement at times if we will sit down and do it. But we can't bury our head in the sand and ignore existential crises and hope that they will just go away.

I will just close by renewing my call to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Vice President and the President. Let's actually focus on these crises like the border, and let's actually do our job and our constitutional duty to address them. Let's actually do what we said we were going to do when we took our oaths to the Constitution of the United States, and we said we wanted to be a part of the people's House to debate, to amend, to vote.

I am not afraid of what we are going to do tomorrow. To my friend, we are going to offer bills, we are going to debate, we are going to amend, and we are going to vote. We should do that on the floor of this House, Madam Speaker. We should do that on the floor of this House.

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

LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, to Mr. ROY, I look forward to our debate tomorrow and I think a good resolution on a number of important issues before the committee.

Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to honor Pride Month.

I want to begin by saying that we are grateful to the members of the Congressional LGBTQ-plus Equality Caucus, who continue to be champions for full equality for our community.

Each year, we gather as a community in June to celebrate the progress that our community has made, that is the LGBTQ-plus community, and also to reflect on the work ahead and how much remains to be done. It is an opportunity each year to really celebrate the progress we have made and recommit ourselves to the work that remains. This year is no different.

In 2021, we come together on the floor of this House to celebrate Pride Month with some very great highs and some very deep lows. Our community was deeply impacted by COVID, both because preexisting conditions added to people's vulnerabilities, but also because segments of our population already face isolation, which was made even worse during the pandemic.

Like all communities, we have been shocked at the efforts to undermine our democracy and restrict the right to vote, restrictions that we know will impact our community, particularly people of color, trans people, and those with disabilities.

Of course, this year alone we witnessed a historic number of anti-transgender laws being introduced around the country, many of them passing. Opponents of equality have decided to zero in on the most vulnerable within our community, the community that is subject to the greatest amount of violence and the worst kind of discrimination, and we must stand up in force against this.

But it wouldn't be Pride Month without a celebration, and we have much to celebrate this year.

In the last 6 months, Congress passed the NO HATE Act, which strengthens hate crimes reporting; we passed the Pulse Night Club Memorial bill. Now the Senate has passed it, and it goes to the President's desk for his signature.

In February, I proudly introduced H.R. 5, the Equality Act, with 224 original cosponsors. It passed the House with bipartisan support. President Biden has challenged Congress to do everything in its power to get him the bill, get it to his desk for his signature.

We are rolling up our sleeves to get the bill passed in the Senate. I am particularly proud that the House of Representatives did its part in passing this critical piece of legislation.

No American should be forced to live in fear of legal discrimination simply because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, and they certainly shouldn't have to worry about whether or not the person in the White House or the State legislature will undermine what few protections they do have.

The Equality Act is a commonsense piece of legislation that gets to the core issue of equality by expanding the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and other existing laws, to ensure that LGBTQ Americans can live their lives free from discrimination.

Equality is a founding principle of this great country, and I hope that by the time I stand before you for Pride Month next year, we will have turned this bill from a hope into a reality.

I am very proud to have the support of so many Members of Congress and so many colleagues. In fact, every single Democrat is an original cosponsor of the Equality Act, including, of course, you, Madam Speaker.

So I am proud to be a part of a caucus that understands the fundamental importance of recognizing the dignity and value of every person, and Pride Month is about expressing that and affirming that to all LGBTQ-plus people all across this country and all across the world.

Tonight, I am proud to have one of the co-chairs of the Equality Caucus, MARK TAKANO, Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, a member of the LGBTQ community, a very close friend, a deeply respected colleague, and a great champion for the equality of our community.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) to share his views on the celebration of Pride.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I thank my true friend from the State of Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), who chairs the LGBTQ-plus Equality Caucus, for his work.

I want to say that Pride is always a very special time of year. It is a time of protest, a time of celebration, a time that we remember the struggles, honor the trailblazers, and appreciate the progress that we have made in the fight toward equality.

Throughout our history, LGBTQ people have been denied their basic rights. To this day, LGBTQ Americans across the country still face discrimination in key areas of life, from housing to healthcare.

While the Supreme Court has ruled to expand nondiscrimination protections in employment and made marriage equality the law of the land, in 29 states LGBTQ people aren't fully protected from discrimination.

That is why we are working hard to get the Equality Act signed into law.

Discrimination in this country has also been enshrined into policies at every level, including in the military.

Despite this, thousands of brave LGBTQ Americans have still stepped up to serve our country in uniform. For decades, LGBTQ members of the U.S. military and veterans have faced discrimination stemming from official military policies, including Don't Ask, Don't Tell and the Trans Military Ban.

Before Don't Ask, Don't Tell became an official military policy, servicemembers who were LGBTQ had to hide their identities, and those who were suspected of being LGBTQ were targeted by horrendous and traumatizing so-called witch hunts, which stripped them of their dignity and mistreated them based on a suspicion that had nothing to do with their service.

It is estimated that approximately 114,000 servicemembers were discharged on the basis of their sexual orientation between World War II and 2011, while an estimated 870,000 LGBTQ veterans have been impacted by ''hostility, harassment, assaultive behavior, and law enforcement targeting'' by discriminatory military policies.

Many LGBTQ veterans who were discharged on discriminatory grounds are

unable to access their VA benefits, and those still serving face inconsistent protections that make them vulnerable to harassment and put their careers at risk.

But the true extent of the harm by discriminatory anti-LGBTQ policies in the military and at the VA is not known or well understood. To remedy the harm that has been done, we must reckon with the truth of what happened and understand the disparate effects of discriminatory military policies on LGBTQ people.

That is why I have introduced the Commission to Study the Stigmatization, Criminalization, and Ongoing Exclusion and Inequity for LGBTQ Servicemembers and Veterans Act, otherwise known as the Commission on LGBTQ Servicemembers and Veterans Act.

This legislation would launch a comprehensive study on the effects of discriminatory military policies on affected servicemembers, their families, and their units to help America learn the full extent of the harm caused by these policies and the status of protections for LGBTQ servicemembers today.

There are currently 250,000 Active Duty LGBTQ servicemembers and more than 1.5 million LGBTQ veterans receiving healthcare from the VA. But there continues to be a pervasive lack of data collection on LGBTQ servicemembers and veteran populations and an absence of education for both members of the military and the general public about members of the LGBTQ community who serve in uniform. This legislation seeks to address that.

It is essential for the American people to hear stories of LGBTQ servicemembers and veterans to understand the stigmatization they endured while serving our country and to know that, despite this, they are still immensely proud of their service.

□ 2100

This month, I have been sharing powerful stories of LGBTQ veterans on my social media. Every video testimonial reveals stories of bravery and profound love for country. It ends with veterans sharing the same message: LGBTQ people want and deserve to serve, just like everyone else.

We have, of course, made a lot of progress as a country, but there is still a lot of work that needs to be done to make the military and VA more inclusive. It is my mission as co-chair of the Equality Caucus and chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to ensure that we honor the service of every American who has served, regardless of their identity.

This past weekend, we saw action that steers us toward that goal. The Biden administration announced that the VA will begin the first steps to expand care to include gender confirmation surgery for transgender veterans. This is truly a first and incredibly significant step that the VA is taking, and I applaud the VA's decision. Veterans in need of gender confirmation surgery should not have to seek healthcare outside of the VA healthcare system or navigate complicated processes to get the care they need.

This announcement will be life-changing for many, and it is the result of years of hard work and advocacy on behalf of trans veterans and allies.

So in honor of Pride Month, we must keep up the momentum, honor all those who have served our country in uniform, and commit ourselves to creating a truly equal nation.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. TAKANO for his powerful words.

Now, Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), who has been a longstanding member of the Equality Caucus and who has always encouraged the celebration of Pride. For the last 8 years, he has led the resolution in the House marking June as LGBTQ Pride Month. I want to thank him again and his office for his efforts, and I thank him for being with us this evening.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. And I rise tonight to continue to make my payments on a debt that I owe.

I am the son of the segregated South. I know what invidious discrimination looks like. I know what it sounds like. I know what it tastes like. I know what it smells like. Because I have suffered invidious discrimination, I want no one else to suffer what I have suffered.

I rise tonight to pay a debt because I didn't get here by myself, and the people who look like me, we didn't get here by ourselves. Along the way there were people of different stripes who made a difference, such that we could have the opportunities that we have today.

So I am proud to say that I am an ally of the LGBTQIA caucus. I am proud to say that I am a member of the congressional LGBTQ-plus Equality Caucus. And I am proud to say that Mr. CICILLINE is a person who I have great respect for, a person who is making a difference not only in the lives of people who are a member of the community, the LGBTQIA community, but also persons across the length and breadth of the globe, because when you help some directly, you help all indirectly.

I thank Mr. CICILLINE for this preeminent privilege to stand tonight and to be a part of making the world a better place for others. I desire, if I may, to continue.

I want to make the world know that the caucus that I am a member of, the LGBTQ-plus Equality Caucus, has 170 members. The caucus was formed in the 111th Congress. Today, we have introduced the original LGBTQIA-plus Pride Month resolution. This resolution encourages the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQIA-plus Pride Month. It tracks the accomplishments and the milestones and the fight for LGBTQIA-plus equality. It has 187 cosponsors, minus the 100. It has 87 original cosponsors.

This resolution is endorsed by the National Center for Transgender Equality, PFLAG National, the National LGBTQ Task Force, and the Transgender Foundation of America.

We introduced the first LGBT Pride Month resolution in 2013. This resolution had 25 cosponsors. We have introduced a Pride Month resolution in every Congress since 2013.

In 2020, the LGBTQ Pride Month resolution had 62 cosponsors. This year, the resolution has 87 original cosponsors.

Now I would like to just discuss some seminal moments in Pride history. June marks 52 years of Pride celebrations across the country. It was in June of 1970 that the first Pride march took place in New York City to commemorate Stonewall Inn, the site of an act of resistance in June of 1969.

In 1977, Harvey Milk became the first openly gay elected public official in the U.S.

In 1980, the Democratic Party became the first major American political party to endorse a gay rights platform.

In 2000, Vermont became the first State to recognize civil unions between same-sex partners.

In 2003, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled sodomy laws unconstitutional.

In November of 2003, the Massachusetts Supreme Justice Court ruled that preventing gays and lesbians from marrying violates the State constitution.

In 2008, California voters passed proposition 8, a public referendum ending same-sex marriage in the State.

In 2009, Congress passed the Matthew Shepard Act, expanding hate crime laws to include acts motivated by a victim's actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity.

Between 2009 and 2011, Vermont, Iowa, Maine, New Hampshire, the District of Columbia, and New York legitimized same-sex marriage.

In 2010, President Obama officially repealed Don't Ask, Don't Tell, allowing gays, bisexuals, and lesbians to serve openly in the military.

In 2013, the Supreme Court struck down California's proposition 8 and the Federal Defense of Marriage Act.

On June 15, 2020, the Supreme Court ruled that the prohibition against sex discrimination laid out in title 7 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act applied to LGBTQ Americans.

Houston, Texas, has a history that we are proud of. We remember the uprising at Stonewall because it marked the beginning of a movement to outlaw discrimination and laws that prohibited LGBTQIA persons from having the same rights as other persons in this country. Nearly a decade after the resistance displayed in New York at Stonewall Inn, the gay rights movement for equality made its way to Houston, Texas.

Houston's own Stonewall movement occurred in June of 1977, when thousands gathered around city hall in

downtown Houston to protest an infamous antigay activist who was performing in Houston, Texas. According to OutSmart magazine, more than 4,000 protesters marched around the Hyatt Regency Hotel, where the event was held.

The first Houston Pride parade took place in June of 1978, along Westheimer Road; and more than four decades later, it has become the fourth largest Pride parade in the country.

□ 2110

This resolution that we have presented to the House today is one that we will continue to present. We will continue to present it because it is not only the right thing to do, but it is the righteous thing to do.

No person in this country should be treated in such a way as to be defined as mistreated simply because of who they are. We have a right to be ourselves, and we should never be put in a position such that it is perceived that being who you are is inappropriate in a country that extolls the virtues of liberty and justice for all, that extolls the virtue of all persons being equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In this country, every person ought to be proud to celebrate Pride Month.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very eloquent words.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a tireless advocate for women and historically Black colleges and universities, a member of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus, and an original cosponsor of the Equality Act.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his extraordinary work in this area. And I am a proud cosponsor of the Equality Act.

Madam Speaker, I am ALMA ADAMS, and my pronouns are she, her, and hers. Tonight, I rise during Pride Month to honor some of the many LGBTQ elected officials who are working to make North Carolina a more equal and inclusive State.

Last week was Charlotte Black Pride Week, so I am happy to say that North Carolina's 12th Congressional District, which I represent, is home to LaWana Mayfield, who made history in 2011 as Charlotte's first openly gay elected official. Since then, Al Austin and Billy Maddalon joined her as LGBT members of the Charlotte City Council.

In Davidson, Jane Campbell, a retired captain in the United States Navy, serves on the Davidson Town Commission. And Charlotte's John Arrowood made history as the first openly LGBT judge on North Carolina's Court of Appeals.

All of these individuals put themselves forward for public service because they know that we can't sleep on fairness and equal rights. And I am working hard as an ally in Congress, alongside members of my congressional office, supporting the LGBTQ community, and I promise to continue to fight for their rights.

I wish everyone across our country happy Pride. Now go forth and continue to fight because we can't wait for equality; we have to win it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for her eloquent words and for being part of our Pride celebration here tonight.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. NEWMAN), my new colleague who has been such an extraordinary, relentless advocate for our community. I know she does it on behalf of her child but also for children all across America.

Ms. NEWMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative CICILLINE for organizing this Special Order tonight. It is so important.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise on behalf of the millions of LGBTQ-plus Americans who, in 2021, are still fighting for equality in our country.

This year is already record-breaking for anti-trans legislation. Right now, a trans teenager in America is growing up in a country where there are 33 States that have introduced more than 100 bills that aim to curb their rights. The bills are not grounded in science. The bills are not grounded in fact. The lawmakers who have introduced them can't even cite examples of any problem they are designed to solve.

To put it simply, these bills are grounded in hate, and they are not only hateful but demoralizing and frustrating and agonizing, demoralizing to a population of our country that already suffers from high rates of depression, bullying, and suicide.

In the United States, the lifetime depression rate for the general population is roughly 16.6 percent. For America's transgender women, it is 62 percent. Let that sink in.

As a mother of a transgender daughter, I know firsthand how much this weighs on all of our brothers and sisters.

Young LGBTQ-plus Americans need somewhere to turn to for help because most of them don't have someone to turn to. That is true.

In Illinois, we have a 24/7 youth hotline that supports students in crisis and engages trusted adults in their community. Bullying and threats of suicide are the two most common reports through the line. This resource has saved countless lives in Illinois.

But not every State has one of these. That is why I will be introducing legislation to support States' youth mental health and safety helplines and to help States develop these resources if they don't yet have one.

These resources are particularly critical for young Americans who are at a higher risk for bullying and suicide, such as those who belong to the LGBTQ-plus community.

While I continue to urge the Senate to pass the Equality Act, I also want to urge this entire body to work together so we can do more to support our LGBTQ-plus Americans.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for being part of this Pride Special Order and for her incredible advocacy on behalf of our community, particularly her heroic work on behalf of the transgender community. It is making a real difference.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), a new colleague and someone who has been an extraordinary advocate for the LGBT community, a great ally for our caucus. He is a member of the LGBTQ-plus Equality Caucus, an original cosponsor of the Equality Act, and a really powerful voice in our fight for equality.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Pride Month, I rise to recognize my constituent, my friend, Newton City Councilor Holly Ryan. Councilor Ryan is a long-serving activist in my district and my hometown. She is the first openly transgender woman to serve on a city council in Massachusetts and the first openly LGBTQ-plus person to serve on the Newton City Council.

Holly is a distinguished champion of equality, serving as the founding member and former co-chair of the Massachusetts Transgender Political Coalition. Her advocacy led to the passage of both the 2011 trans rights law and the 2016 public accommodation law, ensuring that no one in the Commonwealth can face discrimination because of gender identity.

I was fortunate to serve with Councilor Ryan on the city council before coming to Congress. Councilor Ryan is a trailblazer, paving the way for a more equal future. Massachusetts is better off thanks to her accomplishments.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for participating in our Special Order and for being such a great ally to our community.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished senior member of the Judiciary Committee, someone who has long been a champion of justice and equality, a great ally to the LGBTQ community, an original cosponsor of the Equality Act, and a member of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my dear friend and courageous leader who brought us all together so many years ago and, I believe, built up the Equality Caucus into such an effective spokesperson for all of those who are voiceless in many instances.

Madam Speaker, I thank DAVID CICILLINE. I remember the journey he made on the Equality Act. It was a lot of meetings, a lot of engagement, but he brought us all together. I am very proud to be an original cosponsor and one that gave insight into the necessity for that legislation.

Let me say the very obvious, and that is happy Pride Month. It is an important statement for America, and it is about Americans.

Madam Speaker, these statistics from Texas would give you just a bird's-eye view of what our State is like: percent of adults who are LGBTQ-plus, 4.1 percent; total LGBTQ-plus population, 1,053,000 and, of course, growing; the workforce, 5 percent.

□ 2120

Those who are workers, 647,000; and the LGBTQ-plus, adults raising children, 29 percent—just regular Texans, regular Americans. That is why we stand on the floor of the House today to be able to celebrate Pride Month. And though many of the occasions we have had in Houston and around the Nation are virtual, we are still making our voices heard.

We look forward in Houston to our big Pride Parade, and, of course, we look forward to recommitting ourselves to making equality in every aspect of American life real for members of the LGBTQ community.

We have a shared struggle, a collective joy that is found in the history of that struggle and life experiences that are unique. Unique because individuals have that experience of the LGBTQ-plus. Experiences that many of us have not had, but experiences that sometimes ground themselves in unfair discrimination.

Mr. CICILLINE, I heard a Member on the floor just a few minutes ago indicate how he wanted to amend the Juneteenth legislation. He was sorry he could not amend it. And I was thinking to myself, well, my friend, we have been trying to amend it, establish it, declare it, for 156 years, since the Emancipation Proclamation, the second time around in 1865, in Galveston. And we waited too long. And I would say that we have been fighting for justice for this community, starting with Stonewall in Greenwich Village, and I would say that we could not wait any longer. That was an enormous moment of rising up for your own dignity and freedom and a watershed moment in the LGBTQ movement, reigniting the fight for justice and signaling a new chapter of progress in our country's quest to ensure that fair treatment is the rule, never the exception.

We appreciate the Supreme Court's decision in the fight to respect same-sex couples' right to marry—that took a long time—and to love. Our country's commitment to justice has been maintained by the tireless work of advocates.

I had been here during the Don't Ask, Don't Tell, and just the enormous pride when that was removed from the United States military under President Obama's administration. The auditorium was standing room only as that was signed to ensure that it never would happen again.

This a social movement, enshrined with truth and belief, and the basis of creating all of us worthy of human dignity.

In keeping with this belief, we cannot forget the great champions of my great State, who have been proud Texans, who have not been afraid, even in the climate that we live: Sara Fernandez, Judy Reed, Tommie Ross, JD Doyle, Dalton DeHart, Judge Jerry Simoneaux, and Judge Fran Watson. But, also, our senior stateswoman, and that is our former mayor, Annise Parker, who led the cause for the status of LGBTQ in our community. We thank you, former Mayor Parker.

We thank you for the fight of equality, though we did not make it in this city when we tried to do an ordinance to indicate that bathrooms were not important and no one in this community should be characterized as attacking anyone but just wanting freedom and justice.

I would like to recognize a few organizations that continue to do great work: The Houston GLBT Political Caucus, Save Our Sisters United, Montrose Grace Place in the Montrose Center—many of these were pioneers in doing the work that was so important.

Madam Speaker, I am reminded of the Ryan White Treatment Act. As a member of the Houston City Council, I was honored to be the only Member of Congress that came from Houston, Texas, to stand by Ryan White and his family here in the United States Congress with the late former Senator Ted Kennedy and Senator Orrin Hatch, the two cosponsors; stand right next to him in a sweaty, very small room. I am not sure why they selected that small room. They must have believed that we were not coming from everywhere to witness this historic moment of the Ryan White Treatment Act and to meet Ryan White at that time. It was an amazing recognition at that time of the need for AIDS treatment.

But sadly to say, I sat by the bedside of many of my constituents whose families would not acknowledge that they had HIV/AIDS, and they died alone. What a moment that we lived through. So many died; so many alone, except for friends who would be willing to be by their bedside. We have come a mighty long way.

Madam Speaker, very quickly, as I close, that honor continues to go to those who continue to fight. My meeting with Matthew Shepard's mother, of sitting with her in my office when we talked about the Matthew Shepard Act, and being so proud for her to include me in her book. How heinous to lose your son in that way. How many parents have had to face that?

But again, I pay tribute to Monica Roberts in Houston, who leaves a gaping hole in the hearts of the LGBTQ-plus community. Monica worked as a trailblazing journalist and advocate, never failing to censure the stories of Black trans people and shining the light on the issues of those often ignored.

We intend to introduce legislation dealing with the sizeable number of murders against Black trans persons—mostly women. Ray Hill co-organized the first gay rights organization in Houston in 1967, fiercely advocating for those living with HIV and AIDS.

And so the more than 46,000 same-sex couples in Texas, a third of them LGBTQ Texans, who are raising children. This is a new day, but our work for justice has not ended.

We thank the Williams Institute of the UCLA School of Law. Approximately 900,000 Texans identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender. And maybe one day my State will recognize the fullness of the equality of all. Thank goodness for the H.R. 5, Equality Act, that covers Texas as well.

Madam Speaker, in my third closing—with a little bit of humor—but with all seriousness, I wanted to make sure that I added to this RECORD the Texas Tribune article, ''Texas lawmakers advance bills blocking access to gender-affirming healthcare despite opposition from LGBTQ Texans, medical associations,'' directly impacting 17-year-old Indigo Giles, who was able to get surgery before this law, now 19.

Madam Speaker, ending the depression that they faced, ending the attacks that they felt, feeling more comfortable in their skin—that is what this month is all about, saying to them, saying to America: We are pride and we are proud. And we stand together as an extended family of LGBTQ-plus and all of those who, frankly, recognize that our freedom is intertwined with your freedom.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her really eloquent words and for being such a good ally for our community for so long.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), an education and voting rights advocate, an original cosponsor of the Equality Act, vice-chair of the Equality Caucus here in the House, and an extraordinary champion for our community.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, Representative CICILLINE, for organizing this Special Order hour and for his leadership in introducing and passing the Equality Act, and I look forward to it being signed into law.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Pride Month and to celebrate the rich history of LGBTQ activism in the greater Philadelphia area.

In 1965, years before the Stonewall uprising, protestors borrowed from the tactics of the civil rights movement and staged a sit-in at Dewey's lunch counter in Philadelphia in opposition to its policy of refusing service to ''homosexuals,'' ''masculine women,'' ''feminine men,'' and ''persons wearing non-conforming clothing.'' Can you imagine what they would think today?

Philadelphia is home to this—the first and oldest LGBTQ bookstore in the United States—Giovanni's Room,

as well as Philadelphia Gay News, the oldest LGBTQ publication in the United States. As early as 1981, activists were meeting with the local Department of Public Health to discuss the virus that would eventually become known as AIDS and put pressure on them to address this growing crisis.

In more recent history, Amber Hikes, in the City's Office of LGBT Affairs introduced a more inclusive Pride flag in 2017, adding black and brown stripes to represent LGBTQ people of color.

Today, activism within Philadelphia's LGBTQ community continues through groups like the William Way Community Center, and people like my friend, Kendall Stephens, who is pushing for Pennsylvania to update its hate crime statute to finally include LGBTQ people as a protected class.

From early protests to the continued advocacy of today, the Philadelphia region has plenty to be proud of during Pride Month.

□ 2130

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for being part of this Special Order hour tonight.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS), a colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, someone who has dedicated her work, even before she got to Congress, to ending childhood poverty to the promotion of human rights and equality. She is an original cosponsor of the Equality Act, a member of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus, and a great advocate for our community. We are delighted she is with us this evening.

Ms. JACOBS of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. CICILLINE for yielding to me.

I am honored to join my colleagues tonight to mark Pride Month. I should know note, San Diego actually officially celebrates Pride in July. So I am happy I get an extra month to celebrate with all of you.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today as the proud sister to a trans brother and a gender nonconforming sibling; a proud member of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus; and the proud representative of Hillcrest, the heart and soul of San Diego's diverse and vibrant LGBTQ-plus community.

This year has been difficult for so many of us, but especially for the LGBTQ-plus community. COVID–19 took friends, family members, and beloved community leaders from us. It forced so many into isolation; closed our communal spaces; and added to the economic, mental health, physical health, and childcare burdens.

And to all of the young people stuck at home, away from their friends, and may be with family who doesn't accept you, know this: You are perfect just the way you are and we need you.

But during this pandemic, San Diego's LGBTQ-plus community also rallied together to support one another and to support our community at large. The San Diego LGBTQ Community Center hosted food banks and made home deliveries for folks who were homebound. San Diego Pride hosted vaccine events for LGBTQ-plus people of color, trans, and non-binary people, and those living with HIV.

And next month, at long last, we will finally be able to celebrate Pride together again in person. And as we celebrate, we are also focused on the future. I am proud to work alongside all our LGBTQ-plus siblings to fight for an end to discrimination in all its forms based on sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity.

Earlier this year, I was honored to join every one of my Democratic colleagues as an original cosponsor of the Equality Act, legislation that will be life-changing for so many of my constituents.

The first version of this bill was filed 15 years before I was even born. It had one cosponsor and never got a vote. It is humbling to think about the progress that has happened in my lifetime, progress that was made possible by all those who marched and protested and raised their voices. I am proud to work alongside all of you to continue that work. We will keep up the fight until everyone has equal rights under the law.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for being part of this Special Order hour and for her great support of the LGBTQ-plus community.

Madam Speaker, before I end, I just want to recognize Annise Parker. I also want recognize Barney Frank, Jared Polis, our former colleagues who have served in this House. And now Governor Polis is the Governor of Colorado. TAMMY BALDWIN and KYRSTEN SINEMA in the United States Senate. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, MARK POCAN, ANGIE CRAIG, SHARICE DAVIDS, MARK TAKANO, CHRIS PAPPAS, MONDAIRE JONES, and RITCHIE TORRES, who are current Members of Congress. There are nine LGBTQ Members in the House and two in the Senate. So 11 Members in total.

And part of the reason we celebrate Pride is to send a message to the entire community, but especially to young people who may be struggling with their sexual orientation or their gender identity. Pride is a moment for us to say: You are valued. We celebrate you. We honor you. You have a right like every other American to be treated with dignity and respect. You are hearing that from the floor of the United States House of Representatives, where nine Members of our community serve openly and honestly, and two Members in the Senate.

Let that be a message to every young person, every family struggling with the issues of sexual orientation or gender identity, that they are heard, they are valued, they are affirmed and respected.

Happy Pride Month.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of flight delay.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 961, the Justice for Juveniles Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 961

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2021–2026	2021–2031
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 983, Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2021, as

amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 2571, the AMIGOS Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 2679, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association Charter Amendments Act of 2021, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC–1434. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Stephen R. Lyons, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1435. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Jon T. Thomas, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1436. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Gustave F. Perna, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1437. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, Migratory Bird Program, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Subsistence Harvest in Alaska; Harvest Regulations for Migratory Birds in Alaska During the 2021 Season [Docket No.: FWS-R7-MB-2020-0134; FXMB12610700000-201-FF07M01000] (RIN: 1018-BF08) 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 Natural Resources.

EC–1438. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Pricing Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Auction of Flexible-Use Service Licenses in the 3.45-3.55 GHz Band For Next-Generation Wireless Services; Notice and Filling Requirement, Minimum Opening Bids, Upfront Payments, and Other Procedures For Auctions 110 (Au Docket No.: 21-62) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC–1439. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Amarillo, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 21-52] (RM-11877) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC–1440. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Jonesboro, Arkansas) [MB Docket No.: 21-56] (RM-11811) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC–1441. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 733.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Albany, Georgia) [MB Docket No.: 21-70] (RM-11886) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC–1442. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Green Bay, Wisconsin) [MB Docket No.: 21-72] (RM-11888) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC–1443. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73-622(i), Post Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Cedar Rapids, Iowa) [MB Docket No.: 21-51] (RM-11876) 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 Energy and Commerce.

EC–1444. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Emergency Response Planning and Preparedness for Nuclear Power Reactors (Regulatory Guide 1.101, Revision 6) received June 10, 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–1445. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Fire Protection for Existing Light-Water Nuclear Power Plants [Regulatory Guide 1.205, Revision 2] received June 10, 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–1446. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Fire Protection for Nuclear Power Plants [Regulatory Guide RG 1.189, Revision 4] received June 10, 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–1447. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–1448. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency, with respect to North Korea, originally declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, as amended, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2020, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 202(d); (90 Stat. 1257) (H. Doc. No. 117—45); ; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

EC–1449. A letter from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Terrorist List Governments Sanctions Regulations 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 Foreign Affairs.

EC–1450. A letter from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Burma Sanctions Regulations 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 Foreign Affairs.

EC–1451. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–1452. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, transmitting the Bank's Statement of the System of Internal Controls for 2020, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)); (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–1453. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 1801-AA21) 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 the Judiciary.

EC–1454. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Montana Rail Link, Inc.-Petition for Rulemaking-Classification of Carriers [Docket No.: EP 763] received July 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 Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3239. A bill to make improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code (Rept. 117–67). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3241. A bill to make improvements in the enactment of title 54, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code (Rept. 117–68). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1915. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize certain water pollution control programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3684. A bill to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MORELLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 486. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (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; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 239) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for limitations on copayments for contraception furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1443) to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to ''Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures''; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 14) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review''; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 15) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to ''National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders''; and for other purposes (Rept. 117–71). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 4026. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to Congress a report on actions taken by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to address social determinants of health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 4027. A bill to facilitate the generation and delivery of power from affordable and reliable renewable generation projects and energy storage projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 4028. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to report on and develop a whole-of-Government strategy with respect to the economic competitiveness of the information and communication technology supply chain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 4029. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to establish an interagency national security review process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 4030. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 800 6th Street in Paso Robles, California, as the ''Reverend Ruben Franklin Tate, Jr., Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. COLE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4031. A bill to modify the restriction in section 3326 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the appointment of retired members of the Armed Forces to positions in the Department of Defense to apply to positions at or above the GS-14 level; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ALLRED (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 4032. A bill to provide outreach and technical assistance to small providers regarding the benefits of Open RAN networks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself and Ms. STEVENS):

H.R. 4033. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and Small Business Technology Transfer program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. BEYER:

H.R. 4034. A bill to ensure that pre-apprenticeship programs are considered when planning health professions opportunity grant career pathway demonstration projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 4035. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to prioritize veterans court treatment programs that ensure equal access for racial and ethnic minorities and women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 4036. 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 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. BRADY (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ESTES, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. REED, and Mr. HERN):

H.R. 4037. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to extend and modify the eligibility requirements for 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. CARSON (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 4038. A bill to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress an intelligence assessment on threats to the United States associated with foreign violent White supremacist extremist organizations; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4039. 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 Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. CHENEY (for herself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 4040. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend telehealth flexibilities under the Medicare program, 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. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 4041. A bill to terminate the order requiring persons to wear masks while on conveyances and at transportation hubs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 4042. A bill to provide for funding from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund for all Federal Aviation Administration activities for a certain period in the event of a Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 4043. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure prompt coverage of breakthrough devices under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. GOODEN of Texas):

H.R. 4044. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require State and local election officials to notify the chief State election official of a State with respect to the number of voted ballots that have been received and counted in an election for Federal office at the time of the closing of polls for such election, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mrs. MCBATH):

H.R. 4045. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a task force to be known as the ''6G Task Force'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Ms. WILD, and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 4046. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to establish the Office of Policy Development and Cybersecurity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida (for himself, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. PERRY, and Ms. HERRELL):

H.R. 4047. A bill to direct the head of each agency to repeal at least two rules before adopting a proposed rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4048. A bill to impose sanctions and other measures in response to the failure of the Government of the People's Republic of China to allow an investigation into the origins of COVID-19 at suspect laboratories in Wuhan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 4049. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to give a preference, with respect to project grants for preventive health services, for States that allow trained individuals to carry and administer epinephrine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 4050. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make changes related to family-sponsored immigrants and to reduce the number of such immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 4051. A bill to make opioid treatment programs eligible for grants under section 2008 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. BACON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 4052. A bill to establish a national, research-based, and comprehensive home study assessment process for the evaluation of prospective foster parents and adoptive parents and provide funding to States and Indian tribes to adopt such process; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LAMBORN, and Ms. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 4053. A bill to provide Federal student loan relief for teachers who work in a military impacted community; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. COLE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 4054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat Indian tribal governments in the same manner as State governments for certain Federal tax purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 4055. A bill to establish a cybersecurity literacy campaign, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 4056. A bill to require agencies to notify the Director of the Office of Management and Budget when the agency suspends or terminates a Federal award, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. WILD, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CASE, and Ms. JACOBS of California):

H.R. 4057. A bill to implement the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 4058. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure coverage of mental and behavioral health services furnished through telehealth; 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. NEHLS (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 4059. A bill to reimburse the States for border wall expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. NEWHOUSE (for himself, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STEWART, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. MANN, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BUDD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. EMMER, Mr. MOONEY, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 4060. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate the business of importing, manufacturing, or dealing firearms, or importing or manufacturing ammunition pursuant to section 923 of title 18, United States Code, as a critical infrastructure sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 4061. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception to percentage of completion method of accounting for certain residential construction contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 4062. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure the consensual donation and respectful disposition of human bodies and human body parts donated or transferred for education, research, or the advancement of medical, dental, or mortuary science and not for use in human transplantation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4063. A bill to designate the portion of Interstate Route 57 that is located in Illinois as the ''Barack Obama Highway'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4064. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to provide increased protections for election workers and voters in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SEWELL (for herself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 4065. A bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, 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 Ms. SEWELL (for herself and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 4066. A bill to amend the title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rural health care by ensuring fairness in Medicare hospital payments; 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. SLOTKIN (for herself, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 4067. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a

council to make recommendations on ways to increase the security, reliability, and interoperability of communications networks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MENG, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 4068. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct a study relating to ultrafine particles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 4069. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for additional subsidization assistance to a municipality to carry out on-site wastewater treatment system projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 4070. A bill to direct the Attorney General, in coordination with the President's Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, to study the prevalence and instances of human trafficking at adult entertainment clubs in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNN, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JACKSON, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 4071. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to conduct or support certain gain-of-function research by a foreign adversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

H.R. 4072. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the reissuance of Social Security account numbers to young children in cases where confidentiality has been compromised; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NORMAN, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 4073. A bill to restrict security assistance to Lebanon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H. Res. 485. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Select Committee on Economic Disparity and Fairness in Growth; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CARL:

H. Res. 487. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives the President of the United States should remove Dr. Anthony Fauci from his positions as the President's Chief Medical Advisor and as the Director of the United States National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H. Res. 488. A resolution supporting a stable Colombia and opposing any threat to democracy in Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BASS, Ms. DEAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. MENG, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BUSH, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. KAHELE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LIEU, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CARSON, Mr. KILMER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. JONES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. CHU, Mr. COSTA, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. CRIST):

H. Res. 489. A resolution encouraging the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQIA+ Pride Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEU (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. OMAR, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BASS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JONES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. KIND):

H. Res. 490. A resolution reaffirming the importance of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4026.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 4027.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 4028.

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 into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all of the Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 4029.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 4030.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MOORE of Utah:

H.R. 4031.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ALLRED:

H.R. 4032.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: [The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 4033.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 4034.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4035.

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

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 4036.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. BRADY:

H.R. 4037.

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

United States Constitution Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. CARSON:

H.R. 4038.

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. CARTER of Georgia:
H.R. 4039.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Ms. CHENEY:
H.R. 4040.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 16 of Section 8 of Article I of the 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 in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mr. CRENSHAW:
H.R. 4041.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII, Clause III
Article I, Section VIII, Clause XVIII
By Mr. DEFAZIO:
H.R. 4042.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.
By Ms. DELBENE:
H.R. 4043.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. DONALDS:
H.R. 4044.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 4
By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 4045.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: [The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes
By Mr. DUNCAN:
H.R. 4046.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, grants Congress the authority to regulate interstate commerce
By Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida:
H.R. 404 7.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. GALLAGHER:
H.R. 4048.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mr. GROTHMAN:
H.R. 4049.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section VIII
By Mr. HICE of Georgia:
H.R. 4050.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power ''to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.''
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that Congress has 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. HIGGINS of New York:
H.R. 4051.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 4052.
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 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 Mr. JACKSON:
H.R. 4053.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. KIND:
H.R. 4054.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 7, Clause 1
By Mr. KINZINGER:
H.R. 4055.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause).
By Mrs. LESKO:
H.R. 4056.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. LOWENTHAL:
H.R. 4057.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution
By Ms. MATSUI:
H.R. 4058.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution
By Mr. NEHLS:
H.R. 4059.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. NEWHOUSE:
H.R. 4060.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. I, § 8
By Mr. PASCRELL:
H.R. 4061.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 4062.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 4063.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8
By Mr. SARBANES:
H.R. 4064.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Ms. SEWELL:
H.R. 4065.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Ms. SEWELL:
H.R. 4066.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Ms. SLOTKIN:
H.R. 4067.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: [The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes
By Mr. SMITH of Washington:
H.R. 4068.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes
By Mr. SUOZZI:
H.R. 4069.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. WALTZ:
H.R. 4070.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. WENSTRUP:
H.R. 4071.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. WENSTRUP:
H.R. 4072.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. ZELDIN:
H.R. 4073.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 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: Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ESTES, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 19: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 24: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 243: Mr. ESTES.
H.R. 279: Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 286: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 310: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 366: Ms. HOULAHAN and Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 431: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 461: Mrs. KIM of California.
H.R. 471: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 475: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 476: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 482: Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. COMER.
H.R. 564: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 646: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 660: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
H.R. 821: Mrs. HARSHBARGER and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 903: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STANTON, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 959: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 961: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 983: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 1009: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 1011: Mr. ESTES, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1012: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. MFUME, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1014: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1057: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 1062: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 1088: Mr. BROWN.
H.R. 1102: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1133: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FALLON, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1145: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 1179: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1193: Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 1210: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1235: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1291: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 1314: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1321: Mr. GIMENEZ, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MAST, and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1331: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 1332: Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CASE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 1361: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1366: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1374: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 1379: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 1394: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Ms. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1454: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
H.R. 1456: Ms. CHU and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 1459: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 1474: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1527: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 1551: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1586: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1596: Mr. BOWMAN and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1648: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WILD, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1655: Mr. KINZINGER.
H.R. 1656: Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 1667: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. EMMER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1697: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1733: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1755: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1756: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1776: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1783: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1813: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 1829: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1845: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 1861: Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. COMER.
H.R. 1864: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1884: Mr. JONES and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 1925: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1931: Ms. CHENEY and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1948: Ms. BASS, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1956: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 1960: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1972: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1976: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1978: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2007: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 2012: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 2029: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ROSS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2040: Mr. FITZGERALD.
H.R. 2085: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2096: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
H.R. 2102: Ms. NEWMAN.
H.R. 2103: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 2116: Ms. SEWELL, Ms. BASS, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2125: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 2126: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 2141: Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 2144: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2154: Ms. TITUS and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 2169: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2184: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 2190: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2213: Mrs. MCCLAIN and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 2244: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 2255: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2256: Mr. SOTO, Mr. BERA, Ms. CHU, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEGUSE, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 2288: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 2289: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 2339: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2363: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
H.R. 2371: Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 2372: Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 2400: Mrs. MCCLAIN.
H.R. 2409: Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 2455: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. KUSTOFF.
H.R. 2486: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 2503: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2517: Mr. DUNN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. VALADAO, and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 2589: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2594: Mr. BROWN.
H.R. 2601: Ms. CHENEY and Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 2654: Ms. BUSH.
H.R. 2668: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2678: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 2730: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2759: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2773: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2793: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2811: Mrs. DEMINGS and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 2812: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2838: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 2840: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2846: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 2864: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2887: Ms. STRICKLAND and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2888: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2903: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2974: Mr. KATKO and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2997: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3031: Mr. LIEU, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3044: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3054: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 3060: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GUEST, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, and Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 3079: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 3085: Mr. COLE and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3087: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 3088: Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 3095: Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3105: Ms. MACE.
H.R. 3115: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3134: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 3145: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
H.R. 3149: Mr. AGUILAR and Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 3172: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 3183: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3200: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 3203: Mr. COLE, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3218: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3235: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 3256: Mr. ROY and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3259: Mr. KIND, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. EMMER, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 3266: Mr. ROSE and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H.R. 3268: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3269: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H.R. 3281: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3302: Mr. LATURNER.
H.R. 3303: Mr. LATURNER.
H.R. 3330: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 3335: Mr. STANTON, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3342: Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 3343: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 3354: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3369: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 3385: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KATKO, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 3406: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 3440: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3460: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 3461: Mr. ESTES.
H.R. 3468: Mr. SUOZZI and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3473: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 3488: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3492: Mr. KATKO and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3498: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3508: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3518: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 3519: Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3529: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3531: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3537: Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. MAST, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 3548: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 3572: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3577: Mr. COOPER, Mr. GARBARINO, and Ms. CHENEY.
H.R. 3587: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3598: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 3626: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 3648: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3651: Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 3662: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 3672: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
H.R. 3689: Mr. SOTO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3698: Ms. NEWMAN.
H.R. 3699: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 3718: Mr. LAMB and Mr. KUSTOFF.
H.R. 3723: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 3744: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 3755: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3756: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 3761: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3764: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3796: Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 3804: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3807: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MANNING, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3811: Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3820: Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3821: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 3824: Ms. PORTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JONES, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 3826: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3843: Mr. GOODEN of Texas and Mr. ARMSTRONG.
H.R. 3847: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee and Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 3849: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. GOODEN of Texas.
H.R. 3867: Ms. NORTON and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3870: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 3882: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 3924: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 3929: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3937: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 3946: Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. LIEU, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 3947: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3959: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3962: Mr. POCAN, Mr. HILL, and Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 3968: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 3985: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COOPER, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. VELA, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3999: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 4013: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 4018: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 4019: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. García of Illinois.
H.J. Res. 1: Ms. WILD, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HERN, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. BARR, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, and Mr. GARCIA of California.

H.Res. 47: Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. KILDEE.

H. Res. 59: Mrs. LESKO.

H. Res. 109: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 118: Mr. EVANS, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H. Res. 119: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 186: Ms. GRANGER.

H. Res. 277: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H. Res. 289: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. AGUILAR.

H. Res. 317: Mrs. LESKO.

H. Res. 338: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. WILD.

H. Res. 348: Mr. BURCHETT.

H. Res. 366: Mr. LATTA and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H. Res. 368: Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. TORRES of New York.

H. Res. 397: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 2021 No. 108

Senate

The Senate met at 10:03 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O Lord, our God, thank You for permitting us to bear witness to Your glory. May our lawmakers with their words and actions prompt people to glorify Your Name.

Give our Senators the wisdom to foresee the dangers ahead and take precautions. As they listen to the voice of conscience, may our legislators reverently seek to fulfill Your purposes on Earth. Remind them often that all things are possible by faith and through fervent prayer. Today, continue to guide them as they dedicate themselves to strive to honor You.

We pray in Your glorious 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 22, 2021.

To the Senate:

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

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

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 and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, Act 77 was passed in 2019 by the Pennsylvania State legislature when Republicans held the majority in both houses. Among other voting reforms, the bill provided for no-excuse absentee voting and extended registration deadlines.

At the time, Republicans in the State legislature were operating under the assumption that mail-in voting would boost participation among seniors, who tend to lean Republican. Every single Republican State senator voted for the bill. In the State house, 105 Pennsylvania Republicans voted for the bill and 2 voted no. That was 2019.

Fast forward to 1 year later. Donald Trump, fresh off a resounding loss from the 2020 Presidential election, cried foul and lied—lied—that the election was stolen from him, like a petulant child. One of his favorite bugaboos, as we all know, was mail-in voting.

So a little over a year after 132 Pennsylvania Republicans voted for Act 77 with only two against, they introduced a bill to, you guessed it, repeal Act 77, a law that Republicans passed while they were in the majority just a year before.

There is a rot—a rot—at the center of the modern Republican Party. Donald Trump's Big Lie has spread like a cancer and threatens to envelope one of America's major political parties. Even worse, it has poisoned our democracy and eroded faith in our elections, which is so detrimental to the future faith people need to have in this democracy. And, of course, it became the match that lit a wildfire of Republican voter suppression laws sweeping across the country. Because of one man's lie, Republicans are now doing the dastardly act of taking away voting from millions of Americans—millions of Americans—and making it much harder for them to vote, and many, many, many will not.

From Georgia to Montana, from Florida to Iowa, in 14 different States, through 22 different laws, Republican State legislatures are conducting the most coordinated voter suppression effort in 80 years. And as the example of Act 77 in Pennsylvania goes to show, there is no principle behind these laws: not fraud, not election integrity, not security, not better election administration. The only principle is blatant partisan electoral advantage aimed at

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

Printed on recycled paper.

people of color, young people, urban people, and people who vote Democratic. It has nothing to do with fraud. They haven't pointed out that there is more fraud in those areas than in other areas. It is just blatant, blatant partisan advantage.

Whatever voting changes Republicans think are good for them, they will make them, even if it means resorting to the awful and un-American act of voter suppression. So in State after State—State after State—Republicans are reducing polling hours and locations and the number of drop boxes so that Americans of all parties, but particularly aimed at Democratic voters, people of color, young people, poor people, have a harder time finding the time, place, and manner to vote.

They are limiting the kind of IDs you can use, like student IDs, while at the same time removing requirements of any form of licensing to own a firearm. Has any study shown that there is less fraud among firearm owners than students? There is probably very little among either, but they pick one group and not the other, and we know why.

Republican legislatures are making it easier to own a gun than to vote. Republican legislatures are making it harder to vote early, harder to vote by mail, and harder to vote after work. They are making it a crime to give food or water to voters waiting in long lines. They are trying to make it harder for Black churchgoers to vote on Sunday. And they are actually making it easier for unelected judges and partisan election boards to overturn the results of an election, opening the door for some demagogue, a Trumpian-type demagogue—maybe he himself—to try and subvert our elections in the very same way that Trump tried to do it in 2020.

Republicans say these laws are about ''election integrity.'' They claim they are only trying to ''secure the vote.'' Some of my friends here in Washington have resorted to the old refrain that election laws are best left to the States, ignoring the fact that for generations, we, in Congress, have passed Federal election laws and constitutional amendments to prevent exactly this kind of discrimination and voter suppression.

We all know what these laws are about. I daresay my Republican colleagues know. They are not stupid. When the State of Texas proposes to limit voting hours on Sunday to only a few hours in the evening, do they really believe that is about preventing fraud? Do my Senate friends want to back up that kind of thing, prevent it from even being talked about here on the floor of the Senate? When Georgia Republicans say it is a crime to give a voter some water or food as they wait in line on a hot day, do they really think they are preventing voter fraud by denying them a snack? Give me a break. Give me a break.

Republicans across the country are deliberately targeting all the ways that younger, poorer, non-White, and typically Democratic voters access the ballot. Republicans claim they are making it easier to vote and harder to cheat in an election. In reality, they are making it harder to vote and easier to cheat in an election, and we all know it.

And all we want to do here is debate it in regular order—regular order—which colleagues on both sides of the aisle have asked for. That is what we are asking for here, just to debate these things, and they won't even do that because they are so afraid of what that debate will show: that this is not election integrity; that this is voter suppression and voter suppression directed at only one group of voters.

Well, we are going to see what happens today. Later today, the entire country will see whether our Republican friends are willing to even debate this issue in broad daylight. This afternoon, the U.S. Senate will vote on a motion to proceed to voting rights legislation. We all know what a motion to proceed is around here, but let me explain it. All it says is let's go forward with debate. Let's debate something, and this is among the most important things we could ever debate, the right to vote—what our soldiers have died for and what peaceful marchers have been bloodied for, the right to vote.

It takes 60 votes to start that debate. Everyone knows you still need 60 votes to end the debate on a bill. So even if the Republicans don't like the legislation at the end of the process, let them vote against it then. But, no, they don't even want to debate it. They don't even want to debate it because they are afraid. They want to deny the right to vote, make it harder to vote for so many Americans, and then they don't want to talk about it, sweep it under the rug, and hope that Americans don't hear about it.

But Americans will hear about it. We are going to make sure of that, and millions in the country who are rightly and correctly outraged by what is happening will let everyone know what has happened.

Now, only by starting the process can Senators offer amendments, change the bill, forge compromise. Only then can Senators engage in a full-throated debate about what this Chamber should do about the assault on voting rights in this country. Obviously, there are arguments about what should be done to protect voting rights and safeguard our democracy. Obviously, there are arguments about which policies are the most effective. But shouldn't we at least agree to debate the issue?

That is the only question for the U.S. Senate today. Do my Republican colleagues believe that voting rights, the most fundamental in a democracy, the right that generations of Americans have marched for and protested to achieve, that generations of American soldiers have fought and died to secure, is that worthy of debate? Of course it is.

Should the U.S. Senate even debate how to protect the voting rights of our citizens? There is only one correct answer. We will see if our Republican colleagues choose it this afternoon.

This is not simply a partisan issue, as partisan as the Republican side and the State legislatures and now here in the Senate seem to make it. It is about the fundamental values in this country. It is about what we are all about.

When the Constitution was started in most States, you had to be a White male Protestant property owner to vote. There has been an inexorable march to expand that right to vote and allow more and more Americans to have that right to vote. This is a giant step backward. Obviously, it is a partisan issue to the Republicans, but it is a much deeper issue than that.

Will our colleagues stand up for what generations of Americans have fought for, marched for, and died for or will they just slink away and say we are not even going to debate this?

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, over the weekend, Iran held what its Supreme Leader might call a Presidential election. To the rest the world, including millions of Iranians, what actually happened was quite clear. The regime's favored choice was selected from a limited field of approved candidates in a carefully controlled bit of political theater. There is no doubt this charade works as intended. The Ayatollah got a President-elect with a record of strict adherence to his regime's revolutionary orthodoxy. Meanwhile, former Presidential candidates who emerged as leaders in the popular 2009 Green Movement remain under house arrest. Like his predecessors, Ebrahim Raisi will serve as a figurehead while the Supreme Leader and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard actually run the show.

But even rigged elections have consequences, and the new most visible figure in Tehran has a proven history as a hardline theocrat. For decades, from his time on a so-called death committee in the 1980s, the President-elect played an intimate role in the trial, conviction, and summary execution of political prisoners and peaceful protesters. There is no question he is an extreme hardliner, even in the Iranian context, and now he is set to be the so-called counterpart to President Biden as this administration reengages eagerly with the world's most active state sponsor of terrorism.

In some circles, a looming turnover in the top ranks of Iranian leadership is being spun as a reason for the White House to rush even faster than it already is toward restoring the Obama administration's failed nuclear deal. One particularly eager assessment in the New York Times called the next 6

weeks ''a unique window for clinching an agreement,'' like some sort of liquidation sale in which President Biden needs to take whatever he can. Meanwhile, rational observers know that the fundamental reality of the U.S.-Iranian relations certainly has not changed.

If the selection of a new hardline figurehead in Tehran sends any signal, it is a reminder that showering the regime with sanctions relief and expecting a change in behavior is a reckless and damaging approach. In fact, President-elect Raisi has already said as much himself. Iran's ballistic missile program is ''not negotiable,'' and meeting with President Biden is not on the table.

Of course, Iranian politicians and diplomats are known to lie and to dissemble, so we should pay closest attention to this regime's actions. What will it actually do?

Here is the truth: Domestic political developments in Tehran don't absolve the Biden administration of its responsibility to confront Iran's nuclear and missile proliferation, its support for terrorism, its abuses of human rights, and its relentless efforts to destabilize the entire region.

If President Biden hopes to earn bipartisan support for an Iran policy that could outlast his time in office, he needs to start explaining how he intends to respond as Iran ramps up threats against the United States and our closest partners in its backyard.

Remember, the thousands of rockets Hamas fired at Israel last month were made possible by Iran. So were the precision-guided munitions in Hezbollah's arsenal and the ballistic missiles and UAVs launched into Saudi Arabia by the Houthis in Yemen. And the dozens of militia attacks on U.S. interests in Iraq? Carried out by Tehran's reliable accolades.

The Biden administration has had months to develop a coherent rationale for its eager engagement with the Iranian regime and months to hash out a better plan than rewarding terrorist sponsors with sanctions relief. An explanation to Congress is long overdue.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. President, now on an entirely different matter, later today, the Senate will vote on whether to advance Democrats' transparently partisan plan to tilt every election in America permanently in their favor.

By now, the rotten inner workings of this power grab have been thoroughly exposed to the light. We know that it would shatter a decades-old understanding that campaign law should have a bipartisan referee and turn the Federal Election Commission into a partisan majority cudgel for Democrats to wield against their political opponents. We know that it would let Washington bureaucrats direct Federal dollars into politicians' campaign accounts—government money for yard signs and attack ads. We know that it would let Democrats take a red pen to election laws in each of the 50 States, neutering popular precautions like voter ID while legalizing shady practices like ballot harvesting across the board.

It is a recipe for undermining confidence in our elections, for remaking our entire system of government to suit the preferences of one far end of the political spectrum. And if they could, many Democrats would pass it with the slimmest possible majority, even after its companion faced bipartisan opposition over in the House. What a craven political calculation. What a way to show your disdain for the American people's choices.

Of course, it isn't even limited to election law. Among the most dangerous parts of S. 1 is the way it would equip partisan regulators to intimidate and to discourage private citizens from engaging in political speech.

Unfortunately, this one is a familiar concept for too many Americans. It is not hard to imagine Federal bureaucrats indulging ideological grudges and chilling free speech. It has actually happened before. The Nation was reminded just a few weeks ago how unable the Federal Government can be to protect private citizens' personal information—unable or just unwilling?

But conservatives in particular didn't need a reminder of what became institutionalized discrimination under the last Democratic administration. So when private contributors, nonprofit advocacy groups, and religious organizations see that S. 1's disclosure requirements would intentionally unlearn the lessons of the IRS's abuses under Lois Lerner, they have plenty of reasons—plenty—to fear.

Naming and shaming is not a hypothetical concept; it has been a concrete reality for thousands of private citizens. Today, Democrats are asking for a green light to supercharge the intimidation machine that makes all that possible.

We have heard this entire package described in many ways over the years. It has been around for a while. The same rotten proposals have sometimes been called a massive overhaul for a broken democracy, sometimes just a modest package of tweaks for a democracy that is working perfectly, and sometimes a response to State actions, which this bill actually predates by many years. But whichever label Democrats slap on the bill, the substance remains the same. It has always been a plan to rewrite the ground rules of American politics.

By the way, no matter what far-left activists are telling our colleagues, this most sensitive subject would not be the best place to trash the Senate's rules to ram something through. In fact, these issues would be the worst possible place to push through a power grab at any cost.

The Senate is no obstacle to voting laws done the right way. I have helped write legislation regarding our democracy that has soared through this Chamber on huge bipartisan margins. The Senate is only an obstacle when the policy is flawed and the process is rotten, and that is exactly why this body exists.

Today, the Senate is going to fulfill our founding purpose, stop the partisan power grab, and reject S. 1.

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, what is the status of the floor?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is considering the Fonzone nomination.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, let's be clear. We are facing the most dangerous and overt threat to our democratic system in generations.

Supreme Court decisions like Citizens United and McCutcheon wrongly equated money with speech, and in the decades since, unaccountable dark money has flooded into our political system. This broken campaign finance system allows billionaires to drown out the voices of ordinary Americans with no accountability. This lack of transparency also opens the door for dangerous disinformation campaigns.

After the Supreme Court gutted article V of the Voting Rights Act in another terrible decision, we have also seen State legislatures across the country take up and pass voting laws designed explicitly to prevent Black, Brown, and young voters from exercising their right to vote.

These new laws in States like Georgia, Arizona, and Texas are right out of the pre-Voting Rights Act playbook of the Jim Crow South. Some have called them Jim Crow 2.0, and, frankly, it is hard to disagree. They make it harder to register to vote. They reduce early voting times in polling locations. They restrict access to vote by mail. In the Presiding Officer's State in Georgia, it is now illegal to hand out water to someone who has been standing in line for hours to vote, waiting to vote. Could anything be more wrongheaded?

My home State of New Mexico is a good example of what it looks like to enhance rather than attack participation in our democracy. I am proud of the ways that election officials in my State have stepped up in recent years to make voting safer, to make it more secure and at the same time more accessible for every New Mexican, and our State has seen greater participation in our elections as a result. Now, unfortunately, we are seeing the polar opposite of this approach in our neighboring States.

Just last week, Democratic lawmakers from Texas came to Washington, DC, to warn us just how dire the situation has become in their State. Texas's Governor, Greg Abbott, and Republican lawmakers in Austin are hell-bent on passing sweeping voting restrictions as part of a nakedly

discriminatory power grab. These proposed changes would reduce voting hours, push back the start of Sunday early voting when many Black voters cast their ballots, and eliminate polling locations in larger urban counties. The goal of this type of legislation is pretty plain to see.

This shameful and transparent attempt to take away Texans' right to vote and similar attempts to disenfranchise voters in many other States should be a wake-up call to every single American. We should all be able to see that these attacks on voting are taking advantage of and in many cases being driven by our former President's lies and conspiracy theories about the last election.

Make no mistake, former President Trump's Big Lie about his loss in the 2020 election has sown widespread and damaging distrust in our elections. We should never forget that this same distrust and disinformation fomented a mob of violent insurrectionists who stormed into this very building, the very heart of our democracy, less than 6 months ago.

Now, unfortunately, that cat is out of the bag. I don't see this widespread public distrust in our elections going away anytime soon as a result, especially as long as our former President continues to add more fuel to the fire and particularly when Republicans—even Republicans who know that he is lying—continue to follow him down that rabbit hole.

In one of New Mexico's other neighboring States, in Arizona, there is a so-called audit of the votes cast in their largest county. This bogus audit is being conducted by a private company paid for by secret pro-Trump funders, with no effective oversight.

When you outsource nonpartisan election work to a firm calling themselves the Cyber Ninjas, you know things are off the rails. All of the distrust in our elections that has been ginned up by the former President is all the more reason for us to come together to pass commonsense reforms that would restore all Americans' faith in our elections and in our democracy.

The right of every lawful American to vote is just that; it is a right, and no one, no one, should be able to take that away. The public should have confidence that our leaders are working on their behalf, not in fealty to a class of dark money billionaires. They deserve transparency so that they can see who is behind the political ads on their television screens and their social media feeds. Most importantly, they deserve to know that our fundamentally American right to vote is secure, accessible, and easy to navigate for every single lawful American.

That is why it is so important for the Senate to take up the For the People Act this week. This comprehensive legislation addresses all of the critical challenges facing our political systems and our democratic institutions. The For the People Act would restore transparency, accountability, and strong ethics rules for our elections.

It would stop billionaires from being able to anonymously pour buckets of cash into our elections in an effort to buy them. It would put an end to partisan gerrymandering and broken election rules that allow Republicans and Democrats alike to rig the system for themselves and for special interests. And it would modernize voting systems so that every American, no matter their race, their political party, or their ZIP Code, can have confidence in their ability to exercise their right to vote.

Democrats and Republicans in the Senate should come together to pass commonsense election security, voter protections, and campaign finance reforms in the For the People Act. Each of these provisions, on their own, have won bipartisan support at the State and local level. In a previous, less partisan time, these ideas would have earned broad bipartisan support here in Congress. These are not Democratic or Republican ideas; they are fundamental reforms that we need to pass in order to restore the essential American idea that each of us has a say in who we elect as our leaders.

The House has already passed the For the People Act earlier this year. It is now the Senate's turn to take up this critical legislation. Unless we can pass the reforms that are in the For the People Act, we will keep living under a broken status quo where the special interests wield far too much control and State lawmakers can continue to undermine and ignore constitutional rights.

It is outrageous that Senate Republicans, as we heard from the minority leader, are planning to block legislation to restore voting rights and bring much-needed transparency and ethics into our elections. Their refusal to even allow debate on the For the People Act should be seen for what it is. It is a ringing endorsement of former President Trump's conspiracy theories and his attacks on our elections and on reality itself.

Refusing to take up the For the People Act will prop up the campaigns that we are seeing in States across the country that strip Americans of our hard-won right to vote.

Mr. President, I want to be clear. If Senate Republicans are successful later today in using the filibuster to block the Senate from even debating the For the People Act, this cannot be the end of the story. We simply cannot give up on passing voting rights legislation in this Congress, not when our democracy is what is on the line.

We should all remember that the filibuster is a rule, a rule that cannot even be found in the Constitution, but voting, voting is an American right. When I think about this, I remember my former colleague across the hall from me, actually, when I served in the House, Representative John Lewis. It was one of the most humbling experiences of my life to be able to serve in the same Chamber as Congressman Lewis.

John Lewis dedicated his entire life to the fight for the right of all Americans to cast their ballot safely and without fear of discrimination. More than 50 years ago, he and so many others marched and put their lives on the line to call on President Lyndon Johnson and Members of Congress from both parties to pass the Voting Rights Act. Back then and every time the Voting Rights Act has been reauthorized since, Senators from both parties have found a way to protect our democracy and preserve the right to vote.

Right now, America is facing down daunting threats to our democratic values here at home. For the first time since the Civil War, the greatest threats to the Republic are from within. History will judge all of us based on what we do to defend that fundamental right for all—not some but all—of our fellow Americans.

Mr. President, will we meet this moment? If we fail to rise to the discrimination baked into these State laws, our failure will cast a long shadow. I will be proud to cast my vote on the side of democracy.

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. THUNE. Mr. 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.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, later today, the Senate will vote on S. 2093. S. 2093 is the new S. 1. It is the latest version of the so-called For the People Act, which is a massive, massive Federal takeover of election law.

So why are we taking up a massive Federal takeover of election law? Well, that is a good question. Two years ago, Democrats told us that we needed to pass this law because our electoral system was broken. Well, then came 2020. We had a record voter turnout, the largest voter turnout since the election of 1900, the largest turnout in 120 years in American history. And Democrats won the White House.

After that, it got a little awkward to complain that our electoral system was broken. So Democrats found a new argument. Now, we have to pass this legislation to stop States from taking away voting rights. According to Democrats, States' moves to update or clarify their election laws in the wake of pandemic challenges and vote-counting confusion are really plots to restrict voter access.

Of course, so far, most 2021 State election law updates have proved to be both standard and mainstream, but that hasn't stopped Democrats who have, at times, resorted to outright lies in their efforts to persuade Americans

that we are facing a voting rights crisis.

After all, Democrats need to give some reason for why we should allow the Federal Government to take over our entire electoral system. And Democrats' real reason—because they think S. 1 will give them an advantage in future elections—is not really one that they can use to sell the bill, although Speaker PELOSI did admit on national television that she thought S. 1 would boost Democrats' electoral chances.

The question is where to start when it comes to the bill's content. As I said, like the original S. 1, the new S. 1 is an unprecedented Federal takeover of elections. Historically, running elections has largely been a matter for States, which tailor election laws to the particular needs of their cities and communities.

S. 1 would impose one-size-fits-all, Federal regulations on elections—in many cases, deeply problematic regulations. S. 1 would require States to allow unlimited ballot harvesting, which is the controversial practice of allowing political operatives and others to pick up and deliver ballots, with all of the possibilities for fraud that that creates.

It would gut State voter ID laws—laws which, I would point out, are supported by a strong majority of the American people. A recent poll said 80 percent of Americans support voter ID laws. It would remove legal penalties for registering individuals who are here illegally—and so much more.

But the new S. 1, like the old S. 1, goes way beyond undermining the security of our elections and increasing the likelihood of voter fraud. It would implement public funding of political campaigns, which would mean that government dollars, money that belongs to the American taxpayer, would go to funding yard signs and attack ads. Sitting Senators alone could qualify for more than $1.8 billion in public funding. And that doesn't count their challengers.

Yes, with a record high debt, Democrats apparently think that dropping a couple billion dollars here and there on attack ads and partisan rallies is a good use of taxpayer dollars.

And from there, believe it or not, the ideas only get worse. S. 1 would permanently undermine confidence in our electoral system by turning the Federal Election Commission, the primary enforcer of election law in this country, into a partisan body. That is right. The Democrats' bill would turn the primary enforcer of election law in this country into a partisan body. Now, I am interested to hear how this is supposed to enhance voter confidence in our electoral system. Every single FEC ruling would be suspect.

And on top of all this, S. 1 makes a concerted attack on freedom of speech. It would impose onerous requirements and restrictions on political speech. It would open up private Americans to retaliation and intimidation simply for making a donation to support a cause they believe in. And it would allow the IRS to consider organizations' beliefs when deciding whether or not to grant them tax-exempt status.

In fact, the ACLU—the American Civil Liberties Union—actually opposed the House's version of S. 1 in the last Congress because the bill would ''unconstitutionally burden speech and associational rights.'' That is right. The American Civil Liberties Union opposed the legislation because the bill would ''unconstitutionally burden speech and associational rights.''

As hard as it is to believe when you look at the bill's provisions, S. 1 was billed as an election integrity bill. In fact, this legislation would undermine election integrity, making our elections less secure and more susceptible to fraud. And it would undermine voter confidence in our elections.

The partisan divide in this country has reached new heights, and voters on both sides have lost confidence in our electoral process. Any election legislation that we take up should be focused on building voter confidence in the fairness of our electoral system, not undermining it.

Do my Democratic colleagues seriously believe—seriously believe—that S. 1 would do anything to increase voter confidence in the unbiased character of our electoral system? Do they seriously believe that their bill looks like a nonpartisan attempt to protect American elections? They can't possibly.

From the newly partisan FEC to an IRS empowered to reject tax-exempt status for organizations whose beliefs it doesn't like, S. 1 is very clearly a bill designed purely and simply to enhance political power—the political power, Democrats hope, of the Democratic Party. It is the very opposite of a nonpartisan reform bill.

And I have to ask my Democratic colleagues, do you really want an electoral system that is perceived as partisan and which half the country doesn't trust? Haven't we seen the consequences of that? Are you really prepared to sacrifice voter confidence in our electoral system just so you can win elections?

Later this afternoon, we will vote on S. 1. And I fully expect that this legislation will be blocked, and it should be. The Senate's rules, which require the agreement of 60 Senators to move forward to consider legislation, were designed—designed—for times just like these, times when a narrow partisan majority attempts to shove through partisan legislation, times when a partisan majority attacks the freedoms that our government exists to protect.

The Senate was established to act as a monitoring body and check attempts to ride roughshod over minority rights or to curtail our rights and our liberties. And today the Senate will fulfill that role and prevent this dangerous, partisan takeover of our electoral system from moving forward.

To elaborate on that point for just a moment, when I asked the question earlier on about why would you bring this bill to the floor—it is a good question, I think, knowing full well that it is going to fail, and should fail later today, but why would you bring it to the floor? Well, allegedly, the reason to bring it to the floor was to provide pressures on certain Democratic Members that this is the reason that they need to vote to do away with the legislative filibuster, which is something that has been part of the Senate going back to our Founding Fathers. In fact, the very reason the Founding Fathers created the U.S. Senate was a check and balance against majoritarian rule and running roughshod over the rights of the minority here in the U.S. Senate. And the legislative filibuster has ensured and provided that protection, so much so that it was used extensively in the last 6 years, when Republicans were in control of the Senate, by the Democrats to filibuster legislation. In fact, it was used to filibuster coronavirus relief bills. It was used to filibuster police reform bills. It was used over and over to block the former President's nominees. And yet, now, we are being told that the Senate needs to get rid of the legislative filibuster and that all those Democrats, all those on the other side of the aisle who used it extensively to block Republican legislation over the past 6 years, now believe that we need to get rid of this legislative filibuster and that this bill is example No. 1 for why that is necessary.

Well, it is really ironic and interesting to hear Members on the other side make that argument, given where they were a couple of years ago. It was just a couple of years ago—maybe 3 years ago—that 33 Democratic Senators signed a letter—a letter—to the Republican leader at the time, Senator MCCONNELL, saying that we need to preserve the filibuster, the legislative filibuster, in the Senate because it is so crucial to the essence of the Senate and the protections that it provides for the rights of the minority here in the U.S. Senate. Thirty-three Democrats, many of whom are still serving in this body, adopted that position.

And, in fact, the Democratic whip, my counterpart on the Democratic side, said, a couple of years ago on a morning show:

> I can tell you that would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to our Founding Fathers. We have to acknowledge our respect for the minority, and that is what the Senate tries to do in its composition and in its procedure.

''I can tell you,'' he said, the Democratic whip, the Senator from Illinois, ''that it would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to our Founding Fathers.'' In other words, we need to preserve the filibuster to preserve our democracy. It is essential. That was the view as recently as a couple of years ago. And now, now, we have to get rid of the filibuster to preserve our democracy 2

years later. The filibuster, the legislative filibuster, which in various forms has served our Republic now for over two centuries. It has been a part of the U.S. Senate checks and balances that the Founders envisioned for this country.

And yet here we are bringing a bill to the floor for no other purpose than to have a show vote to try and pressure certain Democratic Senators who, rightfully, are defending the legislative filibuster as an essential element of protecting the rights of the minority in the Senate, of requiring cooperation and collaboration and bringing people together on legislation. Solutions in the Senate, historically—and I was a staffer here back in the 1980s. That is how long my tenure, at least as a staffer and now subsequently as a Member, goes back. But the Senate is a place where solutions tend to be found in the middle because that is required. It is required that there be 60 votes to move consequential legislation. And as a result of that, Members on both sides have to come together. If you want to pass big things in the Senate, you have to figure out a way to get 60 votes. And right now that would require—in the Senate, if you had every Democrat, 50 Democrats, you would have to get 10 Republicans. As was the case when we had the majority in the Senate, we had to get seven Democrats to do anything. And so, in order to even move essential legislation like the coronavirus bill, we had to reach out to the other side. And it forced that compromise, that collaboration, that willingness to come together and work in a bipartisan way on solutions that are durable, that are durable for this country.

It is really interesting in this Washington Post op-ed by Senator SINEMA, where she points out—makes that very point that if you can do something at 51 votes today, and one side blows up the rules in the Senate, that when the majority changes—and it always does in the Senate, and she points out that sometimes when you get in the majority, you think you will be there forever. Well, I have been here long enough to have been in the majority and the minority and in the majority and the minority again. It goes back and forth.

So what are you going to do then the next time the Senate majority flips and all those things that the other side thinks are awful, awful ideas that the Republicans have, and they would love to be able to block them or at least force Republicans to come to the table and negotiate a solution that would require some bipartisan participation to get to 60 votes—what are you going to do then, where we have 51 votes when one side gets the majority and 50 votes and we go back and forth and we have this policy, this kind of policy roller coaster that provides no certainty, no predictability, and certainly gets away from the checks and balances that the Founders intended?

The filibuster—the legislative filibuster, the rules of the Senate, the procedures of the Senate, are designed to protect and preserve democracy not to undermine it. What undermines it are cynical attempts to try and use a piece of legislation that the leadership on the other side knows is going nowhere and bring it to the floor for a show vote to put pressure—to put pressure—on Senate Democrats, who, as I said, rightfully, are defending that very procedure, which has worked so well to their advantage for the past 6 years.

And now we are told the reason they have to change it is because Republicans are being so—we are not cooperating. We are not—you know, we are sticks in the mud. We are stopping and blocking things.

We haven't even been in the minority now for 6 months. We spent the last 6 years in the majority, as the other side extensively—and I emphasize ''extensively'' because any study of the data would suggest that—to block Republican initiatives, to force Republicans to come together to find 60 votes. That was their position and posture for the past 6 years, including 33 Democratic Senators who, as recently as 3 years ago, sent a letter to the Republican leader, saying that we have got to protect the legislative filibuster—statements like the one made by the Senator from Illinois that doing away with the filibuster would end the Senate as it was originally devised and created, going back to our Founding Fathers.

One of the essential elements of this Republic constitutionally was the need for checks and balances. And the bicameral creation of the Founding Fathers, the House, which is based upon the majority, 2-year terms, designed to reflect the will of the of people, the balance and check that was created against that was the U.S. Senate, with 6-year terms, where you have procedures and rules that make it more difficult and challenging, that force this place to be more deliberative, to be more compromising, to consult and work together.

And so what we are doing today, you are going to get up, and my colleagues on the other side are going to talk about how critical it is that we do this because all these States are enacting these terrible, terrible election reforms. And as I said earlier, most of which, at least from what I have seen, are very mainstream and consistent with what the Founders designed in our Constitution, and that is for States to have principal primacy when it comes to controlling and regulating elections in this country. But as I said, it was argued 2 years ago, 3 years ago, in 2019, when this bill was introduced, that it needed to be introduced because we have got to do something to increase participation in our elections; that we really need to encourage people to be more active in our elections; that we have got to get people to vote, which they did, in record numbers—the biggest turnout since 1900, biggest voter participation in the 2020 election literally in 120 years in American history.

So now they introduced a bill this year, and the stated reason is, we have to do this to stop all these States that are adopting these legislative solutions that are going to make it more difficult for people to vote. Well, all I can say is, the rationale for what we are doing today changes depending on the year, depending on the election, but the goal is the same, and that is to create a permanent political advantage for one party—that is all this is about—and to persuade and pressure certain Democratic Senators to do away with one of the fundamental elements of the U.S. Senate in the form of a legislative filibuster.

I hope this vote will make at least some Democrats think twice about the wisdom of permanently politicizing our electoral system and that it will encourage them to make sure that any future election reform proposals are genuinely bipartisan in nature.

Unfortunately, I think it is more likely that Democrats are going to use this vote to argue for destroying the Senate's longstanding protections for minority rights. But today—today, at least, the Senate will fulfill its constitutional mandate and act as a check on this attempt to undermine our basic freedoms.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA).

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNOCK. 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 Georgia.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I rise today at a defining moment in American history and at a time when I sincerely believe that what we do or fail to do will have long-lasting and far-reaching implications for the health, viability, and vitality of the world's greatest democracy.

We debate many important issues in this Chamber, but this issue, the issue of voting rights, I argue, is decidedly different. It is formative and foundational. It is the framework in which all of our other debates take place, for this issue is about the preservation and the protection of the democracy itself. That is, after all, what we claim to be. That is who we are—a democracy built on that sacred idea of one person, one vote.

With all the arguments taking place in the country right now, with all of the audits being ordered, and with all of the voting legislation being feverishly passed in States all across our country, clearly, ironically, there is agreement—albeit for different reasons on the right and on the left—that democracy itself is in danger. Folks on the left and folks on the right believe that there is something broken and it needs to be fixed.

If that is, indeed, the case, what kind of Congress would we be in the whole history of Congresses if, seeing that discussion out there, we refuse to even debate the matter in here? Who are we and how are we to hide in a moment like this?

So I rise with what I think is a simple request of my colleagues. Let's do our job. Resist the easy route, the temptation to hide behind Senate procedure, and let's have a principled conversation in front of the American people about voting rights. Let's have that conversation right here, right now. How could we do otherwise?

It is said that we are the most important deliberative body on the planet. Well, colleagues, how derelict in our duty would we be if, in this defining moment we refuse to even have a debate—a debate—about how best to preserve and protect that which is most precious: the democracy itself.

In my maiden speech this past March, I made an urgent call upon this body to act to protect the right to vote, and I warned then that the cords of our democracy were dangerously frayed. That was not theoretical stuff from me. I hail from Georgia. I argued then that our democracy was being frayed by unfounded conspiracy theories that led to an attack on this very Chamber and undermined by an onslaught of State-level proposals aimed at suppressing the vote.

Since I gave that maiden speech, things have only gotten worse. When I spoke here in March, 250 voter suppression proposals had been introduced in 43 States—250 proposals. Now it is 389 proposals in 48 States. A violent assault on this Capitol is now metastasizing to voter suppression proposals all across the United States of America. Since I spoke here in March, Georgia and 13 other States have enacted these voter suppression bills into law—14 in total. That is 14 States, and counting, where partisan actors, power-hungry politicians have acted along partisan lines to make it harder, not easier, for eligible voters to cast a ballot and guarantee that ballot will actually count.

In Georgia, after record voter turnout in a historic election, there is now a provision in S.B. 202 that allows partisan actors at the State level to take over the board—to take it over—to take over the process at the local level as voters are casting their ballots. Imagine that. That same law also allows any citizen to challenge the voting rights of an unlimited number of citizens, making it difficult to see how you can certify any election.

Let's not kid ourselves. In this Chamber, of all places, a few months after January 6, this is dangerous stuff. That is one reason we need to debate the legislation before us.

I am hoping to include a provision I introduced yesterday with some of my colleagues that will prevent politicians from being able to overrule local election officials and therefore subvert the voices of the people. This provision will also protect local election volunteers from harassment and intimidation.

Right now across the Nation, constitutional rights are being assaulted, and I fear that if we don't act as a body in this moment, we will have crossed a dangerous Rubicon in our Nation that will make it extremely difficult for the next generation to secure voting rights for every eligible American.

This is not just another moment in another Congress. We should not think of this as rote and routine. This is a defining moment that calls upon us to speak, to debate, to act. After all, Congress represents the people. It is the job of Congress, as prescribed in article I, section 4, to ensure that the people are not squeezed out and locked out of their own democracy. This is not our house; this is the house of the people. We are stewards of that trust. We have to ensure that the voices of the people can be heard in their own house, and that is why I am urging my colleagues to begin debating on the voting rights legislation before us. That debate is happening right now out there. How could it not happen in here?

I know some of my Republican friends are vowing to prevent this debate, to stop it before it begins. And we are not talking yet about passing the bill. Be very clear. We are just talking about talking about it, and they don't even want to do that. Really?

Surely some of my Republican friends believe at the very least that in this Chamber, we should be able to debate about voting rights. After all, voting rights are preservative of all other rights. And what could be more hypocritical and cynical than invoking minority rights in the Senate as a pretext for preventing debate about how to preserve minority rights in the society?

I stand here as a proud American. I believe in democracy with all of my heart. I believe that democracy is the political enactment of a spiritual idea, that we are all children of God, and that we have within us a spark of the divine and therefore a right to help determine our country's direction and our destiny within it.

I believe in democracy, government of the people, by the people, and for the people. I believe that the blind spots in our public policy and the wrongs in our history are made right through the power of democracy, people of diverse perspectives helping us to see more fully and embrace more completely what it means to be a government of the people, by the people, for the people. It is how Black people finally gained their citizenship; women, the suffrage; members of the LGBTQ+ community, their dignity and equality under law.

Diverse perspectives and voices help us to see what we would not otherwise see, and that is precisely what is being imperiled right now by all of these voter suppression bills and by some in this Chamber to forestall a necessary debate about voting rights at this defining moment in our history.

Mr. President, who are we and how are we to hide at a moment like this? Why are some people hiding? To what end? For what purpose? At whose behest? From whom are they hiding—the American people who sent us here in the first place?

I hope we can take a bipartisan vote to begin debate on this important piece of legislation because that is what democracy is all about. History is watching, and the future is waiting to see if we are who we say we are—the United States Senate, a serious-minded, deliberative body, the United States of America, a nation built on that simple but sublime principle: one person, one vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I had not planned to speak about the Democratic power grab known as S. 1 and H.R. 1, the For the People Act. I have said my piece on this bill before on the Senate floor and in many other forums. But I have listened to my Democratic friends all day long talk about this bill.

We will later today vote on what is known as a motion to proceed to the debate on this bill. That motion will fail. It won't come close to passing. And our Democratic friends are saying: They won't even debate. They won't even debate election reforms.

Well, first off, let me say, if you ask me what the Republican plan to federalize our elections is, my answer is, we don't have a plan to federalize our elections. We don't think we should federalize our elections. We think the States and their counties have done a pretty good job, traditionally, of running our elections.

I would also remind my Democratic friends that what they present as some kind of unprecedented affront to having a democratic debate in the Senate happened repeatedly, hundreds of times, in the last administration.

My Democratic friends simply voted not even to have a debate—not even to have a debate on, say, a coronavirus relief package last summer, which could have gotten aid to families and businesses when they needed it. When the pandemic was still raging, when vaccines were still months away, they filibustered even a debate until after the election, when we passed, in December, almost exactly the same bill that was under consideration.

They blocked even a debate—even a debate—on policing reforms last summer that might have helped provide police departments across the country with additional financial support or training resources.

I could go on and on about the bills on which they blocked even a debate, like protecting unborn children who can survive outside their mother's womb. Yet, today, the Democrats act as if it is some terrible affront that we are not even going to have a debate on a bill that would be one of the biggest power grabs by Washington in the history of our democracy.

Then you have a lot of Democrats who are complaining that the civic rules and customs—the filibuster has to go. They say it is a racist relic of the Jim Crow era.

I will acknowledge that some Democrats over the years used the filibuster to block civil rights progress, but I will also remind my Democratic colleagues that, yes, they used the filibuster hundreds of times in the last administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter written on April 7, 2017, persuasively authored by SUSAN COLLINS and CHRIS COONS and signed by more than 60 of our fellow Senators urging Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER to ''preserve the existing rules, practices and traditions as they pertain to the right of Members to engage in extended debate on legislation.''

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Democratic Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER SCHUMER: We are writing to urge you to support our efforts to preserve existing rules, practices, and traditions as they pertain to the right of Members to engage in extended debate on legislation before the United States Senate. Senators have expressed a variety of opinions about the appropriateness of limiting debate when we are considering judicial and executive branch nominations. Regardless of our past disagreements on that issue, we are united in our determination to preserve the ability of Members to engage in extended debate when bills are on the Senate floor.

We are mindful of the unique role the Senate plays in the legislative process, and we are steadfastly committed to ensuring that this great American institution continues to serve as the world's greatest deliberative body. Therefore, we are asking you to join us in opposing any effort to curtail the existing rights and prerogatives of Senators to engage in full, robust, and extended debate as we consider legislation before this body in the future.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Collins, Orrin Hatch, Claire McCaskill, Lisa Murkowski, Christopher A. Coons, Joe Manchin, John McCaine, Patrick Leahy, Roger F. Wicker, Luther Strange.

Angus S. King, Jr., Michael F. Bennett, Amy Klobuchar, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, Richard Burr, Mark R. Warner, Jerry Moran.

Roy Blunt, Marco Rubio, Jeanne Shaheen, Thom Tillis, Sherrod Brown, Shelley Moore Capito, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Brian Schatz, Michael E. Enzi, Dean Heller.

Cory A. Booker, Mazie K. Hirono, Dianne Feinstein, John Thune, Bill Cassidy, Heidi Heitkamp, Jeff Flake, Chuck Grassley, Maria Cantwell, Rob Portman.

Lamar Alexander, John Kennedy, John Tester, Thomas R. Carper, Pat Roberts, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tammy Duckworth, Jack Reed, Thad Cochran, Joe Donnelly.

Ben Sasse, Todd Young, Kamala D. Harris, Bill Nelson, Johnny Isakson, Edward J. Markey, Mike Lee, Debbie Stabenow, Sheldon Whitehouse, Robert Menendez, Tim Kaine.

Mr. COTTON. They note that these rules have changed on our Executive Calendar when we consider traditional nominees or executive branch nominees, but they say:

> We are mindful of the unique role the Senate plays in the legislative process, and we are steadfastly committed to ensuring that this great [American] institution continues to serve as the world's greatest deliberative body. Therefore, we are asking you [Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL] to join us in opposing any effort to curtail the existing rights and prerogatives of Senators to engage in full, robust, and extended debate as we consider legislation before this body in the future.

Let me remind you, more than 60 Senators signed this. Twenty-six Democrats currently serving in the Senate signed it, 27 if you include the Vice President.

Let me just give you a few notables. As I said, the Vice President signed it. The following chairs of Senate committees signed this letter 4 short years ago: Senators LEAHY, WARNER, CANTWELL, CARPER, REED, STABENOW, and MENENDEZ. Some other notable Senators—as I said, it was authored by Senator COONS, one of Joe Biden's closest friends in the U.S. Senate. Senator KING, who often finds himself in the middle of consequential debates; Senator HEINRICH, who apparently has changed his tune and today is advocating aggressively to eliminate the filibuster, just like Senator SCHATZ; Senator BOOKER; Senator FEINSTEIN, one of the longest serving Democrats in the Senate; Senator KAINE, who was the Vice Presidential nominee for the Democratic Party in 2016; Senator TESTER, again, who often finds himself in the middle of consequential, bipartisan negotiations.

Yet, somehow, something has changed since 2017. Something has changed, and most of these Democratic Senators now think that the Senate rules must be destroyed so they can pass their massive power grab. What could it be that has changed? What could it be? I don't know. Maybe—maybe it is that Democrats have the most slender reed of power with Joe Biden in the White House and a 50–50 Senate and a four-seat majority in the House.

I wish my Democratic colleagues understood that the shoe can pinch when it is on the other foot.

NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER CHARLES FONZONE

Mr. President, Huawei is no ordinary phone company; it is the eyes and ears of the Chinese Communist Party. According to our Department of Defense, Huawei is a ''Communist Chinese military company'' that is controlled by the People's Liberation Army. A former officer in the PLA founded Huawei.

Huawei is built on stolen technology from American companies like Cisco, and it is engaged in espionage all around the world on behalf of its masters in Beijing, which raises some important questions.

Should American citizens work on behalf of a Communist Chinese military company? If they do, should they then go on to serve in senior positions in the U.S. Government, making policies that will directly affect our safety and security? These aren't academic questions. The Senate is now considering whether to confirm one Christopher Fonzone for a senior legal position in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

By all accounts, Mr. Fonzone is a capable lawyer. I don't question his qualifications or his character, but there is reason to question his judgment.

While working as a law partner at Sidley Austin, Mr. Fonzone performed legal work for Huawei, as well as China's Ministry of Commerce. He performed this work during a critical period when our government was actively exposing Huawei as a Chinese spy company and applying sanctions to it.

He also wasn't just a longtime lawyer in private practice with long-standing clients, to include foreign clients; he had spent most of his career in government, primarily in national security roles. I cannot imagine that he was not aware of the China threat in general or the Huawei threat in particular. After all, the House Intelligence Committee had produced a landmark report exposing Huawei in 2012, while he served in the Obama administration.

Now, I recognize he didn't do all that much work for Huawei—just a few billable hours here and there—but the fact remains that he first served Huawei, and now he wants to serve in the U.S. Government. Nor is he willing to foreclose the possibility of working for such companies in the future.

Unfortunately, Mr. Fonzone is far from alone in his lapse of judgment. There is a rapidly revolving door in Washington, DC, that shuttles people in and out of government. Unfortunately, some of those people go on to work for companies with ties to the Chinese Government and its armed wing, the People's Liberation Army, after they cycle out of government. These individuals are part of what I call the new China lobby. They work at white-shoe law firms, sprawling multinational corporations, and big banks. Their pockets are lined with Chinese Communist cash, just like Hollywood executives and NBA stars and ivory tower academics. Some of them get very rich by doing Beijing's bidding, and they don't want the gravy train to stop.

Consider a recent article in the Financial Times, which reported that some of the richest banks and investment firms in America had been forming partnerships with Chinese state-run banks. Similarly, some of America's biggest companies, like Nike and Coca-Cola, are so addicted to access to the Chinese market that they lobbied last year against a bill to crack down on goods made by slave labor—all because that bill would make it more difficult for Coke and Nike to make their

products in China and to keep access to the Chinese market.

At the same time as our country wages a cold war against the Chinese Communist Party, some of our best and brightest are taking their talents—King James, LeBron James, who is up to his ears in Chinese cash—to work for companies that are little more than puppets of the Chinese state.

That is deeply troubling, and it is high time the U.S. Senate take a stand against the China lobby. That is why I will, regrettably, oppose Mr. Fonzone's nomination. Although he is far from the worst offender, it is time we start drawing a line, and in the future, I will therefore carefully scrutinize nominees for ties to the regime in Beijing and military companies like Huawei.

If you wish to serve in the U.S. Government in the future, let me be very clear: Do not do business with the Chinese Communist Party or its military or the companies that support it. Stop it today. Don't take the work. Don't take the meeting. Don't cash the check.

A man cannot serve two masters. It is as true today as it was in the old days.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators RUBIO, PETERS, and I be allowed to complete our remarks before the scheduled rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF KIRAN ARJANDAS AHUJA

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about those things that unite us as Americans, and I am here to talk about those things that divide us.

For centuries, public service has been something that unites Americans, drawing us together. Citizens from all walks of life serve in our military. They serve in Federal and State and local governments. They serve in police units and in fire departments across our country. They serve as teachers and coaches. And we as a nation are better off for their service and for their sacrifice.

Those who serve our Nation do it not because they have to but because they want to. They do it because they believe this Nation is worth serving. They do it because they believe this Nation is worth defending. They believe it is worth celebrating. And they are right to think all of those things. Service to this country is an act of selflessness that affirms our Nation is a place worth believing in.

But I am concerned that the present administration and this President, President Joe Biden, do not share this point of view. I am worried that President Biden is nominating for Federal office individuals who do not share a view of America as a good and decent place, who do not believe that the history of this Nation is worth celebrating; nominating, instead, people who believe that this is a country founded in racism and shot through with corruption.

Many of these nominees are partisans of a viewpoint that goes by different names but shares several features in common—a view that America is a systemically racist place and systemically unjust; a view of America as corrupt; a view of American society as one that needs to be deconstructed, that needs to be pulled apart, torn down, and then rebuilt in a fundamentally different way.

Now, this broad ideology has become known in public as critical race theory or sometimes just critical theory. And let me tell you, as someone who has taught in our Nation's universities, someone who has seen our institutions of higher learning up close, I would say to those in the media and elsewhere who now deny that there is any such thing as critical theory, that critical theory is, in fact, very real, it is very influential, and it appears to have become the animating ideology of this administration. That is cause for great concern.

Critical theory is an ideology that says the United States is rotten to its core. The leaders of this movement think our society is defined by White supremacy. They think our leaders are complicit, at best.

They think that all Americans are either oppressors or oppressed. In our world-class military, these critics see a vehicle for discrimination. In our American flag, they see propaganda. In our family businesses, they see White supremacy. In our police officers, they see agents of racial oppression.

These critics allow no room for merit, for experience, or for grace in our life together. They pit Whiteness and Blackness against each other in a manner that reduces every American, no matter their character or their creed, to their racial identity alone.

One of these critics, Dr. Ibram Kendi wrote this:

> The only remedy to past discrimination is present discrimination. The only remedy to present discrimination is future discrimination.

That is right. That is what he said. Think about that for a moment. He is saying he is opposed to equality under the law. He is opposing our merit-based system for Federal employment. Dr. Kendi and his followers are in no uncertain terms advocating for State-sanctioned racism in the United States of America.

Now, it is a free country. Dr. Kendi and these other authors can write their books and debate their views and put them out in public. It is absolutely their right to do so. They are welcome to do so. But what we cannot allow—what we must not allow—is our Federal Government to affirm and sanction and advocate this critical race theory. We cannot allow the United States of America, the greatest Nation on Earth, to legitimize a new era of racial engineering.

In the past few years, critical race theory has gained new prominence in the giant corporations, in the media, in the military, and even in our children's schools. We are seeing this across the country. We have seen too many of our children exposed to a curriculum like the 1619 Project and its derivatives that encourage division rather than unity, that rewrites our history in the service of an ideological agenda rather than in the service of truth.

Young children set off to school with eyes full of hope and hearts, full of pride in our country, only to be taught that White privilege defines the Nation, that subjects like mathematics are inherently racist, that the Christian faith is oppressive. They are taught that the nuclear family perpetuates racism.

Now, imagine for a moment if you were taught the same. Imagine if you were taught that your dreams were unjust or unfair, that your family were oppressors, that you were at fault for the problems of our society today. These are just children. We should be nurturing their dreams. We should be nurturing their hopes. We should be giving them a great hope for the future, for the future of this great Nation known as the United States of America, a hope for the future of the greatest Nation in the history of the world, rather than teaching them to mistrust their classmates and to distrust their own history.

It doesn't end there. Last year, we discovered that Federal agencies and other organizations funded by taxpayers were holding workplace training sessions where Federal employees were told that ''virtually all White people contribute to racism''—that is a quote—or where civil servants were required to say that they ''benefit from racism.''

Now, President Trump put an end to this divisive curriculum, and he was right to do so. Workplace diversity training should focus on bringing people together, not on driving them apart. But under this new administration, I fear that critical theory is making a comeback.

In March, President Biden rescinded the former President's ban on this divisive curriculum, and now, he has nominated Kiran Ahuja to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management. That is a key position that runs human resources for the entire Federal Government and millions of its employees. Ms. Ahuja's nomination is before the Senate today. I am concerned that Ms. Ahuja is a disciple of radical theorists. She has frequently promoted Dr. Kendi. She called him a ''thought leader'' at her confirmation hearing back in April. Just last year, Ms. Ahuja wrote that we must free the Nation from the ''daily trials of White supremacy.'' Those are her words.

She appeared to endorse Dr. Kendi's claim that the election of President

Trump in 2016 was an example of ''racist progress'' in this country, and she declared that we must do everything in our collective power to realize Dr. Kendi's vision for America.

I am concerned that, as the Federal Government's HR director, Ms. Ahuja could use her platform to promote radical ideologies that seek to divide rather than unite people. She could bring critical race theory back into Federal Government training and to every level of Federal personnel, stronger than ever. And I am not alone in this concern. All of my Republican colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee opposed Ms. Ahuja in a vote back in April.

Two weeks ago, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association—they represent 100,000 Federal police officers that protect and defend our Nation every day—they announced that they were also concerned about Ms. Ahuja's nomination because of her advocacy of critical theory.

I have to say, I agree with Federal law enforcement. I agree with what they said in their letter. We should nominate candidates for public office that are committed to ideological neutrality, to fairness, and to impartiality under the law. I want to be clear, I do not for a moment question Ms. Ahuja's sincerity or integrity. In fact, I thank her for her willingness to serve the Nation; but I cannot agree with what appears to be her fundamental ideology. At the end of the day, this is not about politics or personalities; this is about ensuring that the Federal Government stands for unity, not division, harmony, not hate.

As the Reverend Dr. King famously said, and he was right, we should judge our fellow citizens by the content of their character, not by the color of their skin. We need a strong nation with strong citizens who see each other as Americans, not as oppressors or oppressed.

Now, I have heard a lot of criticism about my position here today. I have heard the corporate media and those on the left say that I misunderstand critical theory or that it is not real or that it is not a real problem. I have heard many say the United States is indeed built on oppression and remains a systemically racist place.

All I can say is that is not the America I see, that is not the America I know. The working people of this country who have rallied to this Nation's flag in every hour of danger, who are the first to help a neighbor in need, who coach our Little Leagues and volunteer at our churches, who go to work day in and day out to provide for their families and protect the place they call home, these are not oppressors; these are liberators. These are not oppressors; these are great people. They live with a spirit of liberty that has made this country the greatest country in the history of the world, and they want to see that liberty extended to every member of the American family. That is who the American people are. That is what makes them great. That is what they believe—because they are a great people. Our future is a cause for hope and not despair.

The advocates of critical theory tell us we have to dismantle our culture, our history, our families, our Jewish and Christian heritage and beliefs because they are all oppressive. They say the future of this Nation will be defined by racial division and racial strife. I reject that prophecy of our future, and I take my stand on the goodness of the American people and the God who guides us. I take my stand on hope.

It is not oppression that defines the American story. It is hope. From the minutemen at Lexington and Concord, to the pioneers who found a new life in the West, to the heroes of the Underground Railroad, to the Union soldiers at Little Round Top, to the workers who fought the old monopolies for fair pay, to the women who fought for suffrage, to the young men who twice liberated Europe, to the civil rights demonstrators likes of Bull Connor, to the firemen and police officers who rebuilt New York and gave this country confidence again in the years after 9/11, it is love for one another and love for our country that we call home that has defined our story and given us hope; and that love and that hope will define our future once again. I am confident of it.

In this Nation, we are not united by ethnic creed or race or religion—and proudly so. We are united by our shared history. We are united by what we love together. We are united by the radical belief that those who liberate others, those who practice grace and mercy, those who call forth the best in those around them, they are the ones who changed the world; and that principle, that truth, that hope, is what drives our history. And we are not done building that history yet. The greatest Nation in the history of the world is not done yet.

Critical theory in all of its guises distorts our history, it destroys our common love, and it would leave us hopelessly divided, at enmity with one another and alone. To this dark vision, we must say no. To radical hope, we must say yes.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote no on Ms. Ahuja's nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to support Kiran Ahuja's nomination to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management, or OPM. Ms. Ahuja is a proven leader who has the experience and commitment needed to restore confidence in OPM and provide a vision for the future of the Federal workforce.

OPM is an independent agency that supports more than 2 million Federal employees who serve all across the government. Both OPM and the Federal workforce have faced unprecedented challenges in recent years, from attempts to dismantle the agency, to a record-setting government shutdown, to the coronavirus pandemic. And unfortunately, these challenges were made worse due to the lack of consistent and committed leadership at OPM. Our dedicated public servants are on the frontline every day, responding to the ongoing pandemic, protecting our national security, and delivering vital services to the American people each and every day. The dedicated men and women who serve at OPM and throughout the civil service deserve a qualified, experienced leader who is committed to supporting the people who make government work.

Ms. Ahuja's career includes over two decades of management experience, including running nonprofit organizations, leading the White House initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders during the Obama administration, and serving as Chief of Staff at OPM.

Throughout this confirmation process, Ms. Ahuja has demonstrated that she understands the mission of OPM and the experience of safeguarding the nonpartisan civil service. She has committed to working closely and transparently with Congress to strengthen and to modernize the Federal workforce.

I am confident that Ms. Ahuja is the right person to lead OPM at this pivotal time. She will provide the strategic vision and the management needed to reinvigorate the Federal workforce.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the confirmation of Kiran Ahuja for Director of OPM.

VOTE ON FONZONE NOMINATION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Fonzone nomination?

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 243 Ex.]

YEAS—55

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

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Daines	Marshall	Tillis
Ernst	McConnell	Toomey
Fischer	Moran	Tuberville
Graham	Paul	Wicker
Grassley	Portman	Young

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). 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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 107, Kiran Arjandas Ahuja, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

Charles E. Schumer, Gary C. Peters, Jacky Rosen, John Hickenlooper, Tammy Baldwin, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Raphael Warnock, Martin Heinrich, Chris Van Hollen, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Margaret Hassan.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the nomination of Kiran Arjandas Ahuja, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 244 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50. The Senate being evenly divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant bill 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.

RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:38 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF KIRAN ARJANDAS AHUJA

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise in support of Kiran Ahuja and her nomination to be the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, or the OPM. OPM needs an experienced, qualified leader who is committed to the Federal workforce and is invested in their future.

Ms. Ahuja is that leader. She understands the unique challenges facing OPM, and she has the management experience and vision needed to restore and strengthen the workforce. I am confident that Ms. Ahuja is the right person to lead OPM at this pivotal time. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the confirmation of Kiran Ahuja for Director of OPM.

VOTE ON AHUJA NOMINATION

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled to occur at 2:30 would occur immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Mr. PETERS. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

(Mr. KELLY assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. MURPHY assumed the Chair.)

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 245 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50. The Senate being equally and evenly divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the nomination is confirmed.

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021—MOTION TO PROCEED

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to legislative session to resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2093, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant 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.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. is equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I rise today to encourage all of my colleagues to support the motion to proceed that is in front of us.

We might disagree about the underlying bill. In fact, we do disagree. Republicans and Democrats disagree about the underlying bill, but that fact shouldn't prevent us from even having a discussion about the bill and about the issue. It is what we were sent here to do, to talk about the important issues that face the American people.

I can't think of anything more important, anything more fundamental to our democracy than the freedom to vote. That is what we are talking about, the freedom to vote. We are sent here to make our best arguments, to try to persuade Members who don't see the issue in the same way that we do, and in the end, to vote on important legislation like the bill that is in front of us to protect our freedom to vote as Americans.

I want to thank Senator MANCHIN for being willing to engage in this process in good faith and for his hard work on the issue. I have to wonder why my Republican colleagues won't do the same. What are they so afraid of? It is hard to believe that they are afraid of even having the debate—even having the debate. Are they afraid that if the American people hear both sides, the American people will figure out what they are trying to do? After all, the aim of the For the People Act is simply to protect Americans' freedom to vote and ensure their voices are heard.

Sadly, these rights are under attack all across the country, including Michigan. State lawmakers have introduced at least 389 bills to make it harder to vote in 48 States. In 2021, at least 14 States have enacted 22 new laws to take away people's freedom to vote. It is clear this is part of a coordinated, nationwide assault on a fundamental right that my friend, the late Congressman John Lewis, called ''precious, almost sacred.''

Right now in Michigan, Republicans in the legislature are trying to push through a package of bills that will make it much harder for people to vote.

Some analysts have even described the bills as being worse than the ones in Georgia, except we aren't watching them try to criminalize water.

Why are they doing this in Michigan? Well, let me go back again. Michigan is traditionally a tickets-winning State, what you would call a purple State. In 2010, Michigan elected a Republican Governor. Two years later, Michigan helped give President Barack Obama a second term. Two years later, we reelected the Republican Governor, and 2 years later, Michigan supported Donald Trump by the narrowest margin of any State, just over 10,000 votes.

After that election, Democrats did not start a massive effort to take away people's freedom to vote. We got to work. We organized. We listened to people about their concerns, and we worked hard to gain people's support for the next election. That is what you usually do, rather than trying to stop people from voting.

We did that hard work in Michigan, and you know what, we won the next election. In 2020, in the middle of a pandemic, more people in Michigan voted than ever before, 5.5 million of us. And Michigan voters clearly and resoundingly chose Joe Biden to be our next President and KAMALA HARRIS to be our next Vice President of the United States and the President of the Senate. They won by more than 150,000 votes. That is 14 times Donald Trump's margin in 2016.

But what did the Trump campaign do? Well, their campaign—his allies filed eight lawsuits in our State, lost every one. And in the only case that was appealed to the Michigan Supreme Court, the court declined to hear the case, despite having a majority of Republican justices. Republicans know that Michigan's election was fair, the results were accurate, and Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS won our State.

The people of Michigan voted. Michigan counties verified it. Our State certified it. There was no evidence of fraud that would begin to suggest that we need legislation like what Michigan Republicans are pushing. The Republicans just didn't like who Michiganders voted for. That is the same thing that is happening here. Republican colleagues don't like being in the minority. They don't like who people voted for. Well, you have a choice. You could work hard, try to gain people's trust, try to do things for people, win the next election, or you can try to take away their freedom to vote.

I mean, think about it. Think about the fact, in Michigan, Republicans didn't like who we voted for, so they are coming after the voters. They are coming after the voters. We know this is happening all across the country. It is wrong. It is un-American, frankly. And that is why we need this legislation, to protect our freedom to vote and to stop billionaires from buying elections.

We are committed to making sure people have their freedoms protected, and we are committed to making sure that billionaires are not buying our elections as well. We want to end the partisan gerrymandering that makes people's votes count—some count more than others—or rig the system. And we are committed to making sure that the wealthiest people in the country are not buying elections.

Why is this important? We have seen how so-called dark money groups that don't have to report anything, funded by a handful of billionaire donors, pour unlimited amounts of money into our elections in an attempt to influence the outcome. It is easy to understand why the average voter might feel their voice isn't being heard.

The For the People Act takes the crucial steps to give voters their voices back. It includes disclosure requirements so that citizens have a right to know who is giving them money, who is behind those dark money donations. It reforms the Federal Election Commission so they can better enforce the election laws already on the books, and it takes steps to protect our elections from foreign influence.

I, for one, think these are essential to our democracy. I know my Senate Democratic colleagues feel the same. However, Senate Republican colleagues disagree.

So let's pass this motion to proceed so we can talk about it, so we can have a debate about it. Michigan voters made their voices heard. The American people made their voices heard in the election. We need to be debating this issue and making sure that our voices are being heard across the country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, this afternoon, we will have before us, as Members of the Senate, legislation that is entitled the For the People Act.

Before I speak to the For the People Act, S. 1, I want to make clear to colleagues that I have been keenly focused, interested in ensuring that when we have elections in this country, that they are free, they are fair and they are accessible to all, that barriers to voting should be placed on the sidelines.

For the past three sessions of Congress now, I have been the only Republican cosponsor of the Voting Rights Advancement Act. This was a measure that in prior Congresses was led by Senator LEAHY, and I was pleased to be able to join him as a cosponsor. That measure has now been introduced on the House side as the John Lewis Voting Rights Act, a measure to basically reestablish the preclearance system, which was in place until 2013, and then it was pretty much upended with the Supreme Court ruling in Shelby.

I certainly and absolutely intend to cosponsor that measure again under its new name, the John Lewis Voting Rights Act. I will work with Senator LEAHY, I will work with Senator MANCHIN—I will work with anybody on this initiative to help update this formula to ensure that we do have just exactly that, access to voting that is equal, that is fair, that is free from discrimination.

I note at the outset of my comments this morning the support for that legislation so that, again, folks understand that I fully understand that access to the ballot in this country is not perfect and, again, that I have stood behind legislation to ensure that our elections

are fair. We have come a long way. We have come a long way, but I think we all recognize that there is a long path ahead of us.

So let me turn to S. 1, the For the People Act. My fear is that this measure does not move us further down the path. If you look at the bill, it is wholly partisan. Unlike the John Lewis Voting Rights Act, which is very narrowly focused on voting rights, S. 1 has been described as sprawling. It has been described as ambitious, which is fair. Ambitious is not a bad thing, but it is clearly, clearly very broad, and it certainly contains some noteworthy goals, but I fear that there are provisions contained within S. 1 that take it too far or that I think are bad policy or that I simply think are beyond the power of Congress to regulate.

My concern, and I shared this with many, is that the bill that we have in front of us is not so much about voting rights as it is a Federal takeover of the election system—and a partisan Federal takeover of the election system.

The way the bill is being advertised—that somehow or another, we can't count on States to do elections right or fairly—is a premise that I have a problem with. I come from a State where we were under preclearance for a long period of time. We recognize that. We had a history that was not one that I think we were proud of in terms of ensuring that there was fair and open, equal access to all. But what we have seen in the State and how we have worked through that process that was in place some years back is that we have come to this place where we can—we have demonstrated that we can run a proper and an honest election. We have proven this time and again.

Much of my concern about what we have in front of us is that when you nationalize something, when you have kind of a Federal overall oversight, it ends up being a one-size-fits-all mandate coming out of Washington, DC, and in many cases doesn't work in a place like Alaska.

There are certain aspects of S. 1 that I absolutely do support. Early voting. We shouldn't be limited to just the day of the election. I think we recognize that. What we can do to ensure that early voting is there I think is important to us.

I come from a State where, if you want to vote absentee, there is no excuse required. You can just vote absentee because it is more convenient to you. I will tell you, I was really surprised to find out how many States do not allow for that. I think that is something we need to address. I am in support of that.

I think we need to be doing more when it comes to ease of voter registration. Again, in the State of Alaska, we have put in place ways to make it easier for folks to register. But, again, I am looking at what we have done in Alaska, proud of some of the measures we have put in place, but I recognize that we did this without DC prescriptives or mandates of uniformity.

So in walking through some of the concerns that I have—I mentioned making voter registration easier. Well, the For the People Act mandates automatic voter registration. OK. Maybe a good idea. In Alaska, what we have put in place is that Alaskans are automatically registered—unless they specifically opt out, they are automatically registered to vote when they sign up for their Permanent Fund dividend. This is obviously very exclusive and unique to one State and one State alone. But under this measure that we have in front of us, it would require State election officials to automatically register any eligible unregistered citizens.

So I am looking at that and I am saying: All right, well, if we allow for automatic registration on the PFD—there are a lot of Alaskans, believe it or not, who do not sign up for the PFD or are not eligible for the PFD. So is the State going to have to have two different systems here in terms of how we meet this mandate?

I am looking at it and saying: Well, that is a fair amount of Federal micromanagement here. If the State wants to implement an automatic system, it should do so, as Alaska did, but without the threat of the Federal Government looming behind them, making sure the i's are dotted and the t's are crossed in precisely the way the Election Assistance Commission thinks they should be. I don't think we want to make the administration of elections involve even more burdensome efforts or more cost. It is something that you look at and say: Let's make sure we can allow for easier registration, but let's not impose burdensome mandates.

Early voting requirements is another issue. The bill requires at least 15 days of early voting. This is something, again, in Alaska that we already do. It works great, but it also requires that each polling place must be open for at least 10 hours a day. So we are basically back here in Washington, DC, telling us in Alaska that you have to have your polling place open for 10 hours a day.

Think about this in the context of a small community. I will take a super small community, Arctic Village. About 150 people total live there in the village—not 150 voters but 150 people total. It wouldn't make sense. It wouldn't make sense for the State to maintain poll workers for at least 10 hours per day, for at least 15 days, in a community like Arctic Village. The whole town can practically vote in an hour. But that is not the point here. The point is, you are imposing a Federal mandate in a one-size-fits-all approach that just might not fit well there.

One provision in the bill that I have some significant concerns about is requiring same-day voter registration across the country. Again, in Alaska, we think we have been doing a pretty fair job as to how we run our elections. I think it is reasonable that we be allowed to establish voter registration deadlines that work for the administrators in their respective States.

I know some people are surprised, but the fact is, we don't know everything best back here in terms of how to implement or how States should be implementing. States should have the latitude to implement a registration system that works with the State's geography, with their IT infrastructure, and with their election funding and other limitations they may have.

Forcing States to allow ballot harvesting—this is another area I have a problem with. This practice involves paid campaign operatives going out, collecting ballots, and returning them to be counted. I don't know. I look at this one and see so many ways in which this can be abused and exploited.

If a State wants to permit this practice with certain parameters that the State thinks would prevent abuses, that is fine, but not all States should be forced to do so by the Federal Government and be made subject to DC's idea of what actually works here.

Maintaining voter rolls. I think we all want to make sure that voting rolls are current or accurate, but the provisions in S. 1 really go very far. The bill would require States to secure ''objective and reliable evidence.'' This is a term that is not actually defined in the bill, and they have to be able to establish that before removing a voter. What is not considered objective and reliable is a failure to vote or the failure of a voter to respond to a notice sent by the State informing the voter that they have been removed. So you are going to have a situation here where this undefined term will result in people who have long since left the jurisdiction actually remaining on the voter rolls.

Then there is the issue of restructuring the Federal Election Commission. From its very inception, this was designed to be—this was meant to be a body that was bipartisan to specifically ensure that no political party would grant its candidates an unfair advantage in elections. So you have got a restructuring that is proposed here that I think presents a flaw. It would reduce the number of seats on the FEC from six to five, two members each from the two major political parties and one ostensibly Independent. So what this could mean is that a President could simply find someone who would vote in his or her favor each time but who never registered as a member of a particular political party.

This newly partisan FEC would also be given the responsibility of handing out loads of cash from the public coffers. I take issue with this, and I think that you have a fair amount of folks in my State and across the country who do take issue with that as well in terms of public funding.

S. 1 creates a new structure of public financing of campaigns that matches

small dollar donations on a 6-to-1 basis. So I look at that, and, again, I have concerns about why anyone thinks it is a good idea to have even more money in politics. But it is easy to me to see how this could be exploited by a partisan board holding the purse strings here. So, again, I look at that as a particular example of, what are we doing with this in this voting rights bill?

I mentioned in my introduction here that I feel that you have many provisions in this measure that are likely unconstitutional. To start, while Congress has broad authority to regulate the times, places, and manner of congressional elections, our powers are much more limited in how a State chooses to appoint electors to the electoral college. There, we may only determine the time of choosing electors and the day on which they should give their vote. So every provision that purportedly changes State laws regarding how a State chooses its electors could face significant and I think justified challenges in court.

There are numerous provisions that try to criminalize speech that is almost certainly protected. Even the ACLU opposed several parts of this bill on the grounds that it would unconstitutionally limit the speech of citizens as well as compel speech, neither of which is acceptable. Just 2 years ago, the Fourth Circuit invalidated a law that was nearly identical to a provision that is contained in this bill.

Another issue is the issue of tax returns and whether or not Congress can mandate candidates for President to release their tax returns. I think it is only reasonable that they should do so, but the concern that I have is, the Constitution is really pretty clear in outlining the requirements to be President, and releasing tax documents is not one of those. So it just kind of presents a challenge there. Can we direct that? There is an issue.

Requiring States to create redistricting commissions may also be unconstitutional since Congress cannot coerce or commandeer the mechanisms of State government. Congress also likely doesn't have the authority to require States to permit convicted felons to vote or the ability to impose an ethics code on the Justices of the Supreme Court.

So while these may be good ideas, is the constitutional authority there? I think there is a real question to that.

So my concern—and I am coming to the end of my comments here—my concern about this measure is that while the title is strong, ''For the People,'' I am not certain that this measure will do what those who have hoped that it would do will do—it will make administering elections more difficult, more expensive, and subject to Federal micromanagement.

Again, I mentioned the issue of questions of constitutionality and whether aspects of it will be thrown out. Passing this into law could result in messy litigation that leaves the state of election law uncertain for years to come.

I mentioned my concern about one-size-fits-all. That is challenging. We are a pretty amazing 50 States, but we are all a little bit unique. But how States have leeway or latitude in determining what works I think is important.

So I recognize that we are at a place and a time when credibility and faith in our institutions are at a really weak moment, a very weak moment, and so when we think about the things that are core to our institutions, one of those fundamentals is the fairness of our elections and also ensuring that we are taking an approach in this Nation where all people feel that the election process is for them as equal and fair as it is for their neighbor down the street or their fellow American all the way across the country. How we are able to deliver on this promise is something that we need to continue to strive toward.

So I am going to continue to work on voting rights reform. I am going to be doing that through the template of the John Lewis Voting Rights Act. Americans need to have faith in our institutions. They need to know that our elections are fair; that they are easy and accessible for all; and we can't instill that trust with a wholly partisan effort. We have got some work to do. We have got a lot of work to do, and it is important work.

I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, when I got up this morning, the furthest thing from my mind was that I was going to have a chance to see you today. And since I am seeing you today, I want to say thank you. I want to say thank you for your role in this administration and in leading the Biden administration to make a proposal that was passed in the American recovery plan that is going to cut childhood poverty in this country almost in half this year.

And what people should know is not only that the President—the President sitting here—led that effort at the White House, but she led it from the very beginning. She was one of the original sponsors of that legislation. And even though the President's budget has said we ought to make it—extend it to 2025, I just want to let you know that we are still fighting here to make it permanent, and I think we should make it permanent.

We have already had—this is why I am here today. But we have already had Columbia University tell us that there is going to be an eight times annual return on the investment that we make as part of the recovery because instead of mitigating for the problem of kids in poverty, we will actually be eliminating poverty for almost half the kids in this country—for millions of American children. And not only that, over 90 percent of American kids are going to benefit from this Biden-Harris tax cut that is in this package.

So I just want to say thank you for that. And we have got to keep working on it, and I agree that it ought to be extended for years and years and years. For me, that means permanent. We are going to keep trying to do that, so thank you.

And thank you for leading on the issues that we are here to talk about today because this is the moment that we are challenged in ways that we have never been challenged before.

Five months ago—a violent mob stormed this floor 5 months ago trying to stop the peaceful transfer of power from one administration to the next. And they took us out of this room, and they took us to one of the Senate office buildings. And I was watching the television as I was there, and all I could think about was what is the rest of the world thinking about when our Capitol is being stormed by a violent mob of our own citizens—by a violent mob of our own citizens—and not just what our adversaries are thinking, not what is Russia thinking, what is China using with this footage, what are the Iranians going to do with this footage, but what are people like my mom and her parents who were Polish Jews who survived the Holocaust and, after making it through one of the worst moments in human history, were able to rebuild their shattered lives in this country, in the United States of America?

And to think about similarly situated people all over the planet for whom this is the greatest hope still for freedom and for liberty, for democracy itself—that is what is at stake, as least as far as I am concerned in this debate.

And I know the President understands this well, and I hope others understand this well; that even before January 6, our democracy was under attack. It was under attack as a result of gerrymandering. It was under attack because of the way special interests controlled the agenda on this floor and down the hall. It was under attack because of voter suppression that nobody in the 21st century imagined we would ever see in our country again, not to mention the fact of Citizens United, which unleashed the floodgate of money, of billionaires, to control our political system.

This is an effort to separate the American people from their exercise in self-government. It is an effort to destroy the American people's confidence in their exercise in self-government. And making it harder for people to vote is a huge piece of this puzzle.

Now, this isn't the first time in our history that we have been confronted by this kind of stuff. I have said before, and it is absolutely true, that you go back to the founding of this country. It is a story of, on the one hand, the highest ideals that have ever been written down by human beings and the worst instincts that have ever been conjured by human beings. In our case, that was enslaving other human beings.

And our history is a story of that battle between those highest ideals and

those worst instincts. And every single time Americans have stepped up and they found a way to make our country more democratic, more fair, and more free—small ''d'', democratic—and that is what we have to do again. That is our job now because, today, in ways that were unimaginable to me when I was in college, except when I read it in the history books, anti-democratic forces are stronger than anytime since Jim Crow. And it is true. That is a fact.

What I was reading back in the 1980s about laws that had been fought against in the 1960s, they are back in 2020. If you think I am exaggerating, here are some examples. In Georgia, there are bills to undermine nonpartisan election officials so that politicians can overturn outcomes they don't like; in Arizona, the same kind of thing, a partisan election audit; in Florida, a bill to restrict vote by mail; State legislators attempting to give themselves the power to toss out an election, as I said, that they don't like. These are laws all across the country. There are 250 or so of these laws that are being passed.

And, by the way, not a single one of those is being passed with a Democratic vote—a vote from a Democrat—in 250 legislatures. And you know what else doesn't exist in any one of those legislatures? The filibuster does not exist in any one of those legislatures. We need to stand up for our democracy, and that is why we need to pass the For the People Act.

The bill includes commonsense reforms that are broadly supported by the American people. I know—we know these reforms work because they have worked in Colorado, where we banned gerrymandering. We have automatic voter registration. We have early voting. We have vote-by-mail. We have increased election security. This is all nonpartisan. This is all common sense.

This was done by—this wasn't done by Democrats. It was done by Republicans and Democrats working together. What is the result? We have the second highest voter turnout rate in the country—72 percent. I am so sick and tired of saying that. I want us to be No. 1 so that I don't have to hear from Senator KLOBUCHAR how Minnesota is No. 1. I come here, and I have to say we are No. 2. That is not good enough. We need to be No. 1.

But if we had this across the country, the agenda in Washington would look more like what the American people actually sent us here to do. So this isn't just about voting rights, although that is very, very important. It is not just about elections. That is very important. But we could finally, probably, create universal healthcare in this country, improve our schools, make sure that we had an economy that when it grew, it grew for everybody, not just the top 10 percent. We would probably stop spending our time cutting taxes for the wealthiest Americans when our income inequality has never been higher. Although, now that I mention that, I realize, because of the President's leadership and President Biden's leadership, we have actually already started to do that because we cut taxes now for the vast majority of Americans because of the work that they have led.

We can change the destiny of America. That is what we can do. And that is what this exercise in self-government is about. We can show that we can compete with the Communist Government in China and send a signal to people like my grandparents all across the world that American democracy is stronger than ever and that they should trust it; they can count on it and maybe get a piece of it for themselves; that we remain a beacon of freedom and self-government and that we remain committed not to our worst instincts but to our highest ideals.

I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation. And with that, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for his indulgence.

I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, welcome back, and thank you for giving me an opportunity to talk about the bill that we will have before us in about an hour and a half.

I have to stand here and rise in opposition to the For the People Act. I think you could appropriately title it the ''Fool the People Act.'' We are going to be voting on it later today, but it would dramatically alter election laws across our country.

I have been in the Senate for 6½ years, and this ranks up there as one of the worst bills that I have seen come before this body. I know my friends on the other side of aisle like to talk about it as being essential for protecting democracy, but in the face of text that could be patently unconstitutional and taking away the rights of States to administer their elections, I find it hard to believe that it is anything but a motivated attempt to federalize the Nation's election system.

The For the People Act would achieve it through a number of, I think, overreaches. I am only going to talk about a few.

For one, voter ID. The For the People Act would essentially render null voter ID laws across this country. Instead of an ID, which most of us have, and virtually, I think, every citizen should have, you would simply just sign an affidavit to say you are who you say you are. I heard the Georgia law, for example, brought up as providing egregious limits or obstacles to proving who you say you are.

In a hearing a month or so ago, we had an official from Georgia in a Judiciary Committee, and I said: Could you explain to me what the challenge is? So if somebody gets an absentee ballot like you do in North Carolina—we have no-excuse absentee balloting. We have had it for years. I supported it. I voted that way several times. We had people say that it was just an egregious imposition to note a 10 or 12 character driver's license or government ID number on the affidavit. That is all it is. You don't have to send a copy of it. You just simply have to write a number down.

So if you have an ink pen—I guess you could argue if you don't have a writing instrument, then maybe that is an overreach or an imposition on a voter. I don't think it is. And even in the Georgia law that has been castigated by some of my friends on the other side of aisle, they even provide for people who want to vote, who may not have a government-issued ID, other documents that can be used in their place.

We talked about hundreds of bills that have been filed by Republican legislators without a single Democratic vote that are like the Georgia bill that I just described, which I think is arguably a fair bill. But most of these bills are things that Democrats and Republicans should be able to agree on. You should cleanse your voter rolls. You should make sure that people who have died and people who could be registered in one or more States are cleared from the voter rolls just to prevent fraud and abuse, not necessarily perpetrated by any one party but just because the data could be out of date.

And, you know, back on voter ID, I find it remarkable that we have a measure before us that we are going to be voting on today, a simple ID requirement that 80 percent of Americans just this week in a poll said they think is reasonable. Now, you have to also understand that we make accommodations. If you don't have an ID in North Carolina, we moved heaven and Earth to make sure—you need a government-issued ID, I believe, to be able to move through society, to get a hotel room, and to get on an airplane. I had to provide—I had surgery a couple of months ago. I had to present an ID to get admitted into the hospital. I think we are disenfranchising people from the rest of society by not at least making sure that they can identify who they are. There is no argument. You can't get on a plane without an ID. You can't travel internationally without an ID. You can't get healthcare without an ID. But for some reason, to do something, to exercise our right and our privilege to vote, we think that we don't need an ID.

I also worry about a provision in this bill that would allow nationwide ballot harvesting. There are only a couple of States that allow ballot harvesting. What does that mean? You have a worker coming up, going door to door, and encouraging somebody to vote. It may be somebody who doesn't want to vote. But now, you are up there to capture their ballots and bring bunches of ballots to the polls.

Ballot harvesting is legal in some States—I know California. It is not legal in our State. In fact, there was a

Republican candidate who ultimately withdrew himself after winning a race after there were a couple hundreds ballots that were supposedly harvested. I don't think he knew about it, but there was a campaign operative that did it, and it cost him an election.

I will tell you one thing that I really do believe, that if the Founding Fathers were here in this Chamber today, they would really be scratching their heads, and it is the idea of taxpayer-funded elections. Make no mistake about it, Federal, State, and local dollars are used to make sure that we have election machines, that we have poll workers, that we have access. We can always improve access to the polls, but in this bill, they are saying, and people in North Carolina—if you were paying attention last year, my race was, all in with me and my opponent, $296 million. There were a lot of ads on TV.

I had my friends call me up, screaming at the TV when they were mean to me. And I am sure I had my opponent, who is a friend of mine, say the same thing. But now, what we are going to do, if we were to pass this bill, is say: Tom Tillis supporters are going to have to have money spent and directed to his opponent to try and beat him, and vice versa—millions and millions of dollars.

And in States like North Carolina—not only North Carolina taxpayers but taxpayers from across this country—will see their taxpayer dollars come to North Carolina to influence an outcome in a campaign that could be a thousand miles away. That is, I think—taking taxpayer dollars and then spending them on something that they are personally opposed to or offended by is something that I don't think the Founding Fathers would have ever envisioned as being appropriate for this great Nation.

So, ladies and gentlemen, today at about 5:30—I think a little after—the For the People—or as I said, the ''Fool the People''—Act is going to be before us, and it is going to fail. We know it. Senator SCHUMER knows it.

So why are we doing it? Are we doing it for messaging points? Or are there some far-left liberals that just want the vote on the floor, knowing full well it is not going to pass? Have we actually tried to do any work to figure out what role the Federal Government should play in actually improving election outcomes that ultimately need to be administered by the State? No, that hasn't happened.

So today, we are going to come on the floor. This measure is not going to move forward. And somebody may be fooling—I don't know—far-left groups just to say we tried. But they didn't try because if they tried, they would have reached across the other aisle and tried to figure out something that made sense that could pass with 60 votes.

The For the People Act is far afield from what our Founding Fathers envisioned. Can we improve our election processes across this country? Yes, but I would prefer to have the 50 laboratories of democracy figure out how to improve it and have other States implement it, perhaps even other States in the northeast that have far fewer voting days than we do in North Carolina. They could learn from that.

Maybe we should create standards and incentives for that sort of stuff, but not a Federal takeover of the state of the elections in this country. And for that reason, I will be opposing the For the People Act.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for his thoughts.

We are on the cusp of a vote here on legislation that would dramatically change the way we conduct our elections in this country. As my colleague said, are all elections perfect? No. But I have to tell you, I am really proud of what we do in Ohio. We make it easy to vote; we also make it hard to cheat, and that is the right balance.

This bill, S. 1, is called the For the People Act, but what it actually does is it strips away control from people in Ohio and elsewhere to build the right election laws in our own States and centralizes that control here in Washington, DC. That is not consistent with the Constitution or the Federalist Papers. In addition, some of those proposed changes attempt to undermine the First Amendment rights that we hold so dear as Americans.

I am proud of the way we conduct our elections in Ohio, in part because we have high turnout. In fact, we had record turnout last year, and that is great. And I don't want to leave it up to Federal employees here in Washington, DC, to determine how our system should work in Ohio, which is what this legislation would do.

I mentioned the Constitution earlier. It gives the primary power over election administration to the States. It is very clear about that. It also says in Federalist 59, which is Alexander Hamilton, who was the guy most interested in these Federalist issues—he said it is clear that the Federal Government should only get involved in very extraordinary situations.

Last fall, 5.97 million Ohioans cast a vote—that is a record, as I said—and it represented 74 percent of eligible voters in Ohio. Despite that and despite the challenges of running the largest election in our State's history during an unprecedented pandemic, we ran what was wildly reported on the right, on the left, by the media as a secure and successful election—in fact, I think the most successful election we have ever had. Our State-run, bipartisan county boards of election, with two Democrats and two Republicans in each county, were able to do that because they know what is best for Ohio and they are held accountable.

But this partisan bill claims Washington, DC, somehow knows better. S. 1 strips the power from accountable, democratically elected State representatives in my State and around the country to determine congressional districts and hands that over to a Federal panel, again, staffed by unelected, unaccountable third parties and a computer program. Again, I think it should be something that is part of what election representatives are held to account for, is how we draw our congressional districts.

It mandates the controversial practice of ballot harvesting. I don't like ballot harvesting. I think it makes it easier for partisan operatives on both the right and the left to conduct outright voter fraud.

It would force taxpayers to fund the political campaigns of candidates they don't support. It turns the Federal Election Commission into a tool of whichever party controls the White House. So instead of being even, it would actually be lopsided and be partisan.

It seemingly contradicts the 26th Amendment by forcing States to let individuals register to vote as early as 16 years old, and then it could allow those 16- or 17-year-olds to vote by banning State voter ID laws. The vast majority of Americans support voter ID laws. It is a fact. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents think you ought to have some sort of ID when you come vote, but this bill bans that safeguard.

I could list other serious flaws with the proposal, but the bottom line is that this legislation has been presented as a safeguard for democracy when it actually contains some radically undemocratic provisions.

I am in favor of State-level, commonsense efforts to increase voter confidence in our elections. We absolutely should do that. We need to protect democracy by ensuring, again, that people know it is easy to vote. It is accessible. That is good. We should all want that. But we should also make it hard to cheat and be sure we have security in our elections so people know they have trust in the system, that their vote is going to count, as it should. Again, that is what we do in Ohio.

I don't think this legislation furthers those objectives. Instead, I think it would amount to a Federal takeover of our election system, which has always been in the domain of the States.

Our government is built on a carefully constructed framework of checks and balances, including between the branches of government. I cannot support legislation that would run so counter to what the Framers of the Constitution intended and the election system that works well in my home State of Ohio.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I, too, rise in opposition to S. 1 and urge a no vote.

The bill that the Senate will be asked to consider today is a truly radical piece of legislation. It turns out, because of that, it is an unpopular piece of legislation, the kind of bill the Senate was created to help stop from becoming law. S. 1 seeks to transform the way we do elections in this country and to do so on a narrow, partisan basis.

Here is what Americans need to understand about this legislation.

First, it would strip away the power of the States to run elections and hand it to the Federal Government, showing a complete lack of trust in local and State leadership.

It would also spend millions of taxpayer dollars to help politicians run ads for their campaigns. Taxpayers would suddenly have to finance partisan messages they may strongly disagree with, raising serious First Amendment questions.

S. 1 would nullify sensible voter ID laws across the country, including voter identification laws in predominantly Democrat States, like Connecticut and Delaware.

And the legislation would also give the Federal Government the right to draw congressional district lines, even though States have done this since the beginning of our republic.

At its root, this bill is based on a myth. And I consider my words here. It is based on a lie, and that lie is that voting rights are somehow under attack in States like Georgia and Texas. This is utterly absurd, and I think the voters in those States understand that. The election reforms recently passed in Georgia, for example, have actually expanded access to the ballot box, making it easier to vote, but also making it harder to cheat.

The new Georgia law does this, among other things. It expands the window for early voting. The new Georgia law allows no-excuse mail-in voting to continue. It adds 100 new ballot dropboxes. It allows voters to get a government-issued ID for free, and it increases transparency in elections, for example, making sure the ballot counting does not stop in the middle of the night, as we have seen in past elections.

These reforms are entirely reasonable and widely popular across Americans and were based on broad input from the local stakeholders.

My colleagues who are pushing S. 1 say they are trying to save democracy, but, in fact, the bill would actually harm democracy. S. 1 would undermine the security of the ballot box, causing more and more Americans to question the outcome of our elections. We should be working to strengthen trust in democracy, not weaken it.

The only thing bipartisan about this bill is the opposition to it. In my home State of Mississippi, every Member of the House of Representatives—Democrat and Republican—voted against this legislation, including Democrat Representative BENNIE THOMPSON, a chairman of a committee in the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Democratic National Convention of 2020, who said he voted against it because it was opposed by his constituents.

The ACLU has come out against S. 1, saying that some provisions ''unconstitutionally impinge on the free speech rights of American citizens and public interest organizations''—hardly a rightwing conspiracy group, the ACLU.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, along with 300 other organizations, have said this legislation is ''fundamentally incompatible with the American tradition and the principles enshrined in our Constitution.''

And when you ask the public about the specific proposals in this bill, many Americans—conservative and liberal, Democrat, Republican, and Independent—are outright opposed.

According to a recent poll, 81 percent of people say they are concerned with allowing voters to vote without any form of photo ID. Eighty-three percent say they are concerned with ballot harvesting practices, this practice of having party operatives go door to door and pick up large numbers of ballots to turn them in. Sixty-eight percent of Democrats are opposed to so-called ballot harvesting. And 50 percent of people say they oppose taxpayer dollars being used to pay for political campaigns. This, again, cuts across party lines.

So it is clear that S. 1 is not popular. It is squarely at odds with the views of the majority of the American people.

Every Senator who votes yes will need to prepare to explain to voters why they wanted to overturn State voter ID protections, allow ballot harvesting, force taxpayers to pay for political campaigns, and enact a partisan Federal Election Commission. That is why S. 1 should be rejected this afternoon, and that is why it will be rejected.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, this afternoon, I want to discuss my grave concerns with S. 1.

Many have said that this political power grab is a solution in search of a problem. I agree with that. This bill contains, I believe, a number of alarming provisions that would have a devastating impact on our Nation's electoral process. It would make our elections more chaotic and less secure.

This legislation contains more than 800 pages of bad policies that I believe America does not need and does not want. I believe that the strength of our election system is in its diversity, allowing each State to determine what is best for them. S. 1 would force a single, partisan view of elections on more than 10,000 jurisdictions across the country.

For example, State and local election administrators would be forced to change, one, how they register voters and which voting systems they use; how they handle early voting and absentee ballots; and how they maintain voter lists.

It makes election fraud easier to commit and harder to detect by allowing unlimited ballot harvesting, undermining voter ID laws, and making it more difficult to maintain accurate voting lists. A recent university poll found that 80 percent of Americans support requiring a form of identification before a person can vote. Think about it—80 percent.

Remember, now, presently, Americans are required to present a photo ID to do a number of things. We all do it every day: at the airport to board a commercial flight; in a hospital for any outpatient or inpatient procedure; at the pharmacy to purchase over-the-counter sinus medication and certain prescriptions; at the bank to open a bank account; to apply for a mortgage; to drive, buy, or rent a car; to get married; to purchase a gun; to rent a hotel room; to donate blood; to obtain a passport; to pick up packages at the U.S. Post Office. We all do this every day.

This legislation would permanently tip the scales in favor of the Democrats by politicizing the Federal Election Commission, pouring Federal tax dollars into campaigns and chilling free speech. Do Americans really want their taxes going toward a Federal campaign fund that would finance the expenses of all candidates running for Congress?

S. 1 would reverse years of improvements that have been made in many States, improvements that protect the security, integrity, and the credibility of our elections. Each State, I believe, should be left with the freedom and flexibility to administer its own respective elections, without interference from the Federal Government.

S. 1 mandates ballot drop boxes, which increase the risk of fraud by allowing people other than the voter to drop off marked ballots outside of the view of election officials.

As I mentioned before, this bill provides government funding for campaigns: $6 of Federal funding for every $1 from small donors. My gosh, it would be a windfall for a lot of incumbents. This essentially forces Americans to fund candidates they don't agree with and support attack ads against those they do agree with.

It federalizes redistricting, putting in place one set of Federal rules for redrawing congressional districts—something that has traditionally been a role for each State.

Lastly, Mr. President, S. 1 requires States to give felons the right to vote once they are out of prison.

While this is a bad bill all around, I believe these are some of the top worst provisions and the provisions that American people oppose the most: One, gutting State voter ID laws, again; two, spending taxpayer dollars on political campaigns; three, allowing unlimited ballot harvesting; and four, turning the Federal Election Commission into a partisan operation. So just

to name those, among others, are reasons to vote against this bill.

I think the American people do not want this, and they do not deserve to be the recipients of such harmful policy. I do not support this bill, and I trust that a majority of the Senate will not vote accordingly.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, the right to vote is the hallmark of a democracy. It is what distinguishes us from authoritarian regimes where elections are tainted, if they are held at all, where the free and fair elections that define America do not exist.

President Abraham Lincoln once said elections belong to the people. Voting is an action we choose to take to exercise a fundamental freedom our Constitution grants to the people. So when we hear of a bill entitled ''For the People,'' we naturally would assume at first that it must be enhancing our democracy, but a closer examination suggests otherwise. In fact, S. 1 would take away the rights of people in each of the 50 States to determine which election rules work best for their citizens.

Let's start with some indisputable facts. This legislation was first introduced in 2019, prior to last year's Presidential election. It was not considered in the Senate. It did not become law. Nevertheless, according to the Census Bureau, the 2020 election saw the highest voter turnout in the 21st century. Equally significant, Asian Americans and Hispanic Americans voted in record-high percentages, and there was higher turnout across all racial groups, including Black Americans, than in 2016.

The Census Bureau also asked eligible, nonvoting Americans why they didn't vote in 2020. The majority of respondents said that they were not interested, didn't like any of the candidates, were too busy, or simply forgot.

The point is, with the record-high turnout in 2020, it is very difficult to make the case that this bill is necessary, as some have said, to save our democracy.

This is a bill that was introduced to enhance partisan messaging, not to enhance participation in our elections, as the over-the-top rhetoric about this bill highlights. Consider, for example, the debate over Georgia's new election law. In many ways, Georgia's election law actually makes it easier for citizens to vote than in other States that have not been subject to the same backlash.

Georgia allows no-excuse absentee ballots. Delaware, New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut do not. Georgia's new law provides a minimum of 17 in-person early voting days. Delaware, New Jersey, and Connecticut had no in-person early voting days at all in 2020. Although New Jersey enacted a new law to allow early voting earlier this year, to great fanfare, it actually has 8 fewer early voting days than Georgia. Despite having these and many other different election rules, Delaware, Connecticut, and Georgia had very similar levels of Black voter turnout in the 2020 election. Massachusetts, by contrast, had just more than half the Black voter turnout of Georgia.

This information contradicts the underlying premise in S. 1 that we must overturn the laws of every State in our Nation in order to preserve the right to vote.

This legislation would force numerous changes to laws in States that have been successfully conducting elections for a very long time. Let me use the State of Maine as an example—a State that consistently ranks at or near the top of the Nation in voter participation, I am pleased to report. Maine does not have early voting. Maine does not allow ballot harvesting. Maine does not count absentee ballots that arrive after the polls close on election night. Maine does not allow voters to receive absentee ballots automatically without requesting them. Yet, in 2020, 71 percent of Mainers cast a ballot. That is 4½ percentage points above the national average.

These results further demonstrate that, absent a compelling need, the Federal Government should not be preempting the election laws of all 50 States.

Now, let's examine the burdensome list of Federal mandates that advocates of this bill would impose on each and every State. Allow me to highlight just a few of the significant flaws.

The bill would require States to allow ballot harvesting, where third parties, usually political operatives, collect ballots from voters. This raises obvious and significant concerns about voter intimidation, coercion, and ballot security.

The bill would prohibit voter ID, overturning existing law in 35 States. It would require that absentee ballots be accepted up to 7 days after the election, which could lead to chaos and distrust, particularly in close races.

The bill would transform the Federal Election Commission into a partisan entity, which would jettison the requirement for bipartisan agreement on significant issues and lead to partisan enforcement.

Another problem with this bill is that it would allocate billions of Federal dollars to congressional campaigns, forcing Americans to subsidize the campaigns of politicians with whom they vigorously disagree or simply dislike. Even very wealthy officeholders would be eligible for public financing. Do we really need more money in political campaigns when Federal funds could be used to combat the opioid epidemic or to reduce hunger among children or to spur economic development and the creation of more jobs?

Now, Mr. President, there are, of course, times when it is compelling and appropriate for Congress to intervene. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is an excellent example.

It was passed at a time when many Americans, particularly Black Americans, faced overwhelming barriers designed to prevent them from voting.

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is still in effect today. It prohibits voting practices and procedures that are discriminatory. It also allows the Department of Justice to sue any State or local government to enforce this provision.

Certainly, there are improvements that can be made in our election laws. For example, I support efforts to disclose dark money in campaigns. I support mandatory reporting to the FBI if a foreign government contacts a political campaign with an offer of assistance. And I have worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to provide generous grants to States so that they could better secure their voting infrastructure against cyber threats and foreign intrusions.

Unfortunately, S. 1 is not legislation that could ever form the basis of a reasonable, bipartisan elections reform bill. And it is far more likely to sow more distrust in our elections than to ease the partisan divisions in our country. For the reasons that I have discussed, I shall cast my vote against this flawed bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. And I listened to my colleague from Maine on her remarks and I take her at her word. If there would be any chance to work on these election issues in the future, I guarantee we are all ears.

I say that because I come from the State of Washington, and we have a very high election turnout. We have a very high election turnout rate because we have a vote-by-mail system that has been developed over a long period of time. My colleague knew my predecessor, Slade Gorton, who was a three-term Senator. In the 2000 election, I won by 2,229 votes, and I am forever grateful to Senator Gorton for having faith in that election. That election that included provisional ballots and signatures and all sorts of things that people really understood. I think that is the principle here. Our election in the State of Washington is based on your signature.

That is the way it is now when you vote in person, and it is the way it is when you vote by mail. So our system has a lot of security in it, and this legislation that is before us today is to make sure that these rights—these civil rights and constitutional rights of individuals—are upheld throughout the United States of America.

Now, I understand some of my colleagues may not like the ethics reform or campaign finance reform in the underlying bill. I support those provisions. But at the heart of this debate is

whether we are going to fight to make sure that the Federal Government does its job on constitutional rights. I feel like there is a little bit of hiding going on in this discussion about whether we have a role, that this is somehow left up to the States. It reminds me of when Rosa Parks was sitting on a bus. We didn't say it is just up to those individual States. Or when people were denied equal accommodations at hotels, we didn't say it was just up to those States. And we certainly didn't say, when people used police dogs trying to intimidate women to vote in the 1960's, that it was just up to those States.

No, no, no. We did something about it. We passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. We did that because intimidation was happening, and we needed to correct for it. So I hope that our colleagues will think about this issue because to me, it is the same debate we are having on criminal justice reform. So many people on the other side of the aisle said: You know what, this is up to local police departments, and it is just up to the local governments, and that is all there is to it.

No, that is not all there is to this. This is about whether we do our job in upholding these constitutional rights when certain States don't do that.

And so these American voting rights are guaranteed by our Constitution. The 15th Amendment provides that voting rights cannot be abridged on the account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The 19th Amendment, which turned a hundred years old last year, provides that voting rights cannot be denied on account of sex. The 26th Amendment provides that Americans 18 years of age or older cannot be denied the right to vote on account of age.

Generations of Americans fought for these rights over many decades, and they didn't come easy to us as a Nation. Nor should we overlook, now, these issues as we think that these rights, these constitutional obligations that we should be fighting for and should uphold, are facing challenges at the local level.

I know that my colleagues say that these are State rights to hold these elections. Article I, section 4 of the Constitution empowers Congress to make or alter rules for Federal elections. The U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld this authority as broad and comprehensive. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that the election clause gives Congress the authority to ''override state laws to regulate federal elections.''

Now, this was in a pretty famous case in 2015. In the majority opinion in the Arizona State Legislature v. the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, Justice Ginsburg wrote, ''The dominant purpose of the elections clause, the historical record bears out, was to empower Congress to override state election rules. The clause was also intended to act as a safeguard against manipulation of electoral rules by politicians and factions in the States to entrench themselves or place their interests over those of the electorate.''

So these issues are very clear. It is calling on us to make sure that we uphold those constitutional rights. But according to the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law, at least 14 States, from Georgia, Florida, Oklahoma, and many others, have enacted voting rights since the 2020 election to restrict individuals. My colleagues have been out here talking about some of those restrictions, and I think those that place undue burdens on individuals are something that we should be addressing. Yes, States have been at a different pace in allowing vote-by-mail, but we should be empowering people. We should say that we want to empower more people to vote under a system that is fair and gives them those opportunities to do so.

So there are at least 64 bills restricting voting rights moving through 18 State legislatures, and I think that we should be making sure here that we have clarity on what will help us continue to empower the public to cast their vote.

The For the People Act, S. 2093, is a comprehensive bill that makes voting easier. It also authorizes $1.7 billion in new federal grants to help secure the security of our voting system. Again, I like our vote-by-mail system in Washington State. It is based on my signature to the ballot that is checked at the ballot. I can tell you in the last election because of the ruses and various things that went on, 13 different people said that they voted on my behalf. But they didn't. And our election system caught that. They knew that it wasn't me, and they checked the signature on the ballot, and they knew that it was me. So even though the system has had people who are trying to cause distrust and discord about whether we have the right system, it is working. And the more we empower people, the better our democracy.

This legislation requires the Director of National Intelligence to report on threats to election infrastructure, including cyber threats, and requires the President to develop and implement a national strategy for protecting U.S. democratic institutions. I know that these are things that we should be updating. Throughout our history, following the civil war and reconstruction, there were localities that used discriminatory tactics like poll taxes and literacy tests to keep African Americans from voting. The Black community endured both of this kind of intimidation.

And in the years that followed, Americans have protested and marched for these voting rights. And out of this struggle, Congress passed, and President Johnson, signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act to make sure that we kept these promises of our constitution. So the Federal Government has had to intervene and we have done so I am glad that we did.

So I hope that we will continue to say that these provisions that are so important to guaranteeing the right to franchise for Americans, are there, and that they are continuing to be modernized. I hope that what we will do today is the start of an effort to focus on this.

I take my colleague at her word. I am sure she is sincere about wanting to vote to help do something on election and our democracy. We need to start that process today. We need to move forward, we need to address these issues. We can't live in a world where we are not allowed to move forward on a very close election in Washington State. That wasn't the only one we had. We had another one, I think, was decided by probably, you know, a few hundred votes. And were there issues? Yes. And guess what. The system resolved it. The system found any mistakes.

I keep mentioning, you know, a gentleman who basically when it got down to that somebody thought this was a Governor's race that was going to get down to 10 or 15 votes, basically decided to say that he had voted for his wife who had passed away, and admitted it because he knew in the end that they were going to find out. And he thought it was better to come forward and say I made a mistake. She had already passed. I sent in her ballot. It wasn't something I should have done, and we have a system that can work based on our signatures. It can and does today. When you go in to vote in person, you sign your name, and that is the signature, and that is the security of the system. And it has allowed us to trace and find and now expand to vote-by-mail. And it is time for us to say: Let's not make voting harder in the United States of America through a system that basically disenfranchises people, but make a system in the United States of America that is about giving people these opportunities so that people can feel this enthusiasm that we see when we successfully pull this off.

And what we need to be doing here is to show States that an 83 percent voter turnout in the State of Washington is a great victory. A high turnout is a great participatory system, and that is what we should be striving for with these reforms that are about security and about our constitutional rights. I hope our colleagues will support them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled vote: BLUNT, for up to 15 minutes; MERKLEY, for up to 15 minutes; KLOBUCHAR, for 10 minutes; and Senator SCHUMER, for 5 minutes.

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

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, when I look at this substitute, I am reminded of the adage, the new boss is the same

as the old boss. In this case, the new bill is the same as the old bill. It has a different number, but it still maintains the same flawed policies that S. 1 maintains.

Obviously, the majority would like to pass this bill or they wouldn't have labeled it their most important piece of legislation for this Congress. The House of Representatives labeled the same bill, ''H.R. 1,'' their most important piece of legislation for this Congress.

The changes basically give election officials more time to implement policies that I don't think we need, and I think the changes don't make the bill less bad. In fact, what the bill does is it creates a new boss for elections, but the new boss is the Federal Government. It is not about voting rights. It doesn't add any group or any individuals to the group of people who can vote, the kind of thing that Congress has done in the past, starting in the first century of the country and moving on until today. It is, frankly, a politically motivated, Federal takeover of the election systems that would make, in my opinion, elections more chaotic, less secure, less nimble in their ability to deal with individual circumstances that occur on election day.

(Mr. MARKEY assumed the Chair.)

The strength of the election system is the diversity of the election system. This is what President Obama thought in 2016. He may not still believe that, but I still believe it.

S. 1 would force a single partisan view of elections on more than 10,000 voting jurisdictions across the country, taking control away from States, taking control away from local officials—frankly, they are the closest people to the voters—and instead giving it to people in a far-away national capital without the same sense of importance of the people believing that what happened on election day at your precinct is what the voters intended to have happen that day and that the people who were voting were the people who were legally able to vote, not people who may have voted somewhere else—not people who may no longer live in the jurisdiction they are voting in and no longer qualified to vote for that county official or that State representative or whoever, but people who are legally able to vote.

I think this makes fraud easier to commit and, frankly, harder to detect. What we should be doing is making it easier to vote and harder to cheat. I think what we are doing here is making it easier to cheat and harder to find it out.

We allow, in this bill, if it was the law, unlimited ballot harvesting. This is where anybody can go around and collect ballots and, theoretically, be sure that they get to the election authority, but who knows? Who knows what ballot got lost in the mail and what ballot never got in the mail? One of the things the ballot harvester would develop a pretty good sense of is how the person voted whose ballot they were harvesting.

This bill undermines popular voter ID laws that more than half of the States have implemented.

It makes it more difficult to maintain accurate voter lists.

It permanently tips the scales in favor of our friends on the other side by politicizing the Federal Election Commission—a Commission that was established, just like our Ethics Commission in the Senate, with an equal number of one party and no imbalance. This politicizes the Federal Election Commission. It makes it a partisan Agency, not a bipartisan policing Agency.

It pours Federal funds into campaigns, and it chills free speech—bad policy, I think, in search of a problem.

Democrats have said this is necessary to increase voting rights, particularly for minorities, but the overall turnout in the year 2020 was about two-thirds of all the voters—the highest percentage of voters who participated in over a century. What we have here is an election that had the highest level of participation in over a century. Most States had their highest voter turnout in 40 years, and we decide we need to change the system.

S. 1 isn't just about bad policy; it is about what Democrats have seen as a political imperative.

Frankly, this has been the bill that Democrats have offered for about the last 20 years. It varies a little bit from time to time, but about 20 years ago and maybe before that. I was a chief election official in our State at that time. I don't remember Democrats offering this before 20 years ago. But starting about two decades ago, every couple of years and certainly every time Democrats get in the majority in the House, they pass this bill or one almost exactly like it.

When asked about what it would take to maintain the current majority in the House, Speaker PELOSI said: Well, it would be better if we could pass H.R. 1 and S. 1. Now, that sounds like she thinks there is a political advantage there. I respect the Speaker's political judgment and always have respected Speaker PELOSI's political judgment. Her judgment would be that this would be better for Democrats than not changing the current election law.

S. 1 is really full of unnecessary and, as it turns out, unpopular provisions under the label ''Would you like to vote for a bill that would secure democracy?'' Well, of course. Who wouldn't want to be for securing democracy? Fortunately, this bill has been around long enough that people have begun to understand what is in it—the same list that has been out there before.

This bill would render State voter ID laws meaningless by requiring States to allow affidavits in lieu of identification. In other words, you say who you are at the polling place. Well, anybody who is going to try to cast a ballot at the polling place they shouldn't cast is probably also likely to be willing to say they are qualified to vote at that election.

In a recent poll, a poll that came out this week, 80 percent of Americans supported voter ID laws. Another poll just a couple of weeks ago showed national support for voter photo ID was 75 percent. That included 69 percent of Black voters and 60 percent of Democrats.

So we have a principal position of this bill that 80 percent of all voters—at least 75 percent of all voters and 60 percent of Democrats are for, but this bill changes that law that makes sense to almost everybody.

This bill requires that unlimited ballot harvesting that I talked about just a minute ago. The only time I recall a congressional discussion recently about ballot harvesting was last year when the House of Representatives refused to seat a Republican-elected Member because that campaign had used ballot harvesting. Now we have a law that requires every State not to prohibit ballot harvesting. The risk of fraud, the risk of every ballot not getting to the place ballots need to be certainly increases when you hand them to a ballot harvester—usually somebody paid by a campaign or a party to go around and collect ballots and someone whose motivation to get those ballots all turned in may not be everything you want it to be.

Sixty-two percent of respondents in one poll said ballot harvesting should be illegal. It is another provision in this bill that clearly is not a popular provision if people begin to look at it.

Again, voting to protect democracy—sure, that is popular. But the way this bill does it, when people look at it, is not popular.

The bill requires States to give felons the right to vote in Federal elections when they are out of prison. Some States do that; some States don't. Of course, if this bill passed, every State would have the choice of going ahead and doing that or having two sets of voter rolls, one for Federal elections and another one for non-Federal elections. That, of course, makes no sense at all. What this bill anticipates is that no matter what States wanted to do, this is a provision they would have to adopt.

There is another way to get that done: Go to State legislatures and explain the value of having that changed if that change needs to be made.

This bill restricts the ability of States to maintain accurate voter rolls. Many States—States with Democratic Governors or Democratic secretaries of state, Democratic legislatures—have worked hard to see that they had a system in place where you would periodically check and see if the people who are registered to vote are still where they registered to vote from.

Our State—I think a lot of States—if you move to another county and register to vote there, you are supposed to

say as part of that process who you could notify to get you off the voter rolls, but there is no requirement that that has to happen. A periodic check of the voter rolls was seen not too long ago as a huge protection of democracy. This makes it much harder to do. But a 2018 poll found that 77 percent of Americans supported this kind of voter roll maintenance.

Frankly, it would be pretty hard to come up with a bill that had so many major tenets that were so out of step with what people think the government ought to do and what they want their State government to do and in most cases where State governments are doing this.

This bill provides government funding for campaigns—$6 of Federal money for every dollar raised from small donors. Small donors is under $200. Frankly, if you were doing this, there would be—the current Members of the Senate, under this bill, could receive up to, collectively, $1.8 billion from the Federal Government to run their campaigns, to attack their challenger, or whatever they want to do with their campaign money—$1.8 billion to do that. It is pretty easy to qualify for this money.

We saw people raise money in the first quarter of this year. That would have qualified—in the case of our friend the Senator from Texas, Senator CRUZ, somewhere between $25 and $30 million would go to his campaign. We had a markup on this bill in the Rules Committee. Not a single member of the Rules Committee, Democrat or Republican, including Senator CRUZ, thought Senator CRUZ should get $24 or $25 million from the Federal Government for his campaign.

The bill creates a partisan Federal Elections Commission. It gets rid of that bipartisan makeup that has been there from the very start.

This bill chills free speech in that it creates a disclosure document that makes people really reluctant to give money to other groups who aren't candidates who like to talk about elections.

It federalizes redistricting. S. 1 would put in place one set of Federal rules for redrawing congressional districts. That has always been the role of the States. If the State wants to give that to somebody besides the legislature, they can do that, and many States have done that. But States have been the constitutionally designated place to determine how they draw congressional maps in their own States.

Even if a State manages to comply with all these requirements, under this bill, the Justice Department would have to be involved. Under this bill, the court of jurisdiction in all cases on redistricting would be the Federal court in Washington, DC, not the Federal court in the circuit that Missouri is in. You wouldn't even start at the district court in Kansas City or St. Louis. The Federal court in Washington, DC, would be the place you would go.

Of course, the purpose of the bill is to bring all these election decisions to one place. The idea that the best decisions are always made in Washington, DC, on all topics is an idea that most Americans don't agree with. There are things they think we can do and should do and can only do because they can't do them any other way, like defend the country and set big national priorities. But for well over 200 years now, local election officials responsible for the sense of credibility of what happens on election day have done this job. I think they have done it well.

This bill would require States to take burdensome actions and make expensive changes in their election systems. Even if the States have already adopted some of the so-called reforms, they in all likelihood would have to make changes in their system to comply.

So the Federal takeover of elections shouldn't happen. I urge my colleagues not to support it happening. The American people don't want to see the things imposed on our election system that are in this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against this harmful legislation.

I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, every day that I have the honor of coming to work in the hallowed halls of this building—a symbol to the country and to the world of America's commitment to liberty and to justice, freedom, and democracy—I am humbled. I am humbled by the faith and responsibility that the people of Oregon have placed in me to advocate on their behalf. I am humbled by the responsibility of exercising the power of this office to use the opportunity to lift up all Americans, to create a foundation for families to thrive, to tackle significant challenges like human rights and global warming.

But among all these responsibilities one is the highest, which is to defend our constitutional Republic, and in that Constitution, the single most important power given to every American is the right to a voice and a vote, a voice and a vote in the decisions of this government and the direction of our Nation.

As we saw all too clearly on January 6, when this very building was attacked by a mob intent on burning the ballots of millions of Americans, democracy based on free and fair elections is far from guaranteed. Each generation, each new set of Senators and House Members has the responsibility to defend it anew.

The sad truth, however, is that a violent mob storming the Capitol isn't the only way to attack our democracy. It can also be attacked by the quiet plotting of powerful and privileged individuals who hate the concept of government of, by, and for the people, and they work to undermine and corrupt the workings of our Republic to produce, instead, government by and for the powerful.

In his inaugural address, our second President, John Adams, remarked that, ''we should be unfaithful to ourselves if we should ever lose sight of the danger to our liberties if anything partial or extraneous should infect the purity of our free, fair, virtuous, and independent elections.''

Well, my friends, our democracy—our elections are being infected. Our elections are under siege from gerrymandering, which destroys the principle of equal representation. Our system is under siege from dark money, enabling billionaires and powerful corporations to buy our elections. It is under siege by State laws being passed week to week right now that target specific communities to prevent them from voting, thereby manipulating the outcome of elections.

Indeed, at least 22 laws have been enacted in 14 States since January to infect our free and fair elections to deliberately erect barriers meant to make it harder for targeted groups of Americans to vote, to silence the voices of students and low-income Americans, of Native Americans and seniors, of Black and Brown Americans who have fought too long and too hard to have their voice and their vote stolen from them, ripped from them now.

We have a responsibility as United States Senators to ensure every American's freedom to vote, just as this institution sought to do more than half a century ago, when in this Chamber we passed the 1965 Voting Rights Act. We have a responsibility to ensure that every American's voice is heard and that our elections reflect the will of the people.

We can fulfill that responsibility by enacting national standards for voting to ensure that every American can have a say in the key decisions impacting their daily lives, a ''say'' expressed through the ballot box.

That ballot box is the beating heart of our Republic, and those who seek to erect barriers to citizens having access to it are committing a crime against our democracy. We have to stop that criminal action against the rights of Americans. We must create those national standards by taking up this bill, the For the People bill, debating it, and ultimately passing it, to defend our Constitution.

The For the People Act is comprehensive. It does popular, commonsense things to put the American people back in charge of their government and their country. It sets national standards so every American has equal freedom to vote, no matter where they live. In this country, if you are an American, you have the right to vote, plain and simple, full stop. It doesn't matter what your ZIP code is or your income or the color of your skin or your religious beliefs. You have the right to vote.

Many of the State laws restricting voting are designed to eliminate early voting—in person or by mail—and we know exactly why. It is because the

leaders in these States know how easy it is to manipulate the vote on election day. In these targeted communities, the States' leaders wants to be able to decrease the number of polling places, reduce the hours, change the locations, put polling places in locations with limited parking, put out false information about the date of the election, and purge targeted voters from the roll of registered voters, knowing that when they show up on election day, it is too late to correct the error and be able to exercise their right to vote.

The antidote to these horrendous, racist attacks on the freedom and right of every American to vote is early voting in person and by mail, and this act guarantees 15 days of early voting. It sets forth the opportunity to acquire an absentee ballot, to return the ballot by mail or through dedicated dropboxes.

The second big goal in national standards set forth in the For the People Act is to stop billionaires from buying elections. Elections in America are intended to reflect the will of the people, not the will of the powerful and privileged. Thomas Jefferson once described this as the ''mother principle,'' saying that ''governments are republican only in proportion to how they embody the will of the people.''

If the megawealthy can flood our campaigns with billions of dollars sent through shell companies, untraceable money, and manipulate the outcome of the elections, then Jefferson's mother principle is murdered because the outcome serves the powerful, not the people.

The For the People Act says the people should have an equal chance of being heard and that the people listening ought to know who is actually behind those voices and those messages. It does that by creating an ''honest ads'' policy so political ads people see online have to disclose who is paying for them, and it does that by requiring the disclosure of megadonors contributing to political campaigns.

Now, if you or I give a modest donation to a campaign, that campaign has to disclose who we are. Shouldn't the same thing that is true for an average American be true for the megadonors? This standard sets that equal standard.

Third, the national standards set forth in this bill restore equal representation by ending gerrymandering, the process by which we draw congressional districts to favor one party over another and, by doing so, attack the sacred principle of equal representation.

This creates a lot of bias in the House of Representatives down the hall. Take Michigan. In 2012, 2014, and 2016, the majority of the Michiganders voted for one party at every level of government, but because of gerrymandering, the other party held a decisive advantage in the statehouse, in the State senate, and in the congressional House delegation.

The For the People Act defends, restores the principle of equal representation. It does it by creating independent redistricting commissions, made up equally of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. That means candidates running for office actually have to use the power of their ideas, the persuasion of their personality, not a rigged system to hold power.

Finally, the standards in this bill target corruption by addressing and eliminating conflicts of interest. Public servants should serve the public, not themselves. That includes Members of Congress, the administration, and for the first time ever, the Supreme Court. This bill does that by striking down outrageous and corrupt conflicts of interest, strengthening divestment requirements, saying that the President and Vice President have to use a blind trust or limit their personal holdings to assets that don't pose a potential conflict of interest.

It slows the revolving door between public service and K Street. It requires Cabinet Secretaries to recuse themselves from any issues in which a previous employer or client has a financial interest.

The bill requires candidates for Vice President or President to disclose their tax returns to prevent hidden conflicts of interest. It creates a code of ethics for the Supreme Court, something all other Federal judges already have.

None of these four principles is about helping one political party over the other. In fact, the provisions I have just laid out are wildly popular among the American people. An overwhelming supermajority of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents support these four principles. It is as bipartisan as you can get.

Even when it is broke into specific provisions, three out of four Americans—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—say they support these reforms because they believe in the vision of government of, by, and for the people. It is in our DNA.

Americans believe that dark money should not be able to flood our elections. They believe billionaires and corporations should not be able to buy elections. They believe our Nation is ill-served by corrupt conflicts of interest. They believe in the vision and ideals of our ''we the people'' Republic, and this bill is meant to do just one thing: make real the promise of democracy for all Americans.

But powerful special interests don't want that. It threatens their hold on power by ending the ways they have rigged the system, and so they are all about striking down this bill.

Why is that? We hear how Republican leaders say that they like this rigged system. Apparently, they like dark money in campaigns helping to buy elections. Apparently, they like targeting groups of individuals to prevent them from voting, taking us back to the racist efforts that existed before the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Apparently, they like gerrymandering, thinking it is a sort of the political power down the hall, which political scientists says it is. But should it be principle or power that we fight for here?

It should be the principle and the oath of office we took to uphold the Constitution.

Standing before a crowd on a November afternoon to dedicate the Soldiers' National Cemetery at Gettysburg, 4 months after that momentous battle, President Lincoln remarked that they were gathered together to not only dedicate it to the men who had fallen in battle, but to the ideal for which they gave their lives, ''That government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the Earth.''

Today, it is our responsibility to carry that ideal forward and to ensure that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the United States of America. We in this Chamber must pass the For the People Act.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, today the Senate is voting on whether to consider the For the People Act, also known as S. 1. I encourage all my colleagues to support Senate consideration of this crucial election reform bill.

This legislation would put a stop to new State laws across the country that are making it harder for Americans to register to vote and to cast their ballots. So far this year, at least 389 bills to suppress the ability to vote have been introduced in 48 States. At least 22 of these new bills have become law in 14 States.

These newly enacted laws undermine the right to vote from every direction: They create new and unnecessarily strict voter ID laws, which make it harder to vote for the 11 percent of U.S. citizens who do not have a government-issued photo ID, many of whom are elderly or low-income. They reduce the timeframes for early voting, a critical method of voting for many working Americans. And they impose severe limitations on voting by mail, a strategy that many States have used to significantly increase voter turnout over recent years.

These attacks have shown no signs of letting up. In Texas, a restrictive voting bill is pending before the State legislature that continues to get worse the longer it is considered. In its current form, the Texas bill would cut early voting hours, ban drive-through voting, limit vote-by-mail, and add new voter ID requirements for mail-in ballots, along with a host of other restrictions on the right to vote.

These restrictions are harmful to our democracy. We should be working to make it easier for more people to vote, not making it harder. The right to vote is a bedrock principle of our democracy. Unfortunately, many States are using unfounded conspiracy theories of voter fraud as an excuse to pass laws to weaken that fundamental right.

That is why we must pass the For the People Act. This bill will help to ensure that all Americans are able to vote, free of unnecessary hurdles and burdens. It includes a number of commonsense reforms that anyone who believes in the health of our democracy cannot possibly oppose in good conscience.

For example, one provision of S. 1 requires that States allow voters to register to vote online. In an age when you can cash a check, buy a car, and conduct a doctor's appointment entirely online, there is no reason a voter should not be able to register to vote online.

The bill also invests in the health of our election infrastructure by securing our voting systems against foreign attacks. The security of our voting systems should not be a partisan issue.

In addition, S. 1 would ban partisan gerrymandering and require States to draw their congressional districts using independent redistricting commissions, like we do in California. Voters should be able to choose their representatives; representatives should not be able to choose their voters.

We need to empower the voice of every American in our democracy. We need to make these commonsense reforms to our elections.

I understand that some of my colleagues have disagreements with specific parts of the bill. I would urge them to let the legislation come before the Senate and seek to amend it. But to deny this body the ability to even debate and consider such an important bill as this is unacceptable.

The time for these reforms is now. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this important legislation.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak in support of proceeding to debate legislation that is critical to our democracy, legislation that is based on two simple ideas: that Americans must be able to freely choose their elected officials and that government must be accountable to the people, not to those with the most money. These are not Democratic or Republican ideas; they are core American ideas. But for too long, these rights have been under attack, which is why we need the critical democracy reforms in the For the People Act.

I am honored to be leading this legislation with Senators MERKLEY and SCHUMER and to have worked with my colleagues as chair of the Rules Committee, worked with my colleagues in the House and civil rights and democracy reform groups and you, Madam President, to bring this bill forward today.

The freedom to vote is fundamental to all of our freedoms. It is how Americans control their government and hold elected officials accountable. It is the bedrock of our government. It is the founding principle of our country, and it has stood the test of wars, of economic strife, and yes, a global pandemic. But protecting this right has not always been easy.

Throughout our country's 245-year history, we have had to course-correct and take action to ensure that democracy is for the people and by the people and that it has lived up to our ideals.

At the beginning of this year, we were reminded on January 6 that it is up to us to protect against threats to our democracy, to ensure that it succeeds.

I still remember that moment at 3:30 in the morning when Senator BLUNT and I and, yes, Vice President Pence walked from this Chamber with the two young women with the mahogany box full of those last ballots to get over to the House to finish our job so that you, Madam President, were declared the Vice President and President Biden was declared the President. That is upholding our democracy. That is doing it together, Democrats and Republicans doing our job. And what this bill is about to me, this bill is about carrying on that torch to protect our democracy.

Today, the vote to begin debate on this legislation will likely get the support of all 50 Democrats. Senator MANCHIN, along with the rest of our caucus, has made clear to the country that standing up for the right to vote is bigger than any one person or thing. It is about us. It is about us as Americans. I deeply appreciate the work he has put into the proposal he is putting forward today, and I look forward to continuing our discussions with him. He is doing this in good faith. There are many good things in that proposal. And today we are here together to reaffirm we will not give up this fight. It is just beginning.

The 2020 election showed that you can make it safer to vote while giving voters the options that work for them. If it is vote-by-mail—I see my colleague Senator SMITH here. Minnesota is so proud of our same-day registration. That has worked for us. It has made us No. 1 in voter turnout in the country time and time and time again. Many States during the pandemic took steps exactly like that, extending options for voters, like safe vote-by mail, and now 34 States have no-excuse vote-by-mail—34 States. The result? More than nearly 160 million Americans voted—more than ever before and in the middle of a pandemic.

I still remember those voters in the primary in Wisconsin standing in makeshift garbage bags with makeshift masks over their faces in the middle of a rainstorm, in the middle of a pandemic, standing in line to vote. And in an election that the Trump Department of Homeland Security declared was the most secure in our history, the American people elected, yes, President Joe Biden and Vice President KAMALA HARRIS.

But in the wake of that historic election, there has been a pervasive, coordinated, and overwhelming effort to undermine the freedoms of voting in future elections, with over 400 bills introduced in legislatures across the country. Twenty-two laws to restrict voting have been enacted in 14 States, and 31 more bills to roll back the right to vote have passed at least 1 chamber of a State legislature.

As Reverend WARNOCK put it in this Chamber in his maiden speech as Senator, ''Some people don't want some people to vote.'' That is what is going on here.

The new law in Georgia makes it harder to request mail-in ballots, drastically limits ballot drop boxes, and makes it a crime to hand water and food to voters waiting in line to cast their ballots, when in previous elections, Georgians have stood in line for up to 10 hours to vote.

One of the new Montana laws ended same-day registration on election day after it had been in practice in the State for 15 years, and Senator TESTER is joining me in trying to bring this practice across—when we introduced that bill—across the Nation.

In the weeks ahead, similar bills are expected to pass in even more States, including Texas, where the Governor has promised to call the legislature into special session to pass a bill to restrict voting that was blocked at the end of regular session thanks to the heroic efforts of Democrats in the Texas State Legislature who blessed us with their presence just last week.

These are not empty threats; they are real efforts to disenfranchise regular Americans from voting—senior citizens, people with disabilities, people who can't stand in line for 10 hours just to wait to vote.

In the face of these efforts to roll back voting rights in so many States, the For the People Act is about setting basic national standards to make sure that all voters in this country can vote legally in the way that works for them, regardless of which ZIP Code they live in, regardless of whether they live in a big city or in a suburb or out in a small town in western Minnesota. It is about reducing the power of Big Money in our elections by ending secret spending by billionaires and special interests. It is about making anti-corruption reforms to ensure that politicians work for the people, not for themselves.

Republicans have said that this bill is designed to provide a political advantage, but, as a former Republican Commissioner of the Federal Election Commission who chaired under George Bush, Trevor Potter, has said in explaining his support for this bill—and he appeared as a witness in my hearing for this bill—he said:

> This bill does not give power to any particular party over another; it gives power back to the voters.

Giving power back to the voters is exactly what we need.

There is an amplified attack on the right to vote this year, but we have seen serious efforts to restrict voting rights since the Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act 8 years ago. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 marked the cornerstone achievement to the civil rights movement and became a law because of the tireless work of people like John Lewis who put their lives on the line to secure voting rights for all. Fifty-six years later, we are still fighting that battle. At the same time, we haven't had meaningful campaign finance or ethics reform.

Our democracy desperately needs the proposals in this bill. And guess what. The American people agree. Yes, this bill is bipartisan, except right here in this place. It is bipartisan because one poll released recently found that 78 percent of Americans, including 63 percent of Republicans, support making early in-person voting available for at least 2 weeks before election day. That is a proposal in our original For the People, and it is in the managers' amendment that we are voting for cloture on, and it is in Senator MANCHIN's proposal.

Another poll found that 83 percent of likely voters support public disclosure of contributions to groups involved in elections—also the DISCLOSE Act in all three proposals. Yet some of my Republican colleagues want to limit disclosures. By the way, disclosures were championed by Justice Scalia. Yet what happened in our committee hearing on this, our markup? Republicans filed amendment after amendment to gut those provisions of the bill.

So while they make claims—my friends on the other side of the aisle—that this isn't popular, it is just not true. They claim it is not bipartisan. It is just not true. The bill contains nine bipartisan bills, including the Honest Ads Act, which I first introduced with Senator John McCain and Senator WARNER, and now Senator LINDSAY GRAHAM took up that cause. Our provision—that provision would finally hold the social media companies accountable to make sure that there are disclaimers and disclosures on political ads.

There is the work that I have done with Senator LANKFORD and with you, Madam President, when you were in the Senate to make sure we have backup paper ballots. We still have eight States that don't have backup paper ballots. That provision is in this bill.

Many of the bill's provisions have already been adopted in red, blue, and purple States and have the support of Governors and election officials from both parties.

Twenty-one States have same-day voter registration, including red States like Idaho, Wyoming, and Iowa. That is great, but our question should be, why don't all 50 States have it, especially when the Constitution of the United States specifically says that Congress can make and alter rules for Federal elections? It is as clear as the words on the page. Twenty States have automatic voter registration laws, including Alaska, Georgia, and West Virginia. Forty-five States allowed all voters to vote by mail in the 2020 election, and 44 States have early voting.

What this bill does is takes the best of the best and puts in place minimum standards so that no matter what State you call home, you have access to the ballot box. That is why Senator MERKLEY has worked so hard on this legislation. That is why Senator SCHUMER made this bill Senate file No. 1.

The bill that we are voting to advance includes changes that directly respond to concerns about implementation from both Democratic and Republican States and local officials. We heard those concerns, and the Democrats on the Rules Committee, which included Senator WARNER and Senator KING—we worked on that managers' amendment and made it easier for rural areas, extended the time system, and got at their concerns. And then Senator MANCHIN has come up with more ideas and more things we can do to make the bill strong.

We heard from election officials that requiring States to accept mail-in ballots for too long after election day would delay them from certifying the results, so we shortened the window.

I could go on and on and on. In good faith, we have worked to make this bill work for America, and now it is time to allow for debate on this bill.

Our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle say this bill—this is one thing Senator MCCONNELL would say in the hearing—that it would cause chaos. I say this: Chaos is a 5-hour wait to vote. Senior citizens standing in the hot Sun for 5 hours, for 10 hours—that is chaos. Chaos is purging eligible voters from voter rolls and modern-day poll taxes and one ballot box for a county of 5 million people, which is exactly what they did in Harris County, TX. That is exactly what is happening in that State right now. Chaos is voters in Wisconsin waiting in line to vote for hours in the rain in their homemade masks and plastic garbage bags. The angry mob on January 6 that came into this very Chamber, that spray painted the columns, that attacked police officers, that injured people left and right—that is chaos.

As I said from the stage on Inauguration Day under that bright blue sky where you could still see the spray paint at the bottom of those columns and the makeshift windows we had in place—I said this: This is the day our democracy picks itself up, brushes off the dust, and does what America always does: goes forward as a Nation under God, with liberty and justice for all. We cannot do that if Americans are disenfranchised, if they are not part of our democracy.

Republicans have sadly made it clear that this is not legislation they are willing to negotiate or even debate. They won't even give it a week. They won't even give it a few days. Just last week, they held a press conference to tell the American people that they don't believe Congress should act to protect the right to vote or get rid of secret money in our elections. So, honestly, I would love to get support from the other side of the aisle, but we have to be honest—I don't expect we are going to get it.

So, my Republican colleagues, this is not the end of the line for this bill. This is not the end of the line. This is only the beginning because if you have your way, those voters won't even be at the end of the line. They are not going to be able to vote.

In the Rules Committee, we will be holding a series of hearings—not just one hearing, a series of hearings—and we are taking it on the road for the first time in a long time. We are going to Georgia and holding a field hearing there so we can hear firsthand from people in the State on what is happening and why we must carry out the constitutional duty in this Chamber to act.

I urge my Republican colleagues to recognize the work being done in States to restrict the freedom of Americans to exercise their sacred right to vote. Our Nation was founded on the ideals of democracy, and we have seen for ourselves in this building how we can never take it for granted.

We can't let State legislatures get to pick and choose who votes and what votes get counted. That is not how democracy works. I urge all of my colleagues to do what the American people are asking us to do and to do what is right. Vote today to bring us closer to passing legislation to strengthen our democracy. We can't wait in line, and we can't make the people of America wait in line. The time to do this is now.

I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, let me thank so many of my colleagues, including our chair of Rules, the Senator from Minnesota; our lead sponsor on this bill, Senator MERKLEY; and so many others who have done so much on this legislation.

Now, what makes a democracy a democracy? It is the right of citizens to choose their own leader; to forge their own destiny, rather than have it decided for them; the right to vote; the right that generations of Americans have marched and protested to achieve; women who reached for the ballot; and marchers who were bloodied on a bridge in Selma; the right that generations of American soldiers fought and died to defend, buried now in patriot graves from Normandy to Gettysburg.

And, right now, it is a fact—a fact—that voting rights are under assault in America in a way that we have not seen in many, many decades. Republican State legislatures are limiting polling hours, locations, and ballot

drop boxes, raising new ID barriers for students, making it a crime to give food and water to voters in line, and in States like Texas, trying to move Sunday voting hours so it is harder for Black churchgoers to go to the polls after services.

It is the most sweeping voter suppression effort in at least 80 years, targeting all the ways that historically disenfranchised voters—Black and Brown Americans, students, the working poor—access the ballot.

We can disagree about solutions to this problem, about which policies might be more effective, but we should all agree this is a problem. We should all agree that protecting voting rights is worthy of debate, and that is what this next vote is about. Should the U.S. Senate even debate—even debate—how to protect the voting rights of our citizens?

The story of American democracy is full of contradictions and halting progress. At the time of our Constitution's ratification, you had to be, in most States, a White, male, Protestant landowner to vote. How many in this Chamber—how many of us would have been able to participate in those first elections?

The truth is, many of us, particularly on our side of the aisle, would not have been able to vote. But ever since the early days of the Republic, Americans launched mighty movements, fought a bloody civil war, and, yes, passed Federal election laws to expand the franchise until there were no more boundaries.

Are we in a backslide here in the 21st century? Are we going to let reactionary State legislatures drag us back into the muck of voter suppression? Are we going to let the most dishonest President in history continue to poison our democracy from the inside or will we stand up to defend what generations of Americans have organized, marched for, and died for—the sacred, sacred right to vote, the thing that makes a democracy a democracy.

I plead with my Republican colleagues. Stand up, my Republican colleagues. Stand up to a man who has lied. We all know he has lied. You know he has lied about our elections. Do not let this man lead you around by the nose and do permanent damage to our democracy. At least have the decency and honor to let this Chamber debate. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the 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.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed on 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, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 246 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Majority Leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I want to be clear about what just happened on the Senate floor. Every single Senate Republican just voted against starting debate—starting debate—on legislation to protect Americans' voting rights. Once again, the Senate Republican minority has launched a partisan blockade of a pressing issue here in the U.S. Senate, an issue no less fundamental than the right to vote.

I have laid out the facts for weeks. Republican State legislatures across the country are engaged in the most sweeping voter suppression in 80 years, capitalizing on and catalyzed by Donald Trump's Big Lie. These State governments are making it harder for younger, poorer, urban, and non-White Americans to vote.

Earlier today, the Republican leader told reporters that ''regardless of what may be happening in some States, there's no rationale for Federal intervention.'' The Republican leader flatly stated that no matter what the States do to undermine our democracy—voter suppression laws, phony audits, partisan takeovers of the local election boards—the Senate should not act.

My colleagues, if Senators 60 years ago held that the Federal Government should never intervene to protect voting rights, this body would have never passed the Voting Rights Act. The Republican leader uses the language and the logic of the southern Senators in the 1960s who defended States' rights, and it is an indefensible position for any Senator—any Senator—let alone the minority leader, to hold. Yet that was the reason given for why Republicans voted in lockstep today: Regardless of what may be happening in some States, there is no rationale for Federal intervention.

That is both ridiculous and awful. All we wanted to do here on the floor was to bring up the issue of voting rights and debate how to combat these vicious, oftentimes discriminatory voting restrictions, and today, every single Democratic Senator stood together in the fight to protect the right to vote in America. The Democratic Party in the Senate will always stand united to defend our democracy.

I spoke with President Biden earlier this afternoon as well. He has been unshakeable in his support of S. 1, and I want to thank the President and the Vice President for their efforts. But regrettably—regrettably—our efforts were met by the unanimous opposition of the Senate minority.

Once again, Senate Republicans have signed their names in the ledger of history alongside Donald Trump, the Big Lie, and voter suppression, to their enduring disgrace. This vote, I am ashamed to say, is further evidence that voter suppression has become part of the official platform of the Republican Party.

Now, Republican Senators may have prevented us from having a debate on voting rights today, but I want to be very clear about one thing: The fight to protect voting rights is not over, by no means. In the fight for voting rights, this vote was the starting gun, not the finish line. Let me say that again. In the fight for voting rights, this vote was the starting gun, not the finish line.

As many have noted, including my friend Senator WARNOCK this morning,

when John Lewis was about to cross that bridge in Selma, he didn't know what waited for him on the other side. He didn't know how long his march would be, and his ultimate success was never guaranteed, but he started down that bridge anyway. Today, Democrats started our march to defend the voting rights of all Americans. It could be a long march, but it is one we are going to make.

Today, we made progress. For the first time in this Congress, we got all 50 Democrats unified behind moving forward on a strong and comprehensive voting rights bill. And make no mistake about it, it will not be the last time that voting rights comes up for a debate in the Senate.

Republicans may want to avoid the topic, hoping that their party's efforts to suppress votes and defend the Big Lie will go unnoticed. Democrats will not allow that. Democrats will never let this voter suppression be swept under the rug.

We have several serious options for how to reconsider this issue and advance legislation to combat voter suppression. We are going to explore every last one of our options. We have to. Voting rights are too important, too fundamental. This concerns the very core of our democracy and what we are about as a nation, so we will not let it go. We will not let it die. This voter suppression cannot stand, and we are going to work tirelessly to see that it does not stand.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am delighted to follow the majority leader and his strong remarks about the beginning of the process of passing S. 1, not only to deal with the question of voting rights but to deal with the question of the dark money plague that is infesting our democracy and taking the power over decision making in this body and in this building away from regular people and putting it into the hands of not only special interests but of special interests who are happy to operate in secret.

One of the ways in which this power has been deployed has been with respect to the judicial branch of government. And I am here now for my third speech in ''The Scheme'' series to draw attention to this problem.

In the first two ''Scheme'' speeches, I described the corporate power game plan offered by lawyer Lewis Powell to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the subsequent effectuation of that game plan by Justice Lewis Powell, appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court 2 months—2 months—after his secret corporate power game plan went to the chamber. The execution of the Powell plan was one of three converging threads that led to the scheme to capture the Court.

The Powell plan, thread one, was a political response recommended for America's traditional corporate elite, which had been traumatized by the social upheaval of the 1960s. The second thread, thread two, was a separate strain of American ire that had been simmering on our society's fringe for many decades. The extremists on this simmering fringe were traumatized by things long accepted as mainstream by most Americans.

The fringe resentments shifted with the varying tides of news and events but regularly boiled over against several targets. One was the role of Jewish people in finance, the press, Hollywood, and—after FDR—in government. Another was the improving economic and social condition of minorities. Another was the arrival of immigrants, particularly non-European immigrants; but backlash to immigration from Ireland and Italy had been profound, as my home State experienced back under the Know-Nothings. Other resentments sprang from imaginary events, conspiracy theory delusions, and crackpot ideas.

This persistent strain along the American fringe was chronicled in Pulitzer Prize-winning Richard Hofstadter's 1964 essay, ''The Paranoid Style in American Politics,'' later a popular book. This latent strain of paranoid extremism showed itself in groups like the John Birch Society, which never gained social or political acceptance. It was fed and nurtured by a handful of rightwing foundations set up by a few colossally rich and politically irate and frustrated families. It boiled up in the Presidential campaign of Senator Barry Goldwater, which ended in one of the worst landslide defeats in American history. It drove the occasional aspirations of the Libertarian Party, whose extremist platform suffered predictable but humiliating crushings at the polls. All of this defeat, over all of these decades, concentrated the strain, isolated its most persistent and determined elements, and added to it an emotional payload of resentment.

One target of this fringe was the existence of government regulation. The Libertarian Party, in 1980, ran on a platform of ending Social Security, ending Medicare, closing the post office, undoing the American highway program, stopping public education, and eliminating all our public regulatory agencies—even the Federal Aviation Administration that keeps planes from bumping into each other.

This platform barely attracted 1 percent of the vote, an unsurprising but humiliating crushing. That humiliating crushing was suffered by David Koch, Libertarian Party candidate for Vice President, and the party's major funder. The Koch family is spectacularly, unimaginably rich. Privately held Koch Industries pours hundreds of millions of dollars into their pockets every year. The family annual income exceeds most families' dreams of lifetime wealth. The Kochs have social ambition, putting their names on educational TV programs, art centers, and university buildings. They are not the sort of people who take humiliation well. They are also not stupid, and the family has long and sometimes dark international experience, including odious efforts in previous decades to build factories for evil regimes.

Made confident by the arrogance of wealth, driven by extremist ideology, spurred by the resentment of humiliating political rejection, experienced in the devious ways of the international world, steeped in the corporate skills of long-term planning and patient execution, and with unlimited resources to indulge themselves, the Koch brothers, Charles and David, were uniquely positioned to take this longstanding, latent, extremist fringe and amplify it and direct it, by plan, in secret, and over decades if need be.

If front groups needed to be set up, so be it; subsidiaries were a familiar concept. If identities needed to be laundered off money they gave, so be it; telling lawyers to find or design a way to do that was familiar. If fringe groups needed to be coordinated to work collectively with each other, so be it; organizing with others through trade associations and lobbying groups was familiar activity. And if money needed to be spent, well, so be it; money was no object, and getting people to do things for you for money is a familiar practice of the very rich.

The nurture and guidance of the Kochs breathed new strength and life—and deregulatory purpose—into the nativist far-right fringe. Meanwhile, in the regulatory arena, waited the third of the three threads. Major corporate interests—from the railroads first to banks, chemical companies, and polluting industries—had assembled, over time, a quietly powerful presence to help them in administrative Agencies; to make sure that regulation was friendly to business, and, even more than that, under the right circumstances, with the right people and pressures, could be turned to advantage of the regulated industry.

In administrative hearings and rulemakings, regulated industries regularly outgunned public interest groups. Law firms dedicated to this lucrative corporate regulatory practice sprouted. Gleaming stables were kept of well-tended professional witnesses who could reliably spout the corporate line in Agency proceedings.

Companies played the long game in these regulatory Agencies, of accreting minor victories, step-by-step, inch-by-inch, but that together summed up to major gains. Many of these gains were deeply buried in the weeds of arcane

policy and technical detail, inscrutable to the general media and so invisible to the general public.

Revolving doors spun between regulatory Commissions and industry, so that Agency decision makers often reflected the values, priorities and interests of the regulated industry, not the general public. At the extreme, the regulatory Agency became servant to the industry master—a phenomenon well known and well documented as regulatory capture. I wrote a separate book on this, ''Captured,'' so I won't dwell on it at great length here. It is enough to note that regulatory capture is so common that it has been a robust field of academic research and writing now for decades, both in economics and in administrative law.

So these three socioeconomic strands converged. America's regular corporate elite took up the Powell memo strategy of emboldened political engagement, seeking to reclaim their power and restrain the unwelcome changes roiling American society. The extremists of great wealth brought to the rightwing fringe and its motley array of extremist groups an unprecedented strategic discipline, unlimited resources, and the tactics of hard-edged corporate organization. The regulatory capture apparatus was there for the hiring, eager to pursue the new prospects offered by big industries and eccentric billionaires. Out of this slumgullion of immense wealth, extreme political ambition, and expertise at regulatory capture, how long would it take for people to start thinking about capturing not just regulatory Agencies but courts—indeed the U.S. Supreme Court?

As it turned out, not long. The Court had made itself a target of the rightwing. Brown v. Board of Education provoked massive resistance across the South out to defend segregated public schools. Roe v. Wade provoked, as it still provokes, the religious right. So did Engel v. Vitale, restricting prayer in schools. Griswold v. Connecticut offended those upset by the sixties sexual revolution. Miranda v. Arizona, Mapp v. Ohio, and Gideon v. Wainwright offended the tough-on-crime crowd. To the far right, the Supreme Court offered a bounty of things to hate. Even without the Powell Memo's corporate plan of ''exploiting judicial action'' ''with an activist-minded Supreme Court,'' the Court would likely have been an irresistible target.

But with that plan and that recommendation, it began to come together. And so the scheme was launched, fed by three political tributaries: one, the corporate plan in Lewis Powell's memo to the Chamber; two, the resurgent Koch-powered, far-right fringe; and three, the eager, available mercenaries of regulatory capture.

The effort to capture the Court has likely been the most effectual deployment of rightwing and corporate resources into our common American political life, and America is now a very different place as a result of it. Much of it, like the proverbial frog in the proverbial pot, we have even gotten used to, and we accept it now as normal, when it isn't.

To be continued.

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.

Mr. CRUZ. 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 Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate a win for the country. Today, the United States rightfully failed to advance the ''Corrupt Politicians Act,'' meaning that this bill will not come to the Senate floor for a final vote. This is a huge win for the citizens of the United States. This is a huge win for democracy, and it is a huge win for the integrity of our elections.

The ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' is the most dangerous legislation we considered in the Senate in the 9 years I served in this body. It is an attempt by Senate Democrats at a brazen power grab. It is an attempt by Democrats to federalize elections and to ensure that Democrats won't lose control for the next 100 years.

This bill isn't about protecting the right to vote. It is precisely the opposite. It is about taking away the right to vote from the citizens and giving it instead to the corrupt politicians in Washington who want to stay in power.

The ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' would strike down virtually every commonsense voter integrity law adopted by States across the country. Thirty-six States have adopted voter ID laws, a reasonable and commonsense step to protect the integrity of elections that over 70 percent of Americans support and over 60 percent of African Americans support. In fact, recent polling now shows support for voter ID at over 80 percent, thanks, no doubt, to the relentless assault to voter ID mounted by Senate Democrats. The ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' would repeal the vast majority of these voter ID laws.

Likewise, 31 States prohibit ballot harvesting, the corrupt practice of paying political operatives to collect other people's ballots. What would the ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' do? It would strike down all of those laws in 31 States and would mandate ballot harvesting nationwide. It would mean that paid political operatives from the Democratic National Committee could go to nursing homes and collect votes—some of those votes, no doubt, from individuals who may be no longer competent to make a decision. The reason 31 States have acted to ban ballot harvesting is it invites voter fraud. An unscrupulous operative can fill out the ballot for a senior citizen who no longer has the capacity to make a decision, and if that senior citizen has the temerity to vote in a way the operative doesn't like, there is nothing to prevent the operative from throwing that ballot in the mail and simply not sending it in, only sending in the ballots that happen to comply with their own political preference. If you care even one whit about election integrity, striking down every prohibition on ballot harvesting is precisely the wrong step to take.

The ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' would also automatically register to vote anyone who comes in contact with the government. So if you get a welfare check, you get an unemployment check, you get a driver's license, you go to a State college or State university, you are automatically registered to vote. What is the problem with that? The problem with that, as the authors of the bill know, is that would register millions of illegal aliens to vote. Millions of illegal aliens come into contact with the government, and automatic registration is designed to register millions of illegal aliens.

How do we know this? We know this, among other things, because the bill explicitly immunizes the State officials who would be registering illegal aliens to vote. It grants a safe harbor and says, when you illegally register illegal aliens, you will have no liability. If you care about the integrity of elections, registering millions of illegal aliens to dilute and steal the votes of legal American citizens is exactly the opposite way to go.

Not only that, many States have reasonable restrictions on felons and on criminals voting. What does the ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' do? It strikes all of those down and instead mandates that all felons should be allowed to vote—murderers, rapists, child molesters all allowed to vote because Democrats have made the cynical calculation that if millions of illegal aliens are allowed to vote and millions of criminals and felons are allowed to vote, that those individuals are likely to vote Democrat and Democrats want to stay in power.

The bill also prevents States from correcting voter rolls and from removing people who passed away. You can't go in when someone's dead and say, you know, dead people shouldn't be voting. No, this bill mandates: Leave the dead people on the rolls—another step designed to invite fraud.

Moreover, the ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' is welfare for politicians. This bill is designed to give hundreds of millions of dollars every year to corrupt incumbent politicians to keep them in power. It matches, for contributions under $200, 6 to 1 Federal funds so that the Members of this body would receive, collectively, over a billion dollars in Federal funds to stay in power. That is great if you are a corrupt politician who wants to prevent a challenger from ever defeating you. And if you want to prevent the voters from making a different choice, then you flood

them with Federal funds to make it so you can't beat corrupt incumbents, but that is not what you do if you want to protect the right to vote.

This bill is brazen. It is so brazen that the joke really is admitted in one provision of the bill. The Federal Election Commission was created in the wake of Watergate, designed to protect integrity in our elections. It was, from the beginning, designed to be bipartisan—three Republicans, three Democrats—because Congress recognized that a partisan Federal Election Commission would be deeply injurious to our democracy, that to have a Federal Election Commission with any integrity, it needed to be bipartisan, which means you needed a bipartisan majority to act in order to ensure that neither party weaponizes the Federal election laws.

What does the ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' do? It turns the Federal Election Commission into a partisan body, shifts it from three Republicans and three Democrats to three Democrats and two Republicans. It turns it into an arm of the Democratic Senate Committee, in effect. Nothing in this bill is as cynical as that provision. We are in a 50–50 Senate. We have close elections in this race.

The Presiding Officer is a sophisticated political player. I want you to ask for a second, in a close election, in the weeks before the election, if the Senate majority leader had the ability to launch investigations from the Federal Election Commission, to bring prosecutions from the Federal Election Commission to sue the political opponents of the majority, how much would that invite abuse?

I understand right now Democrats are in power of both Houses of Congress and the White House. Power can be intoxicating. But I do want to point out it wasn't that long ago that the Presiding Officer and I were both in this body—4 years ago—when there was a Republican President and a Republican House and a Republican Senate. You didn't see the Republican majority try anything as brazen as the ''Corrupt Politicians Act.'' You didn't see a Republican majority trying to rig the game, trying to change the rules so that Republicans could never be defeated in the next election. You didn't see the Republican majority trying to turn the Federal Election Commission into a partisan weapon.

I ask you, what level of comfort would you have as an elected Democrat if MITCH MCCONNELL had control of the Federal Election Commission, if it were Republican partisan agents? I think you would be entirely justified in being concerned that it would be used as a political weapon to hurt you. Your last election was a relatively close election. Imagine 2 weeks before the election if a Republican Federal Election Commission had mounted a sweeping investigation in the massive campaign finance violations by the incumbent Senator who happened to be of the party that was out of power. You would rightly feel that it was grotesquely unfair; yet that is what every Senate Democrat just voted to create.

You know, the most pernicious aspect of this bill has been the racial demagoguery that it has invited. We have heard the Senate majority leader invoke, in booming terms, specters from our sorry history of racial discrimination in the past. The Senate majority leader has used the phrase ''Jim Crow 2.0'' repeatedly—as has the President of the United States, as has the Vice President of the United States—deliberately inflaming racial tensions, suggesting that laws, commonsense voter integrity laws in States like Georgia and Texas, things like requiring voter ID or requiring signature verification on absentee ballots, are somehow a modern manifestation of Jim Crow. That is a grotesque lie.

The majority leader knows that. The President of the United States knows that. The Vice President of the United States knows—they know they are lying. But, ironically, they inadvertently said something that is accurate about this piece of legislation. Jim Crow legislation was grotesque and ugly. It was legislation that was drafted, without exception, by Democratic politicians. Jim Crow was written by Democratic politicians, and its purpose, when the Jim Crow laws were written, were to prevent the voters from ever voting out of office Democratic politicians. It is one of the ugliest chapters of our Nation's history. And thankfully, we repudiated Jim Crow.

Well, the majority leader used the phrase ''Jim Crow 2.0,'' and inadvertently, he is right, but not about what he is describing. He is right about the ''Corrupt Politicians Act.'' The ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' follows the exact same pattern that Jim Crow did. It is partisan legislation, written by elected Democrats, designed to keep elected Democrats in office and to steal the right to vote from the citizenry to decide on somebody else. Democracy is too important for that.

And the kind of cynical racial demagoguery that we have seen around this bill, while ignoring the substance of it—and I will point out the media has been eager to ignore the substance of it. The media says: Should we protect the right to vote? Yes, we should protect the right to vote.

This bill takes away your right to vote. This bill is designed to prevent the voters from choosing to throw the bums out—the most fundamental right of any voter to throw the bums out, whether they are one side or the other side. We the people have sovereignty, and this bill, the ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' was designed to take that power from the people and give it to the politicians in Washington.

So today was a victory. It was a victory for the American people. It was a victory for democracy. It was a victory for the Constitution. And it was a victory for the rule of law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1520

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I rise today for the 13th time to call for every Senator to have the opportunity to vote on a commonsense, bipartisan bill, the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act.

This bill would ensure that members of our military would get the justice and the justice system that their sacrifices deserve. We do not have time to delay. I began calling for a floor vote on this bill on May 24. That is 29 days ago. Since then, it is estimated that 1,624 servicemembers will have been raped or sexually assaulted. More will have been victims of other serious crimes.

Many of them will feel that there is no point in even reporting the crime because they have no faith in the current military justice system. That is because right now, if a servicemember reports a crime, the case and their fate will be put into a commander's hands.

This bill argues, instead, that our servicemembers who are victims of serious crimes or who are accused of serious crimes should have those cases reviewed by an impartial, trained, military prosecutor. It does not say that commanders are removed from their responsibility with regard to the military justice system. It doesn't say that commanders are relieved of their responsibility of ensuring good order and discipline. Under this bill, commanders will still have the full array of tools to implement good order and discipline—counseling, restriction, confinement, protective orders, rank reduction, nonjudicial punishment, summary court-martial, and even special court-martial. None of these change under the law.

In addition, under today's system, only 3 percent of commanders have the right to do convening authority for general court-martial. So the truth is, it is a small number of commanders who will be even affected by this legislation. But I can promise you, the view from the servicemembers will be significant because they will now see that if they are someone who has been assaulted or harassed or had any justice need, that the person reviewing the case would be highly trained and unbiased. And if you are a Black or Brown servicemember who is disproportionately punished under the current system, you would know that the decision maker was impartial, unbiased, and highly trained. This change is something that will help both victims of sexual assault and also defendants' rights.

For serious crimes, we need both pieces of this puzzle, and this bill provides both. It will still allow commanders to take the administrative steps to send a message to their troops about what is or is not tolerated, and 97 percent of them have to do that

every day without having convening authority for general court-martial. It will allow for victims and their families to get real justice.

The Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act will deliver the results that our servicemembers and their families deserve without compromising command authority. That is what our allies have said. The UK, Germany, Israel, Australia, the Netherlands, and Canada have all testified to our body in various hearings and various committees that they saw no diminution in command control and no diminution in the ability to prepare and train troops.

The truth is that this is a reform whose time has come, and every minute we delay, we are not standing by our servicemembers. It is a change that has been supported by veterans groups across the country. Whether it is the Iraq and Afghanistan association of veterans, whether it is the Vietnam veterans association, whether it is the Foreign Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars, military veterans support this bill.

This is a change whose time has come, and I request that we have a floor vote to decide this.

Sixty-six Senators on a bipartisan basis support this. The committee has been addressing this issue for 8 years. We have already passed 250 smaller reforms, none of which has had a dent on the problem. It is time to do the reform that survivors have asked for and that veterans organizations support.

I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1520 and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that there be 2 hours for debate equally divided in the usual form; and that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I would like to thank my colleague from New York for her work to move this issue forward. But once again, I would object to the request for the reasons I have previously stated.

In addition, today the ranking member of the committee, Senator INHOFE, released the written views of each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which he had requested on Senator GILLIBRAND's proposed legislation.

I understand that some in our body might discount these views of senior military leadership, and that is their prerogative. But I do believe it is important that their voices be part of the public discourse. They have dedicated their lives to the service of this Nation. They have led troops in combat. They have experienced all of the issues that face commanders and face subordinates. They have a unique, I think, position within the system. In addition, the military will have to implement whatever system Congress devises, and it will require their expertise and skill.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to Senator INHOFE.

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

CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES M. INHOFE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INHOFE: Thank you for your continued support and sincere interest in assessing the impact of proposed legislation on the Armed Forces. As I understand the scope of the ''Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act of 2021,'' the draft bill would remove the commander from decisions for all non-military offenses and felony cases punishable by one year or more, including the following: prohibited activities with military recruits or trainees by a person in position of special trust: wrongful broadcast or distribution of intimate visual images: murder; manslaughter: death or injury of an unborn child; child endangerment; rape and sexual assault; mails: deposit of obscene matter; rape and sexual assault of a child; other sexual misconduct; larceny and wrongful appropriation; fraudulent use or credit cards, debit cards, and other access devices; false pretenses to obtain services; robbery; frauds against the United States; bribery; graft; kidnapping; arson, burning properly with intent to defraud; extortion; aggravated assault; assault with intent to commit murder, voluntary manslaughter, rape, sexual assault, rape of a child, sexual assault of a child, robbery, arson, burglary, or kidnapping; maiming; domestic violence; stalking; perjury; subordination of perjury; obstructing justice; misprision or serious offense; wrongful refusal to testify; prevention or authorized seizure of property; noncompliance with procedural rules; wrongful interference with adverse administrative proceeding; and retaliation,

The Uniform Code of Military Justice exists to provide justice and to maintain good order and discipline, both of which directly contribute to unit cohesion and U.S. military effectiveness in combat. The military is unique in that commanders must maintain good order and discipline in order to successfully perform on the battlefield under the most intense of circumstances. Commanders' orders must have the force or law, and all within his or her unit must acknowledge this authority. With this responsibility to enforce the rule of law comes accountability.

It is my professional opinion that removing commanders from prosecution decisions, process, and accountability may have an adverse effect on readiness, mission accomplishment, good order and discipline, justice, unit cohesion, trust, and loyalty between commanders and those they lead. However, in the specific and limited circumstance of sexual assault, I remain open-minded to all solutions. This is a complex and difficult issue. I urge caution to ensure any changes to commander authority to enforce discipline be rigorously analyzed, evidence-based, and narrow in scope, limited only to sexual assault and related offenses.

As I am sure you are aware, the Secretary of Defense established the Independent Review Commission on Sexual Assault in the Military on February 26, 2021, chartered to address the multiple aspects and factors of this issue. It is my belief we have not made sufficient progress in recent years to eliminate sexual assault, and we have consequently lost the trust and confidence of many Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines, and Guardians in the chain of command's ability to adjudicate these serious crimes. I intend to reserve judgement until I have an opportunity to review the final recommendations of the Independent Review Commission to determine the merits of any such recommendations vis-a-vis proposed legislation currently in the Senate and House of Representatives.

I remain committed to providing you my candid personal views and will do so after I have reviewed the recommendations of the Commission. I look forward to providing you my personal assessment on this matter in the near future.

Sincerely,

MARK A. MILLEY,
General, U.S. Army.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I won't quote from this letter at length now, but I would just point out that the Chiefs are open-minded about changing the way we prosecute sexual assault and harassment within the ranks. So am I. In fact, I think that is something that I hope becomes clear in our progress legislatively moving forward. But they nevertheless stress the importance of ensuring that any change Congress enacts must be carefully tailored to address the problems we are trying to solve, and the critical problem we are trying to solve is sexual assault, sexual harassment, any kind of crime dealing with sexual misconduct.

In addition, adequate time and resources must be afforded for implementing any of the changes that we propose. The nature and the magnitude of change we are contemplating here is complex; we have to make sure we do this right.

Further, we have heard over the past few years from the leadership of the military service Judge Advocate Generals' Corps, who have uniformly opposed these changes in nature and scope. These are the military lawyers, the very military justice experts to whom this bill would invest authority currently reserved to commanders. I believe we should listen to them as well and move prudently and deliberately to address the problem at hand.

So, as I have said a number of times already, I intend to include the administration's recommendations that derive from the President's Independent Review Commission in the markup of the Defense bill, subject to amendment, not to move the bill on the floor without the chance for my colleagues in the committee to have their voices heard. These ladies and gentlemen have dedicated themselves to military policy for many years. They are experts in different dimensions of this issue, and they will add significantly to the debate.

To simply take a bill and send to it the floor without amendments I think is not the way to proceed. I anticipate a bill that will be strengthened through debate and discussion and deliberation by the committee.

With that, I would reiterate my objection to Senator GILLIBRAND's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I disagree with the chairman because the service chiefs and commanders for the last 8 years have objected to any serious reform. In fact, they have said time and again ''Trust us. Trust us. We will get this right'' and have objected to any major reform.

In fact, that is what they did anytime we tried to reform the military—they objected on the same basis, using the same words, when we tried to repeal don't ask, don't tell. They objected in the same way when we tried to allow women to get credit for being in combat. They objected in the same way when we integrated the military.

So to hear these objections over and over again after the committee has studied this issue for 8 years and allowed 250 reforms to be put into the NDAA—all of which were OK by the DOD—just flies in the face of reality.

The military has demanded sole responsibility of these cases for the 8 years that I have worked on this issue, and have they dented the problem? No. Sexual assaults were estimated at 20,000 by the military last they counted. Has the rate of cases going to trial increased? No. Has the rate of cases that have ended in conviction increased? No. So under no measurable has the DOD got a handle on this.

For the chairman to say it has to go through the committee, this issue has been going through the committee for 8 years. In fact, when I passed bipartisan reform with people like Senator JONI ERNST on the safe to report language, it was taken out in conference by the same DOD staff who didn't want it in there in the first place.

So under the chairman's view, this bill could certainly go through committee. We have more than half of the members. But I promise you, it will be watered down or taken out in conference because the chairman and the ranking member are against it, and they have the authority to do so. So he is not offering a fair process.

The fact that this bill has 66 cosponsors—how many bills in America, in this body, have the support of TED CRUZ and LIZ WARREN, of MITCH MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER? None. This is the kind of bipartisan bill that this country is yearning for, the kind of commonsense reform that can protect servicemembers.

While the chairman is so interested in supporting what the generals and the admirals and the top commanders want, why does he not listen to the servicemembers themselves, to the people who have suffered sexual assault, to the people who have suffered racial bias in prosecution? Those are the people he should be listening to, not the top brass.

We have deferred to them the entire 10 years I have been on this committee, and in the entire 10 years, our committee has failed. It is time to bring this bill to the floor.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, just a short time ago on this Senate floor, we witnessed a low point for this body. We witnessed every Republican Senator voting against moving forward to consider legislation to strengthen our democracy. We witnessed all 50 Republican Senators voting to block consideration of the For the People Act.

I don't know why people are afraid of debating this issue, which is so fundamental to our country at this particular point in time. This bill, the For the People Act, has many important provisions. One of them, of course, is to establish minimum national standards, to make sure that every eligible American voter can access the ballot box. That should be something we all want. We should want every American eligible to vote to be out there exercising his or her right to vote, to participate in the decision making in our democracy. And yet not a single Republican Senator voted to proceed with that debate, even though this bill is more important now than ever before because we see, as we speak, Republican State legislatures, in so many places around our country, voting to erect barriers to the ballot box.

We see this in State after State, a pure partisan power play to rig the rules, to win elections by subtraction—not to win elections through the hurly-burly debate over the issues of the day, not to win elections by talking about the agenda that somebody is advocating and why someone should vote for a particular candidate. That is the way it is supposed to be. But these are legislatures that are putting up barriers to make it harder for people to access the ballot and specifically designing these barriers to try to limit participation by people of color and by younger voters.

We saw that even before the aftermath of this election. We saw it in the aftermath of the Supreme Court decision in Shelby v. Holder. We saw Texas and North Carolina and other States adopting these kind of restrictive voting laws. You don't have to take my word for it; the U.S. courts took a look at the North Carolina law that was passed a number of years ago and said that they targeted African-American voters with ''surgical precision'' to try to keep them from accessing the voting booth, and that is exactly the kind of thing that is going on now in State after State around the country: trying to win, not by the addition and multiplication of democracy, but by subtraction and by division.

And so why are these States doing this at this moment? They are doing it because of the Big Lie that was perpetrated in the aftermath of our Presidential election, a lie that the former President persists in spewing and repeating to this very moment, the lie that he was somehow cheated or robbed out of an election that led to the attack on this Capitol on January 6.

It is that lie that is giving rise to these actions in State legislatures. It is that lie that sadly led this body just a short while ago to block consideration of a bill to establish a commission to look at what happened on January 6. That bill, too, was filibustered just like this one, in order to prevent the American people from getting to the bottom of the Big Lie. Republican Senators blocked that, too. They don't want the country to know, and they are perfectly happy to allow all these State legislatures to put up barriers to voting as part of that Big Lie narrative.

And we know it is a big lie for so many reasons. Of course, President Trump and his campaign took their claims to courts throughout the country. Over 60 courts said those were ridiculous claims. President Trump's own Justice Department and his Attorney General, former Attorney General Barr, before he stepped down, said there was no wrongdoing in this election that would change any kind of outcome.

The President's point person at the Department of Homeland Security, responsible for monitoring the integrity of elections, has testified before Congress and said very clearly that the 2020 Presidential election was the most secure election in American history—most secure in American history. That is from the person in charge of election integrity in President Trump's own administration.

So why are all these States enacting these barriers to voting after an election that the Trump Homeland Security Department said was the most secure in history? It is because so many people turned out and voted in that secure election and they didn't like the outcome.

So when you don't like the outcome in elections, instead of taking your case to the American people and saying, Vote for us next time because here is our agenda for the country, here is what we are going to do—instead, they decided they are going to try to win by putting up barriers to try to prevent those large turnouts, especially from people of color, and we saw younger voters come out in 2020.

So the decision to block this bill from debate is just a continuation of protecting the Big Lie. It is a continuation of protecting the Big Lie that is being fueled around the country by Donald Trump's continuous fraudulent claims, which unfortunately have seized the Republican Party.

We saw what happened in the House of Representatives. LIZ CHENEY, a stalwart conservative, ousted from her leadership position because she didn't pay homage to the former President. That is what is going on here. That is what is going on in the House, and that is what is reflected in this vote today, the refusal to even debate a bill to strengthen our democracy. Come to the floor, tell us what you don't like, tell us what you want to do. Do you really believe that what these State legislatures are doing is a good thing for our democracy?

I know it is easier not to have to talk about that, easier to ignore that, but we are not going to let this issue go away. We are going to be here week after week to make sure that we continue to push this For the People Act.

Now, in addition to the provisions to establish minimal protections so every eligible voter can access the voting booth, the For the People Act also has a number of very important provisions that are overwhelmingly popular with the American people. One of them is the incorporation of what is known as the DISCLOSE Act.

The DISCLOSE Act does a very simple thing: It gets rid of secret corporate money being plowed into our elections through these secret super PACs. You know what happened after the decision in Citizens United were two things. One, corporate money could flow in unlimited amounts into elections, but the Supreme Court at the time said: You can at least be aware of who is spending this money if you pass laws to make sure it is transparent.

In fact, a lot of the Justices who voted to overturn the Citizens United—excuse me, voted to allow corporate money in politics, who were the majority in Citizens United, have also said in that same opinion that they essentially expected Congress to enact laws to ensure transparency.

In fact, eight of the nine Supreme Court Justices in that case took that position. Yet the Republican leader, who in the early 2000s called for more transparency when it came to money being spent in elections, is taking the opposite idea: We don't want the public to know who is spending all that money. We want it to be secret.

I think most of us would agree and I know the American public agrees that they have a right to know who is spending millions and millions of dollars to try to influence their votes. We know that because survey after survey shows that Republicans, Democrats, and Independents all agree that they should know who is spending all of this dark money.

When you see a TV commercial that says, ''Paid for by the Committee for America,'' you should know who is financing that ad to try to influence your vote. It is a very simple principle. Voters have a right to know. It was a principle agreed to by conservative jurists like Justice Scalia. And yet the position of the Republican Senators today was: We don't even want to talk about that. We don't even want to debate that provision.

By the way, that provision, the DISCLOSE Act, passed the House back in 2010, and it came here to the U.S. Senate, and the Senate version of the DISCLOSE Act was debated on this Senate floor, and 59 Senators at that time voted to proceed with the bill.

You might say: 59 Senators, that is the majority; why didn't it pass? Because of the filibuster rule. They needed 60. And 59 Senators said: We want disclosure. And 59 Senators said: Get rid of secret money. But because of the filibuster rule, it didn't pass. It couldn't get to final passage on a simple majority.

If that had passed back in 2010, we wouldn't have our airwaves flooded with secret money today. We would have done what the American people wanted. The DISCLOSE Act is in this bill now, and once again, 11 years later, Republican Senators are filibustering the bill for the DISCLOSE Act.

They don't want the American people to know who is spending all of that money, mostly corporate money, flowing underground under the radar screen through our political system to try to elect candidates of the choice of whatever special interests are spending that money. They don't want you to know who they are, who is spending all that money to elect people. So why don't we all agree we are going to get rid of secret money? Apparently, we don't even want to debate that.

Another provision that is universally popular with the American people is the idea that we should have nationwide nonpartisan congressional districting. Let's draw congressional districts not based on politics but based on some nonpartisan criteria.

I think we all heard the line that it should not be the case that politicians are picking the voters. Voters should pick their elected officials. These days, people can draw congressional district maps with incredible precision with the use of computers. You can literally try and draw a congressional district designed to get exactly the electorate they want.

I don't think that is the way the Founders expected it to end up working, to get a computer that could draw these districts with that kind of precision and accuracy. And so one of the other important provisions in the For the People Act is, Let's draw congressional districts so that, we, the people, can make these decisions without the lines having been drawn to predetermine the outcome. That is also in this bill.

It also has some other important provisions that I support to try to reduce the impact and influence of big money contributors to allow people with lesser means to be able to contribute to elections and have some element of public financing so that the system is more geared toward the public interest than relying exclusively on the private big contributions. That is another provision that is in the For the People Act.

Some people may disagree with that. Come to the floor, debate it, offer an amendment to get rid of it, let's vote. But what we saw today was a refusal to engage in the democratic process of debate in consideration of a bill. They used this provision, the filibuster provision, to block a bill to help protect and strengthen our democracy, and that is a sad and shameful day in the U.S. Senate.

But I am going to end with this. This issue is not going away. I was glad to see that even as every Republican Senator voted no, every Democratic Senator united together to say, We stand for the idea that we should have some minimal national standards for access to the ballot booth to protect our democracy and that we should get rid of secret money in politics.

Every Democrat said, Let's proceed to debate a bill that has those important provisions in it. And so we are not going away. This is a vote that may be a temporary setback, but it is my strong view that, at the end of the day, democracy will prevail in the sense that it will be strengthened and that the American people are not going to stand for a process that reinforces the Big Lie that was perpetrated on this country.

And so the good news—the good news, as I said, is every Democratic Senator said yes to moving forward, and we will find a way to get this done. We will find a way to protect our democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

RECOGNIZING JULY 1, 2021, AS THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 282, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 282) recognizing July 1, 2021, as the 100th anniversary of the Government Accountability Office and commending the service of the Government Accountability Office to Congress and the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 282) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AMENDING THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2184 introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2184) to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to institute a trading prohibition for certain issuers that retain public accounting firms that have not been subject to inspection by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, 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. 2184) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 2184

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

SECTION 1. TRADING PROHIBITION FOR 2 CONSECUTIVE NON-INSPECTION YEARS.

Section 104(i) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7214(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A)(ii), by striking ''the foreign jurisdiction described in clause (i)'' and inserting ''a foreign jurisdiction''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''3'' and inserting ''2''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''3'' and inserting ''2''.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1251

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader following consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 74, S. 1251; that the only amendments in order be the following: Lee amendment No. 2119.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that there be 2 hours for debate equally divided on the bill; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the Lee amendment; that the bill be considered read a third time; the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 115.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ali Nouri, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs).

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate, and if confirmed, the motion 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 nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

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

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

NOMINATION OF KENNETH ALLEN POLITE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request relating to the nomination of Kenneth Allen Polite to be an Assistant Attorney General at the Department of Justice, PN423.

Last week, at the Senate Judiciary Committee's Executive Business Meeting, I noted my intent to object to Mr. Polite's confirmation not on the basis of his credentials—I happen to find him well qualified for the position—but on the basis of the Justice Department's failure to respond to congressional oversight requests.

To date, the Justice Department has failed to provide a full and complete response to any of my oversight requests.

As one of many examples, on February 3, 2021, and March 9, 2021, Senator JOHNSON and I requested information from the Justice Department relating to Nicholas McQuaid. Mr. McQuaid is Acting Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, the position Mr. Polite will hold upon confirmation. In those letters, we raised concerns about potential conflicts of interest in light of the fact that Mr. McQuaid was employed at Latham & Watkins until January 20, 2021, and worked with Christopher Clark, whom Hunter Biden reportedly hired to work on his Federal criminal case.

This arrangement presents a potential conflict of interest. A core function of congressional oversight is to ensure that governmental Departments and Agencies are free of conflicts of interest. That is especially so with the Justice Department and FBI. If conflicts infect them, those investigations and prosecutions—the very purpose of the Department's existence—could be undermined.

As a part of my oversight, I have requested a recusal memo for Mr. McQuaid. I have also requested to know, as a threshold issue, whether one even exists.

Attorney General Garland has failed to answer and provide the requested records. I have noted to the Department that in 2016 I received from the Department Andrew McCabe's recusal memo to illustrate precedent exists for such a production to Congress. Still, the Justice Department refuses to provide the same for Mr. McQuaid.

There is nothing more eroding of public faith than an unresponsive executive branch that believes it only answers to the President and not the U.S. Congress and, perhaps most importantly, ''we the people.''

This administration's continued ongoing and blatant lack of cooperation has forced my hand. Thus, unfortunately, I must object to any consideration of this nomination. My objection is not intended to question the credentials of Mr. Polite in any way. The executive branch must recognize that it has an ongoing obligation to respond to congressional inquiries in a timely and reasonable manner.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BAPTIST HEALTH

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Baptist Health of Arkansas's centennial—a significant and commendable milestone.

Today, Arkansans are gathering to celebrate this institution and its staff that have been dedicated to providing exceptional faith-based healthcare to its patients, strengthening communities through compassionate service, and continuously responding to the ever-changing health needs of Arkansans.

On February 16, 1921, the Arkansas Baptist State Convention incorporated Baptist State Hospital to ensure Arkansans had access to quality, faith-

based healthcare. Baptist Health started with a mere 70 beds and in just 1 year more than tripled that number, administering care to more than 300 patients. The hospital's humble beginnings show the diligence of the men and women who, through intense devotion, made this organization what it is today.

The dedication of Baptist Health's providers is a testament to this healing ministry's service and commitment to its patients. For 100 years patients from across the State, Nation and world have relied on the hospital's incredible doctors, nurses and staff to perform lifesaving treatments and surgeries.

This institution has served the State of Arkansas in numerous ways, from creating thousands of jobs to supporting the State economy and saving the lives of countless patients. Baptist Health has created reliable medical service across the State and helped many medical professionals in their educations and careers.

Baptist Health has been a leader in medical advancement in Arkansas, and its community of medical professionals have made tremendous sacrifices to serve and care for patients. Their dedication has been apparent during the COVID–19 public health crisis. This devotion to its mission has made Baptist Health Arkansas's largest and most comprehensive not-for profit healthcare organization. From the doctors and nurses to the office workers and maintenance staff, each member of the team demonstrates a passion for helping and healing.

Congratulations to Baptist Health on 100 years of service and dedication to helping Arkansans live long and healthy lives. I look forward to its continued excellence in healthcare for our State for many more years.●

REMEMBERING EMMANUEL LARRYN SLACK

● Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, Emmanuel Larryn Slack, age 17, entered into eternal rest on Friday, June 4, 2021, at Oschner LSU Hospital in Shreveport, LA. Emmanuel was born on January 18, 2004, to Melvin G. Slack, Jr., and Bridgette L. Wililams in Shreveport, LA. While attending Union Spring Baptist Church under the leadership of Pastor Roosevelt Seaberry, he was an active member of the youth choir and the drill team. Upon changing residences, he later accepted the Lord Jesus Christ as his Savior under the leadership of Pastor Joey Ketchum at the Western Hills Baptist Church. He was a faithful and active member in the ministry. Gifted with reaching young people, he became active with Bible studies, Vacation Bible School, and Youth Group activities under both leaders. Emmanuel attended Huntington High School, where he was a member of the Yearbook club and participated in JROTC. When thinking of career choices, he was originally certain he wanted to be a police officer or an FBI agent, but it was after he took an interest in politics and the Republican Party that he began to thrive. He became active with the Texas Young Republicans and Republican Women of Bossier, where he expressed his beliefs in American individualism, rule of law, the Constitution, and the Holy Bible, which guided him to greatness and continual self-improvement. Emmanuel expressed his views across Louisiana and Texas lines and considered himself to be bipartisan, a conservative Republican, a proud soon-to-be Texan, upholding traditional values like bravery, courage, leadership, and principle, and above all, a follower of Christ. Emmanuel was actively working on an internship with Rhonda Anderson of Longview, TX. He was embraced by Governor Greg Abbott's office; Tarrant County Young Republicans of Fort Worth, TX; attorney general of Louisiana Jeff Landry's office; Caddo Parish Commissioner Jim Taliaferro; Commissioner Mario Chavez of District 10; Congressman MIKE JOHNSON of the Fourth District of Louisiana; Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana Billy Nungesser; Republican Women of Bossier; and Ouachita Parish Republican Women. His hope was to become a Governor, Senator, or President.

Preceding Emmanuel in death were his maternal grandmother Marel D. Williams, grandfather Larry N. Williams, Sr., and paternal grandfather Melvin Slack, Sr., a veteran of the U.S. Marine Corps. He leaves to celebrate his life parents Bridgette L. Williams and Melvin G. Slack, Jr.; paternal grandmother Jackie Spivey Slack; brothers Triston M. Williams, Nehemiah C. Slack, and Melvin Slack III; sisters De'Angelique Slack and Jasmine Slack; Godparents Tamra P. Thompson, Michael Pennywell; Pastor Handy Giles and First Lady Charlene Giles; aunt Yolanda Y. Williams-Brown; uncle Larry N. Williams, Jr.; special friends Mario Chavez, Jenna Marie Kimball, Tayler Davis, Clayton Quinn, Parker Ward, and Whitney Scates; mentors, Christ Henry and Joshua Harvey; as well as several uncles, aunts, and loving cousins.●

RECOGNIZING THE INTERNATIONAL FALLS JOURNAL

● Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, today I rise to honor and pay tribute to the International Falls Journal, the local newspaper of the International Falls and Koochiching County communities that has provided timely, trustworthy, and thorough reporting to Minnesotans for the past 110 years. On June 24, 2021, the International Falls Journal will sadly publish its final edition.

Founded in 1911 by Clarence Burton Montgomery as The Daily Journal, the then-daily paper has been a community staple since its start, informing locals of who was born and who died, local business news, and what happened at city council and school board meetings. Through different disasters and crises, The Journal made sure they delivered the news to their readers. In 1988, a fire ripped through its office on a Friday night, claiming most of the building and everything inside, including the paper's equipment. Still, that Monday and for weeks following the fire while the outlet was without printers, the paper was published as planned. This was 38 years after the great flood of 1950, when—you guessed it—the paper still ended up on their readers' doorsteps despite the unprecedented circumstance.

The paper went through several owners before landing in the hands of Arlin Albrecht and Phil Duff, The Journal's current publishers, who purchased the paper in 1974.

Regardless of ownership, locals have always been able to count on The Journal. International Falls Area Chamber of Commerce President Tricia Heibel said it well: ''From births, deaths, marriages, school events and sporting highlights, from lost pets to everything else, it was just a really central communication tool.''

As the daughter of a newspaperman, I grew up knowing just how important local newspapers like the International Falls Journal are. In fact, it is thanks to the presence of a local newspaper—the Duluth Herald—in my dad's childhood home that my grandmother spotted his interest in storytelling when he was just 12. Local papers played an irreplaceable role in my father's life, as they continue to today for countless readers.

But today, newspapers of all sizes are struggling and closing. Ad revenue for U.S. newspapers plummeted from $49.4 billion in 2005 to $14.3 billion in 2018. During that time, two other companies, Facebook and Google—worth over $2.4 trillion combined—became advertising titans. These two companies don't just control the majority of online advertising; they have built power over the news and crushed local news outlets along the way.

With the closure of The Journal, we are once again seeing the impacts of this firsthand. We can't stand by and watch this happen to our independent press. That is why I have introduced bipartisan legislation to let news publishers join together to negotiate fair terms with these giant digital corporations. We must give independent papers the chance to compete.

But even as we work to ensure other papers are able to keep their lights on, the International Falls Journal is a reminder of the value of local journalism. For more than a century, it has empowered its readers by providing them with accurate, relevant information about their communities. It has captured moments big and small that together tell a beautiful story of the region that will live on.

Even as it closes its doors, generations will benefit from the legacy it leaves behind.●

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

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.)

PRIVILEGED NOMINATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On request by Senator CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee the Judiciary: Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Brian Allen Benczkowski.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1225. A communication from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rural Innovation Stronger Economy (RISE) Grant Program'' (RIN0570–AB06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1226. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Purpureocillium lilacinum strain PL11; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 10023–91–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1227. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tolfenpyrad; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 10024–51–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1228. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals relative to the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1229. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, with respect to North Korea; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1230. A communication from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final rule adding new part 525, the Burma Sanctions Regulations, to 31 C.F.R. chapter V'' (31 CFR Part 525) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1231. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in Hong Kong that was declared in Executive Order 13936 of July 14, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1232. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the International Criminal Court that was declared in Executive Order 13928 of June 11, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1233. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Examinations for Risks to Active-Duty Servicemembers and Their Covered Dependents'' (12 CFR Chapter 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1234. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule on Standards for Business Practices and Communication Protocols for Public Utilities'' ((RIN1902–AF72) (Docket Nos. RM05–5–029 and RM05–5–030)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1235. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2021'' (RIN3150–AK24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1236. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; California; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District'' (FRL No. 10024–56–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1237. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Multi-Pollutant Standards Rule, Control of Emissions from Large Combustion Sources'' (FRL No. 10024–92–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1238. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Iowa; State Implementation Plan and State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants'' (FRL No. 10024–99–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1239. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Nebraska; Revisions to Title 129 of the Nebraska Administrative Code; Chapter 39 Visible Emissions from Diesel-powered Motor Vehicles'' (FRL No. 10025–00–Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1240. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Monitoring requirements'' (FRL No. 10024–84–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1241. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Quality Implementation Plan; California; Mendocino County Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits'' (FRL No. 10024–19–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1242. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''State of Michigan Underground Injection Control (UIC) Class II Program; Primacy Approval'' (FRL No. 10023–18–OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1243. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Arizona; Stationary Sources; New Source Review Updates'' (FRL No. 10024–21–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1244. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; Definitions of emergency and emergency engine'' (FRL No. 10024–87–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1245. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Volatile Organic Material Definition Update'' (FRL No. 10024–89–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1246. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Emissions Reporting Rule'' (FRL No. 10024–93–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1247. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Part 9 Miscellaneous Rule'' (FRL No. 10024–97–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21,

2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1248. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Lead'' (FRL No. 10024–91–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1249. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Improvements for Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Test Procedures, and other Technical Amendments'' (FRL No. 10018–52–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1250. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Lead and Copper Rule Revisions; Delay of Effective and Compliance Dates'' (FRL No. 10024–33–OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1251. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Nevada: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions'' (FRL No. 10024–12–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1252. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rescission of the Source-Specific Federal Implementation Plan for Navajo Generating Station, Navajo Nation'' (FRL No. 10024–15–Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1253. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2020 report of the Federal Coordinated Health Care Office; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1254. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1255. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2021–0071 - 2021–0075); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1256. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's annual report concerning military assistance and military exports; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1257. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, fifty-two (52) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of State, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1258. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Milk and Cream Products and Yogurt Products; Final Rule to Revoke the Standards for Lowfat Yogurt and Nonfat Yogurt and to Amend the Standard for Yogurt'' (RIN0910–AI40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1259. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2021–06, Introduction'' (FAC 2021–06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1260. A communication from the Principal Deputy Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''System Review Report''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1261. A communication from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Performance Plan for fiscal years 2020–2022, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal years 2020–2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1262. A communication from the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report for the period from October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1263. A communication from the Section Chief of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Lasmiditan in Schedule V'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–558)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1264. A communication from the Section Chief of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Serdexmethylphenidate in Schedule IV'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–808)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1265. A communication from the Section Chief of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Oliceridine in Schedule II'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–715)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1266. A communication from the Section Chief of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Four Specific Fentanyl-Related Substances in Schedule I'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–806)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1267. A communication from the Section Chief of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of NM2201, 5F-AB-PINACA, 4-CN-CUMYL-BUTINACA, MMB-CHMICA, and 5F-CUMYL-P7AICA in Schedule I'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–479)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1268. A communication from the Section Chief of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Remimazolam in Schedule IV'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–658)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1269. A communication from the Section Chief of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Removal of Samidorphan From Control'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–665)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1270. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Annual Report for fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1271. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Office of Economics and Analytics, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Auction of Flexible-Use Service Licenses in the 3.45–3.55 GHz Band; Notice and Filing Requirements, Minimum Opening Bids, Upfront Payments, and Other Procedures for Auction 110; Bidding in Auction 110 Scheduled to Begin October 5, 2021 (Auction 110 Procedures Public Notice)'' (AU Docket No. 21–62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1272. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rates for Interstate Inmate Calling Services'' ((WC Docket No. 12–375) (FCC 21–60)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 21, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Ely Stefansky Ratner, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Shawn Graham Skelly, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Meredith Berger, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

*Gina Maria Ortiz Jones, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

*Caroline Diane Krass, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Robert T. Clark and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Theodore P. LeClair, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2021.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Eileen H. Laubacher, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. David R. Storr, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Michael J. Schwerin, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Bradley D. Dunham and ending with Capt. Douglas W. Sasse III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 27, 2021.

Navy nomination of Capt. Dennis E. Collins, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Army nominations beginning with Col. Alison C. Martin and ending with Col. George R. Smawley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 27, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Eugene D. Cox and ending with Col. Deydre S. Teyhen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 27, 2021.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Jonathan P. Braga, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Antonio A. Aguto, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Stuart W. Risch, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. David J. Furness, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Matthew G. Glavy, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Paul A. Chamberlain, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Haldane B. Lamberton, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Joseph A. Dinonno, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Michael N. Adame and ending with Brig. Gen. Timothy J. Winslow, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Robert A. Boyette and ending with Brig. Gen. Jimmie L. Cole, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Michael J. Garshak, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Damian K. Waddell, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Mark G. Alessia, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Rose P. Keravuori, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Mark T. Simerly, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Christopher A. Holland and ending with Col. Chad E. Stone, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Derek L. Adams and ending with Col. Matthew S. Woodruff, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. William R. Merz, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Francis D. Morley, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Edwin J. Deedrick, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

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

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

Air Force nomination of Whit A. Collins, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Timothy E. Holland, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Karl J. Vogel, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Nicholas R. Reynolds, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Jeannette M. Watterson, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Jason O. Allen, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Connie Irene Armstrong and ending with Kevin S. Yokley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Ramie K. Barfuss and ending with Dentonio Worrell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 12, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Eric P. Ahnfeldt and ending with D016011, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 12, 2021.

Army nomination of Christopher A. Blanco, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Curt C. Lane, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with David P. Curlin and ending with Ernest P. West, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 25, 2021.

Army nomination of Michael R. Bean, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Daniel J. Meyers, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of James M. McKnight III, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Craig P. Lanigan, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Lisa M. Kopczynski, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Toby J. Alkire and ending with Joe E. Murdock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 25, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Jeremy C. Abrams and ending with Brigitta Woodcox, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 25, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Donna M. Alexander and ending with Charles S. Zakhem, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 25, 2021.

Army nomination of Anthony C. Bonfiglio, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with David A. Acosta and ending with Meago H. Y. Yuotang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 25, 2021.

Army nomination of David R. Evans, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Nicollette A. Dennis, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Waldo D. Galan, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Roger W. Dodson, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Chase D. Crabtree and ending with Travis H. Owen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Army nomination of Donald A. Vacha, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Michael E. Lane, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Timothy J. Redhair, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Bryce E. Livingston and ending with Gregory K. Persley, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Maria I. Bruton and ending with Young J. Yauger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Ryan S. Bible and ending with Jason C. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Avery J. Carney and ending with Christopher C. Pase, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Army nominations beginning with Robin L. Burke and ending with Justin R. Schlanser, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Army nomination of Brenton A. Arihood, to be Major.

Army nomination of Tracy R. Norman, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Anthony N. Sama, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Joseph L. Gill II, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Jaclyn N. Urso, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Paul J. Goguen, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Benjamin E. Barr, to be Major.

Navy nominations beginning with Patricia H. Ajoy and ending with Wade C. Thames, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Robin C. Cherrett and ending with Mike E. Svatek, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Joseph B. Harrison II and ending with Brian L. Schulz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Taylor R. Forester and ending with Danielle S. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with David B. Damato and ending with Anthony J. Toriello, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Roy L. Henkle and ending with Eric T. Ruiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Steven J. Dwyer and ending with Randy R. Reid, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Thomas P. Abbott and ending with Stephen V. Yenias, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Daniele Braham and ending with Richard E. Schmitt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Shawn G. Gallaher and ending with Julie A. Spencer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael P. Aiena and ending with Tyrone Y. Voughs, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Josh A. Cassada and ending with John L. Young III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin D. Bittle and ending with Michael P. Mulhern, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Jodie K. Cornell and ending with Joshua A. Frey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey N. Dugard and ending with Marvin D. Harris, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Kenneth O. Allison, Jr. and ending with Omar G. Martinez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2021.

Navy nomination of Anne C. Mooser, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Kelly L. Byrne and ending with Nicolaas A. Verhoeven, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with John A. Allen and ending with Bradley J. Williford, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Jordan M. Adler and ending with Brian P. Worden, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Kyle C. Bachman and ending with Michael B. Zimet, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nomination of Ashley S. M. McAbee, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Antonio Barcelos, Jr. and ending with Alfred J. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher M. Anctil and ending with Alan W. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Jemar R. Ballesteros and ending with Emily K. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Marco A. Acosta and ending with John G. Zilai, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Sung H. Ahn and ending with Jon M. Washko, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Drew R. Barker and ending with Kristen S. Whitesell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Miguel A. Bernal, Jr. and ending with Phillip A. Zamarripa, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard S. Chernitzer and ending with Russell P. Wolfkiel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Jason K. Bruce and ending with Troy M. Willman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Sylvester C. Adamah and ending with Matthew T. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nomination of Patrick L. German, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Andrew S. Foor, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Kevin M. Bacon, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Abdeslam Bousalham and ending with Charles S. White, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Chabonnie R. Alexander and ending with Jerry R. Tofte, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael J. Arnold and ending with Tamara J. Worlton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Casey J. Burns and ending with Kirstin C. Wier, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Timothy D. Barnes and ending with Jacqueline P. Vanmoerkerque, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Derek Butler and ending with Brent E. Troyan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Accursia A. Baldassano and ending with Jacqueline R. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Anthony P. Bannister and ending with Michael R. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Navy nominations beginning with Jennifer D. Bowden and ending with David A. Stroud, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Space Force nominations beginning with Heather J. Anderson and ending with Craig M. Zinck, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 25, 2021.

Space Force nominations beginning with Edward G. Ferguson and ending with Kimberly A. Templer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

Space Force nominations beginning with James J. Watson and ending with Lincoln K. Miller, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15, 2021.

By Mr. WARNER for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

*Christine Abizaid, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(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. COTTON:

S. 2156. A bill to eliminate the disparity in sentencing for cocaine offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2157. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Center for Mental Health Services of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, to award grants to implement innovative approaches to securing prompt access to appropriate follow-on care for individuals who experience an acute mental health episode and present for care in an emergency department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2158. A bill to extend the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2159. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 400 College Drive, Middleburg, Florida, as the ''Andrew K. Baker Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2160. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of General Services from establishing per diem reimbursements rates for travel within the continental United States (commonly known as ''CONUS'') for certain fiscal years below a certain level, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. LEE, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 2161. A bill to modify the restriction in section 3326 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the appointment of retired members of the Armed Forces to positions in the Department of Defense to apply to positions at or above the GS–14 level; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2162. A bill to require the Small Business Administration to publish loan default rates by franchise brand, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2163. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a plan to reduce the backlog of requests for information made to the Department of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RISCH, Ms. ERNST, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2164. A bill to provide for certain reforms with respect to the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SASSE (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 2165. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow parents of eligible military dependent children to establish Military Education Savings Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 2166. A bill to provide that certain orders of the Federal Communications Commission shall have no force or effect until certain conditions are satisfied, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 2167. A bill to establish a national, research-based, and comprehensive home study assessment process for the evaluation of prospective foster parents and adoptive parents and provide funding to States and Indian tribes to adopt such process; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2168. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to modify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2169. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a grant program relating to the removal of firearms from adjudicated domestic violence offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 2170. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to provide for transparency and landowner protections in the conduct of lease sales under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 2171. A bill to prohibit Presidential appointees from subsequently acting on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of China, the Chinese Communist Party, and Chinese military companies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 2172. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve grants, payments, and technical assistance provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to serve homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COTTON, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2173. A bill to permit Centers for Disease Control and Prevention-recognized virtual diabetes prevention program suppliers to be included in the Medicare Diabetes Prevention Program Expanded Model conducted by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation under section 1115A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315a); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 2174. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the annual wellness visit under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 2175. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of preventive home visits under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 2176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that floor plan financing includes the financing of certain trailers and campers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 2177. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to ensure sufficient bonding and complete and timely reclamation of land and water disturbed by Federal and Indian oil and gas production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2178. A bill to provide collective bargaining rights for fire fighters and emergency medical services personnel employed by States or their political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2179. A bill to provide grants to owners of intergenerational dwelling units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2180. 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. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2181. A bill to amend the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act to authorize the Elder Justice Initiative, to require that online resources of such initiative are made available in Spanish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2182. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a national evictions database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2183. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the financing for the Hazardous Substance Superfund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2184. A bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to institute a trading prohibition for certain issuers that retain public accounting firms that have not been subject to inspection by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 281. A resolution recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health and its critical role in America's biomedical research strategy by advancing biomedical research and the mission of the National Institutes of Health, the world's premier biomedical research agency; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. Res. 282. A resolution recognizing July 1, 2021, as the 100th anniversary of the Government Accountability Office and commending the service of the Government Accountability Office to Congress and the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 75

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) 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. 150

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 150, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the inclusion of certain audio-only diagnoses in the determination of risk adjustment for Medicare Advantage plans, and for other purposes.

S. 189

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 189, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for annual cost-of-living adjustments to be made automatically by law each year in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 198

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps.

S. 346

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) 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. 452

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 452, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 456

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 456, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 464

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 464, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 753

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to reauthorize the Highlands Conservation Act, to authorize States to use funds from that Act for administrative purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 773

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 773, a bill to enable certain hospitals that were participating in or applied for the drug discount program under section 340B of the Public Health Service Act prior to the COVID–19 public health emergency to temporarily maintain eligibility for such program, and for other purposes.

S. 1031

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1031, a bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on disparities associated with race and ethnicity with respect to certain benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1041

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1041, a bill to advance the strategic alignment of United States diplomatic tools toward the realization of free, fair, and transparent elections in Nicaragua and to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to protect the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of Nicaragua, and for other purposes.

S. 1125

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes.

S. 1134

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 1134, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick ''Roddie'' Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 1210

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1220

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1220, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1315

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1315, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items under the Medicare program.

S. 1530

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1530, a bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to make breakfasts and lunches free for all children, and for other purposes.

S. 1600

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1600, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to make modifications to the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1641

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1641, a bill to prohibit rescinding the recognition of Israel's sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

S. 1644

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1644, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a time-limited provisional approval pathway, subject to specific obligations, for certain drugs and biological products, and for other purposes.

S. 1777

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1777, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to codify the Trump administration rule on reporting requirements of exempt organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 1819

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1819, a bill to support State, Tribal, and local efforts to remove access to firearms from individuals who are a danger to themselves or others pursuant to court orders for this purpose.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1856, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and stability of the transportation security workforce by applying the personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1893

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1893, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to support rural residency training funding that is equitable for all States, and for other purposes.

S. 1904

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1904, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 1909

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was withdrawn as a

cosponsor 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. 1934

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1934, a bill to improve public trust in the Federal Government by establishing customer experience as a central measure of performance for agencies and the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 1972

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1972, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve dependent coverage under the TRICARE Young Adult Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2050

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2050, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove silencers from the definition of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2084

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2084, a bill to terminate the order requiring persons to wear masks while on conveyances and at transportation hubs.

S. 2106

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 2128

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. RES. 210

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 210, a resolution designating July 21, 2021, as ''Glioblastoma Awareness Day'' .

S. RES. 241

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 241, a resolution widening threats to freedom of the press and free expression around the world, and reaffirming the vital role that a free and independent press plays in informing local and international audiences about public health crises, countering misinformation and disinformation, and furthering discourse and debate to advance healthy democracies in commemoration of World Press Freedom Day on May 3, 2021.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2184. A bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to institute a trading prohibition for certain issuers that retain public accounting firms that have not been subject to inspection by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

S. 2184

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

SECTION 1. TRADING PROHIBITION FOR 2 CONSECUTIVE NON-INSPECTION YEARS.

Section 104(i) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7214(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A)(ii), by striking ''the foreign jurisdiction described in clause (i)'' and inserting ''a foreign jurisdiction''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''3'' and inserting ''2''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''3'' and inserting ''2''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 281—RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDATION FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH AND ITS CRITICAL ROLE IN AMERICA'S BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH STRATEGY BY ADVANCING BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AND THE MISSION OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, THE WORLD'S PREMIER BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AGENCY

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 281

Whereas Congress chartered the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health (referred to in this preamble as the ''FNIH'') to support the mission of the National Institutes of Health (referred to in this preamble as the ''NIH''), which is to advance research in pursuit of fundamental knowledge that will lead to better health outcomes for all;

Whereas June 26, 2021, marks 25 years since FNIH commenced its work to improve health outcomes for the people of the United States by facilitating groundbreaking research and catalyzing innovation and discovery to answer the toughest scientific questions;

Whereas FNIH is recognized by Congress, NIH, and the biomedical community as a model for aligning public and private partners around a common cause that advances breakthrough biomedical discoveries and improves the quality of people's lives;

Whereas, among the hundreds of programs FNIH has facilitated, the Grand Challenges in Global Health partnership, founded in collaboration with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, achieved scientific breakthroughs against deadly diseases in the world's poorest countries and elevated the role of FNIH as a leader in building alliances for biomedical research;

Whereas FNIH, NIH, and the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services launched the Accelerating Medicines Partnership as a public-private collaboration to pursue new methods to develop diagnostics and treatments for Alzheimer's disease, type 2 diabetes, autoimmune disorders, Parkinson's disease, and schizophrenia;

Whereas the FNIH created a new model for clinical trials through initiatives to fight breast cancer and lung cancer, continues to bring together partners to identify, develop, and qualify biomarkers to improve drug discovery and regulatory decisionmaking, and recognizes and supports trailblazing researchers, some of whom have won other prestigious scientific prizes, including the Nobel Prize;

Whereas FNIH supports caregivers of NIH Clinical Center patients through the Edmond J. Safra Family Lodge, a temporary residence for caregivers whose close presence helps to sustain patients who volunteer for NIH research that was constructed and is maintained by the FNIH on the NIH campus;

Whereas FNIH answered NIH's call to action to address the largest pandemic in a century by launching and coordinating the Accelerating COVID–19 Therapeutic Interventions and Vaccines (''ACTIV'') initiative in partnership with numerous government agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and biopharmaceutical companies to accelerate the most promising COVID–19 vaccines and treatments; and

Whereas FNIH remains an indispensable institution to the biomedical research mission of the NIH and the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 25th anniversary of the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health and its critical role in advancing biomedical research and the mission of the National Institutes of Health, the world's premier biomedical research agency;

(2) applauds the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health for its leadership and ongoing efforts to advance human health outcomes through innovative public-private partnerships that achieve groundbreaking biomedical research results;

(3) commends the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health for its efforts to address the COVID–19 pandemic through the Accelerating COVID–19 Therapeutic Interventions and Vaccines initiative and accelerate the development of the most promising treatments and vaccines for COVID–19; and

(4) reiterates that the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health, in partnership with the National Institutes of Health, is a vital and essential component of biomedical research strategy of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 282—RECOGNIZING JULY 1, 2021, AS THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE AND COMMENDING THE SERVICE OF THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE TO CONGRESS AND THE UNITED STATES

Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr.

PADILLA, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 282

Whereas the General Accounting Office, predecessor to the Government Accountability Office (referred to in this preamble as the ''GAO''), opened its doors on July 1, 1921, following the enactment of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (Public Law 67–13; 42 Stat. 20);

Whereas the need, identified by Congress following World War I, for more information and better control of expenditures made by the Federal Government was filled by the creation of the independent GAO;

Whereas Congress provided the GAO with a broad mandate—

(1) to investigate how Federal dollars are spent; and

(2) to review all Federal expenditures;

Whereas, as the size and expenditures of the Federal Government grew during the Great Depression and World War II, the GAO became overwhelmed with fiscal audits, which pushed Congress to amend the authority of the GAO to enable it to assist Federal agencies with improving their accounting and spending controls;

Whereas Congress amended the authority of the GAO to expand its work beyond financial audits to performance audits to determine how Federal agencies and programs performed and met their objectives in the wake of the Great Society programs of the late 1960s;

Whereas the GAO shifted its priorities in the late 1900s and early 2000s—

(1) to highlight high risk areas for Federal Government waste and operation failures; and

(2) to work to improve Federal financial management and budgeting;

Whereas, as of the date of adoption of this resolution, the GAO is known around the world as a leader and source of objective, nonpartisan information on government operations through its work examining cost, effectiveness, and other factors related to the success of Federal programs;

Whereas, in addition to its field offices across the United States, the GAO operates field offices around the world to make it easier to access and monitor Federal Government operations that extend across the globe;

Whereas the GAO employs approximately 3,200 people and has been recognized as being one of the top workplaces in the Federal Government for several years by its multidisciplinary workforce, which includes analysts, auditors, lawyers, economists, scientists, actuaries, law enforcement and security personnel, healthcare experts, and education, public policy, computer science, and cybersecurity personnel, among others;

Whereas the GAO averaged a $165 return on every $1 invested in the GAO between fiscal years 2016 and 2020 as a result of Federal agencies and Congress acting on recommendations made by the GAO;

Whereas the financial benefit to the Federal Government resulting from the work of the GAO totaled—

(1) in fiscal year 2020, $77,600,000,000; and

(2) in the past 20 years combined, over $1,200,000,000,000; and

Whereas, in addition to serving as the preeminent independent government watchdog agency in the world, the GAO provides additional services, which include—

(1) writing legal opinions at the request of Congress or in response to a bid protest;

(2) authoring resources and standards for auditors around the world;

(3) operating a hotline for the public to report waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement of government funds; and

(4) providing testimony before Congress on a multitude of topics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 100th anniversary of the Government Accountability Office (referred to in this resolution as the ''GAO'') on July 1, 2021;

(2) commends the GAO for 100 years of service to Congress and the United States as the preeminent independent government watchdog agency in the world;

(3) offers its continued support to allow the GAO—

(A) to fulfill its mandates as required by law;

(B) to respond to requests made by Members of Congress; and

(C) to aid the Federal Government in improving its stewardship of taxpayer dollars;

(4) recognizes Eugene Dodaro, the Comptroller General and head of the GAO as of the date of adoption of this resolution, and the dedicated and professional staff of the GAO who work diligently to produce fact-based reports, thoughtful recommendations, and sound legal decisions; and

(5) will continue to partner with the GAO in the pursuit of its mission—

(A) to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities; and

(B) to help improve the performance and accountability of the Federal Government for the benefit of the people of the United States.

Ms. HASAN. Mr. President, it is my great honor. as Chair of the U.S. Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committees Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight to recognize July 1, 2021, as the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and commend it for its service to the people of the United States. I am grateful to Comptroller General Gene Dodaro and to GAO's 3,200 employees who work hard to ensure that federal programs are well managed and fiscally responsible. As we recognize the GAO, I also encourage my colleagues to continue to partner with the GAO as we work together to help improve the performance of the federal government for the benefit of the American people. I urge my colleagues to join me in adopting this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2119. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1251, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a program to reduce barriers to entry for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in certain voluntary markets, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2119. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1251, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a program to reduce barriers to entry for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in certain voluntary markets, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Growing Climate Solutions Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. GREENHOUSE GAS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER AND THIRD-PARTY VERIFIER TRANSPARENCY PROGRAM.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to increase access to informational resources for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners regarding voluntary environmental credit markets, including through the Program;

(2) to provide informational resources relating to technical assistance through covered entities to farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in overcoming barriers to entry into voluntary environmental credit markets; and

(3) to establish the Advisory Council to advise the Secretary regarding the Program and other related matters.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The term ''Advisory Council'' means the Greenhouse Gas Technical Assistance Provider and Third-Party Verifier Transparency Program Advisory Council established under subsection (f)(1).

(2) AGRICULTURE OR FORESTRY CREDIT.—The term ''agriculture or forestry credit'' means a credit derived from the prevention, reduction, or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or carbon sequestration on agricultural land or private forest land that may be bought or sold on a voluntary environmental credit market.

(3) BEGINNING FARMER OR RANCHER.—The term ''beginning farmer or rancher'' has the meaning given the term in section 2501(a) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279(a)).

(4) COVERED ENTITY.—The term ''covered entity'' means a person or State that either—

(A) is a provider of technical assistance to farmers, ranchers, or private forest landowners in carrying out sustainable land use management practices that—

(i) prevent, reduce, or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions; or

(ii) sequester carbon; or

(B) is a third-party verifier entity that conducts the verification of the processes described in protocols for voluntary environmental credit markets.

(5) GREENHOUSE GAS.—The term ''greenhouse gas'' means—

(A) carbon dioxide;

(B) methane;

(C) nitrous oxide; and

(D) any other gas that the Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Council, determines has been identified to have heat trapping qualities.

(6) PROGRAM.—The term ''Program'' means the Greenhouse Gas Technical Assistance Provider and Third-Party Verifier Transparency Program established under subsection (c).

(7) PROTOCOL.—The term ''protocol'' means a systematic approach that follows a science-based methodology that is transparent and thorough to establish resources—

(A) for the development of projects to prevent, reduce, or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions or sequester carbon that include 1 or more baseline scenarios; and

(B) demonstrating how to quantify, monitor, report, and verify the prevention, reduction, or mitigation of greenhouse gas

emissions or carbon sequestration by projects described in subparagraph (A).

(8) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(9) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The term ''technical assistance'' means technical expertise, information, and tools necessary to assist a farmer, rancher, or private forest landowner who is engaged in or wants to engage in a project to prevent, reduce, or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions or sequester carbon to meet a protocol.

(10) VOLUNTARY ENVIRONMENTAL CREDIT MARKET.—The term ''voluntary environmental credit market'' means a voluntary market through which agriculture or forestry credits may be bought or sold between private sector entities.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and after making a positive determination under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall establish a voluntary program, to be known as the ''Greenhouse Gas Technical Assistance Provider and Third-Party Verifier Transparency Program'', to publicize common practices and common qualifications of covered entities that the Secretary determines are related to the activities described in subsection (d).

(2) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall establish the Program only if, after considering relevant information, including the information collected or reviewed relating to the assessment conducted under subsection (g)(1)(A), the Secretary determines that the Program will further each of the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

(3) REPORT.—If the Secretary determines under paragraph (2) that the Program would not further the purposes described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) and does not establish the Program, the Secretary shall publish a report describing the reasons the Program would not further those purposes.

(d) COMMON PRACTICES OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDERS.—

(1) PROTOCOLS AND QUALIFICATIONS.—After providing public notice and at least a 60-day period for public comment, the Secretary shall, during the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the Program is established, publish—

(A) a list of, and documents relating to, generally recognized protocols for voluntary environmental credit markets that are designed to ensure consistency, reliability, effectiveness, efficiency, and transparency, including protocol documents and details relating to—

(i) calculations;

(ii) sampling methodologies;

(iii) accounting principles;

(iv) systems for verification, monitoring, measurement, and reporting; and

(v) methods to account for additionality, permanence, leakage, and, where appropriate, avoidance of double counting; and

(B) descriptions of qualifications of covered entities that provide assistance to farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in accomplishing the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

(2) ACTIVITIES.—The activities described by the Secretary under the Program shall include current and future activities that prevent, reduce, or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions or sequester carbon, which may include—

(A) land or soil carbon sequestration;

(B) emissions reductions derived from fuel choice or reduced fuel use;

(C) livestock emissions reductions, including emissions reductions achieved through—

(i) feeds, feed additives, and the use of byproducts as feed sources; or

(ii) manure management practices;

(D) on-farm energy generation;

(E) energy feedstock production;

(F) fertilizer or nutrient use emissions reductions;

(G) reforestation;

(H) forest management, including improving harvesting practices and thinning diseased trees;

(I) prevention of the conversion of forests, grasslands, and wetlands;

(J) restoration of wetlands or grasslands;

(K) grassland management, including prescribed grazing;

(L) current practices associated with private land conservation programs administered by the Secretary; and

(M) such other activities, or combinations of activities, that the Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Council, determines to be appropriate.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—In publishing the generally recognized protocols and description of qualifications under paragraph (1), the Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Council, shall ensure that the descriptions for covered entities to be described under the Program include maintaining expertise in all relevant information relating to market-based protocols, as appropriate, with regard to—

(A) quantification;

(B) verification;

(C) additionality;

(D) permanence;

(E) reporting; and

(F) other expertise, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Advisory Council.

(4) PERIODIC REVIEW.—As appropriate, the Secretary shall periodically review and revise the list of generally accepted protocols and description of qualifications published under paragraph (1) to include any additional protocols or qualifications that meet the requirements described in paragraph (3).

(e) WEBSITE AND PUBLICATION OF LISTS.—

(1) WEBSITE AND SOLICITATION.—During the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the Program is established, the Secretary shall publish, through an existing website maintained by the Secretary—

(A) the generally accepted protocols and description of qualifications published by the Secretary under subsection (d)(1); and

(B) instructions and suggestions to assist farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in facilitating the development of agriculture or forestry credits and accessing voluntary environmental credit markets, including—

(i) through working with covered entities described under the Program; and

(ii) by providing information relating to programs, registries, and protocols of programs and registries that provide market-based participation opportunities for working and conservation agricultural and forestry lands.

(2) PUBLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—During the 1-year period beginning on the date on which the Program is established, the Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Council and following the review by the Secretary for completeness and accuracy, shall use an existing website maintained by the Secretary to publish—

(i) a list of covered entities self-identified as technical assistance providers; and

(ii) a list of covered entities self-identified as verifiers of the processes described in protocols for voluntary environmental credit markets.

(B) PROHIBITION ON CLAIMS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A person, regardless of whether the person is described under the Program, shall not knowingly make a claim that the person is a ''USDA-certified technical assistance provider or third-party verifier for voluntary environmental credit markets'' or any substantially similar claim.

(ii) PENALTY.—Any person that violates clause (i) shall be subject to a civil penalty equal to such amount as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, not to exceed $1,000 per violation.

(3) UPDATES.—Not less frequently than quarterly, the Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Council, shall update the lists published under paragraph (2)(A).

(4) SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall notify Congress of the publication of the initial list under paragraph (2)(A).

(5) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary—

(A) to compel a farmer, rancher, or private forest landowner to participate in a transaction or project facilitated by a covered entity described under the Program; or

(B) to act as a covered entity.

(f) GREENHOUSE GAS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER AND THIRD-PARTY VERIFIER TRANSPARENCY PROGRAM ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the Program is established, the Secretary shall establish an advisory council, to be known as the ''Greenhouse Gas Technical Assistance Provider and Third-Party Verifier Transparency Program Advisory Council''.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Council shall be composed of members appointed by the Secretary in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) GENERAL REPRESENTATION.—The Advisory Council shall—

(i) be broadly representative of the agriculture and private forest sectors; and

(ii) be composed of not less than 51 percent farmers, ranchers, or private forest landowners.

(C) MEMBERS.—Members appointed under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) not more than 2 representatives of the Department of Agriculture, as determined by the Secretary;

(ii) not more than 1 representative of the Environmental Protection Agency, as determined by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(iii) not more than 1 representative of the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(iv) not fewer than 12 representatives of the agriculture industry, appointed in a manner that is broadly representative of the agriculture sector, including not fewer than 6 active farmers and ranchers;

(v) not fewer than 4 representatives of private forest landowners or the forestry and forest products industry appointed in a manner that is broadly representative of the private forest sector;

(vi) not more than 4 representatives of the relevant scientific research community, including not fewer than 2 representatives from land-grant colleges and universities (as defined in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103)), of which 1 shall be a representative of a college or university eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (commonly known as the ''Second Morrill Act'') (26 Stat. 417, chapter 841; 7 U.S.C. 321 et seq.), including Tuskegee University;

(vii) not fewer than 12 experts or professionals familiar with voluntary environmental credit markets and the verification requirements in those markets;

(viii) not more than 3 members of nongovernmental or civil society organizations with relevant expertise; and

(ix) not more than 3 members of private sector entities or organizations that participate in voluntary environmental credit markets through which agriculture or forestry credits are bought and sold.

(D) CHAIR.—The Secretary shall designate a member of the Advisory Council to serve as the Chair.

(E) TERMS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term of a member of the Advisory Council shall be 2 years, except that, of the members first appointed—

(I) not fewer than 8 members shall serve for a term of 1 year;

(II) not fewer than 12 members shall serve for a term of 2 years; and

(III) not fewer than 12 members shall serve for a term of 3 years.

(ii) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—After the initial term of a member of the Advisory Council, including the members first appointed, the member may serve not more than 4 additional 2-year terms.

(3) MEETINGS.—

(A) FREQUENCY.—The Advisory Council shall meet not less frequently than annually, at the call of the Chair.

(B) INITIAL MEETING.—During the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the members are appointed under paragraph (2)(A), the Advisory Council shall hold an initial meeting.

(4) DUTIES.—The Advisory Council shall—

(A) periodically review and recommend any appropriate changes to the list of generally recognized protocols and description of qualifications published by the Secretary under subsection (d)(1);

(B) make recommendations to the Secretary regarding the best practices that should be included in the descriptions of generally recognized protocols and qualifications described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) advise the Secretary regarding—

(i) the current methods used by voluntary environmental credit markets to quantify and verify the prevention, reduction, and mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or sequestration of carbon;

(ii) additional considerations for describing covered entities under the Program;

(iii) means to reduce Federal barriers to entry in the business of providing technical assistance or the verification of the processes described in protocols for voluntary environmental credit markets for covered entities;

(iv) means to reduce Federal compliance and verification costs for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in entering voluntary environmental credit markets, including through mechanisms and processes to aggregate the value of activities across land ownership;

(v) issues relating to land and asset ownership in light of evolving voluntary environmental credit markets; and

(vi) additional means to reduce barriers to entry in voluntary environmental credit markets for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners.

(5) COMPENSATION.—The members of the Advisory Council shall serve without compensation.

(6) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—The Secretary shall prohibit any member of the Advisory Council from—

(A) engaging in any determinations or activities of the Advisory Council that may result in the favoring of, or a direct and predictable effect on—

(i) the member or a family member, as determined by the Secretary;

(ii) stock owned by the member or a family member, as determined by the Secretary; or

(iii) the employer of, or a business owned in whole or in part by, the member or a family member, as determined by the Secretary; or

(B) providing advice or recommendations regarding, or otherwise participating in, matters of the Advisory Council that—

(i) constitute a conflict of interest under section 208 of title 18, United States Code; or

(ii) may call into question the integrity of the Advisory Council, the Program, or the technical assistance or verification activities described under subsection (d)(2).

(7) FACA APPLICABILITY.—The Advisory Council shall be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), except that section 14(a)(2) of that Act shall not apply.

(g) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 240 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall—

(A) conduct an assessment, including by incorporating information from existing publications and reports of the Department of Agriculture and other entities with relevant expertise, regarding—

(i) the number and categories of non-Federal actors in the nonprofit and for-profit sectors involved in buying, selling, and trading agriculture or forestry credits in voluntary environmental credit markets;

(ii) the estimated overall domestic market demand for agriculture or forestry credits at the end of the preceding 4-calendar year period, and historically, in voluntary environmental credit markets;

(iii) the total number of agriculture or forestry credits (measured in metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent) that were estimated to be in development, generated, or sold in market transactions during the preceding 4-calendar year period, and historically, in voluntary environmental credit markets;

(iv) the estimated supply and demand of metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent of offsets in the global marketplace for the next 4 years;

(v) the barriers to entry due to compliance and verification costs described in subsection (f)(4)(C)(iv);

(vi) the state of monitoring and measurement technologies needed to quantify long-term carbon sequestration in soils and from other activities to prevent, reduce, or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in the agriculture and forestry sectors;

(vii) means to reduce Federal barriers to entry into voluntary environmental credit markets for small and beginning farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners and the extent to which existing protocols in voluntary environmental credit markets allow for aggregation of projects among farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners;

(viii) the potential impact of Department of Agriculture activities on supply and demand of agriculture or forestry credits;

(ix) the extent to which existing protocols in voluntary environmental credit markets, including verification, additionality, permanence, and reporting, adequately take into consideration and account for factors encountered by the agriculture and private forest sectors in preventing, reducing, or mitigating greenhouse gases or sequestering carbon through agriculture and forestry practices, considering variances across regions, topography, soil types, crop or species varieties, and business models;

(x) the extent to which existing protocols in voluntary environmental credit markets consider options to ensure the continued valuation, through discounting or other means, of agriculture and forestry credits in the case of the practices underlying those credits being disrupted due to unavoidable events, including production challenges and natural disasters; and

(xi) opportunities for other voluntary markets outside of voluntary environmental credit markets to foster the trading, buying, or selling of credits that are derived from activities that provide other ecosystem service benefits, including activities that improve water quality, water quantity, wildlife habitat enhancement, and other ecosystem services, as the Secretary determines appropriate;

(B) publish the assessment; and

(C) submit the assessment to Congress, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

(2) QUADRENNIAL ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Advisory Council, shall conduct the assessment described in paragraph (1)(A) and publish and submit the assessment in accordance with subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) every 4 years after the publication and submission of the first assessment under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1).

(h) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Program is established, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall publish and submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report describing, for the period covered by the report—

(1) a review of the outcomes of the Program, including—

(A) the ability of farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners, including small and beginning farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners, to develop agriculture or forestry credits through covered entities described under the Program;

(B) methods to improve the ability of farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners to overcome barriers to entry to voluntary environmental credit markets; and

(C) methods to further facilitate participation of farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in voluntary environmental credit markets; and

(2) any recommendations for improvements to the Program.

(i) CONFIDENTIALITY.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary, any other officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture or any agency of the Department of Agriculture, or any other person may not disclose to the public the information held by the Secretary described in subparagraph (B).

(B) INFORMATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the information prohibited from disclosure under subparagraph (A) is—

(I) information collected by the Secretary or published by the Secretary under subsection (g) or (h);

(II) personally identifiable information, including in a contract or service agreement, of a farmer, rancher, or private forest landowner, obtained by the Secretary under this section; and

(III) confidential business information in a contract or service agreement of a farmer, rancher, or private forest landowner obtained by the Secretary under this section.

(ii) AGGREGATED RELEASE.—Information described in clause (i) may be released to the public if the information has been transformed into a statistical or aggregate form that does not allow the identification of the

person who supplied or is the subject of the particular information.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not prohibit the disclosure by an officer or employee of the Federal Government of information described in paragraph (1)(B) as otherwise directed by the Secretary or the Attorney General for enforcement purposes.

(j) FUNDING.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to the amount made available under paragraph (2), there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(2) DIRECT FUNDING.—

(A) RESCISSION.—There is rescinded $4,100,000 of the unobligated balance of amounts made available by section 1003 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2).

(B) DIRECT FUNDING.—If sufficient unobligated amounts made available by section 1003 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2) are available on the date of enactment of this Act to execute the entire rescission described in subparagraph (A), then on the day after the execution of the entire rescission, there is appropriated to the Secretary, out of amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $4,100,000 to carry out this section.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. STABENOW. Mr. President, I have 12 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 22, 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 Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 2:30 p.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 Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 22, 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 Tuesday, June 22, 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 Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

The Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, CUSTOMS, AND GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

The Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 2021

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Wednesday, June 23; 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, upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Boardman nomination; further, that if cloture is invoked on the Boardman nomination, all postcloture time expire at 5:45 p.m.; finally, that if the nomination is confirmed, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 2 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:40 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

CARLTON WATERHOUSE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF SOLID WASTE, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE PETER C. WRIGHT.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. DANIEL W. DWYER

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

GABRIEL J. ALLISON, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC D. BORGMAN, OF NEW YORK
HEATHER D. BROOKS, OF FLORIDA
PATRICK GENE BURLINGAME, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
KAREN E. CASTRO, OF OHIO
CHARLES MEDFORD CLATANOFF, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH EVAN DE BERNARDO, OF VIRGINIA
AARON C. EASLICK, OF MICHIGAN
AYANDA NGOZI FRANCIS GAO, OF GEORGIA
PAUL ROBERT GIBLIN, OF ARIZONA
SHEIMALIZ E. GLOVER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
DAVID C. GUTIERREZ, OF GEORGIA
SALMAN R. HAJI, OF TEXAS
AMY R. HOCKING, OF TEXAS
PORTER NELSON ILLI, OF UTAH
JOSHUA P. JOHNSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MPAZA SICHILIMA KAPEMBWA, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT OWEN KEANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS
DONALD D. KIM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RAQUEL JACQUELINE KING, OF FLORIDA
IAN M. KITTERMAN, OF MICHIGAN
JEFFREY T. KRAMB, OF VIRGINIA
JERICA J. LAMAR, OF MARYLAND
ORIANA LUQUETTA, OF FLORIDA
JONATHAN A. MCCLELLAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
SEAN H. MCLEOD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KEVIN S. MOSS, OF FLORIDA
CAITLIN E. NETTLETON, OF FLORIDA
SITA ALETHEIA RAITER, OF CALIFORNIA
JAMES K. ROGERS, OF ARIZONA
KYLE J. ROHRICH, OF NEBRASKA
JOHN JOSEPH RYAN, OF CALIFORNIA
SKARRN RYVNINE, OF FLORIDA
EDDY SANTANA, OF ILLINOIS
JAMES CARL SMYTHERS, OF VIRGINIA
CHARLES L. SPECHT, OF ILLINOIS
MICHELLE N. STOKES, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL FIELDING TEMPLEMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELIZABETH MELODY TROBAUGH, OF WASHINGTON
JAMES LEVERING TYSON III, OF WASHINGTON
AMANDA M. ZEIDAN, OF GEORGIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

JIM NELSON BARNHART, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREW M. HERSCOWITZ, OF MARYLAND
TERESA L. MCGHIE, OF NEVADA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR:

ARTHUR W. BROWN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JOHN J. CARDENAS, OF CALIFORNIA
MARY EILEEN DEVITT, OF VIRGINIA
KARL W. FICKENSCHER, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID GOSNEY, OF CALIFORNIA
SEAN M. JONES, OF NEW JERSEY
JENNIFER M. LINK, OF ILLINOIS
HELEN MARY PATAKI, OF CALIFORNIA
ANNE ELIZABETH PATTERSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KERRY A. PELZMAN, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN A. PENNELL, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

JEFF R. BRYAN, OF VIRGINIA
ALEXIOUS M. BUTLER, OF GEORGIA
ALISA MAUTNER CAMERON, OF MARYLAND
JEREMIAH CAREW, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN L. CARNEY, OF FLORIDA

THOMAS MARK CRUBAUGH, OF WISCONSIN
NATASHA M. DE MARCKEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PATRICK K. DISKIN, OF FLORIDA
SHERI–NOUANE B. DUNCAN–JONES, OF WASHINGTON
NANCY JANE ESLICK, OF WASHINGTON
MERVYN ANTHONY FARROE, OF FLORIDA
SCOTT D. HOCKLANDER, OF ALASKA
CATIE C. LOTT, OF WASHINGTON
MARTIN G. MCLAUGHLIN, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD L. NELSON, OF TEXAS
HANH N. NGUYEN, OF CALIFORNIA
ANUPAMA SPATIKA RAJARAMAN, OF TEXAS
MATTHEW D. REES, OF MARYLAND
LUIS A. RIVERA, OF MARYLAND
DANA H. ROSE, OF COLORADO
KIMBERLY ANNE ROSEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ZEMA SEMUNEGUS, OF VIRGINIA
JULIE A. SOUTHFIELD, OF VIRGINIA
PETER C. TRENCHARD, OF MARYLAND

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR:

WADE C. MARTIN, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

DANNIELLE R. ANDREWS, OF CALIFORNIA
BRIAN E. ANSELMAN, OF VIRGINIA
AMY E. ARCHIBALD, OF CALIFORNIA
SUZANNE M. INZERILLO, OF ILLINOIS
ILA S. JURISSON, OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDER I. KASANOF, OF NEW YORK
JAMES D. MULLINAX, OF WASHINGTON
MARTINA C. POLT, OF TENNESSEE
ALAN S. PURCELL, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT A. RAINES, OF MARYLAND
SCOTT M. RENNER, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, AND A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

EDWARD R. DANEK, OF MASSACHUSETTS
FERNANDO OSPINA, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

RAHEL ABOYE, OF VIRGINIA
PHILIPPE ACCILIEN, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTOPHER B. ADAMS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
YIKEE ADJE, OF CALIFORNIA
MINAL AMIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LENNA NEAT ARANGO, OF TEXAS
MARIALICE BONITA ARIENS, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
JEAN–JACQUES BADIANE, OF NORTH CAROLINA
SCOTT CHARLES BARTOS, OF VIRGINIA
DANIELLE RENEE BASH, OF INDIANA
MIRANDA STEPHANIE ODENDAHL BECKMAN, OF UTAH
JASON EDWARD BENNETT, OF OREGON
ROBYN BERTHOLON, OF TEXAS
NADIA NOUR BLACKTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JACQUELINE GAYLE BONY, OF FLORIDA
ELIZABETH M. BRENNAN, OF FLORIDA
SIMONE BROWN, OF NORTH CAROLINA
KATHLYN BRYANT, OF NEVADA
JOHN GREGORY BUTLER, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINA M. CAIRNS, OF CALIFORNIA
JOLIE MARIE CAREY, OF NEW YORK
PRIYA MACHIMADA CARIAPPA, OF FLORIDA
JENNIFER CARVALHO, OF MARYLAND
JOSEPHINA GARCIA CERVANTES, OF CALIFORNIA
DAVID H. CHARLES, OF GEORGIA
AMENA AYOUBI CHENZAIE, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH S. CHON, OF MARYLAND
BETTY Y. CHUNG, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN L.R. CONE, OF VIRGINIA
ELLEN AMANTE DE GUZMAN, OF MARYLAND
SCOTT DEPIES, OF VIRGINIA
MARK R. DOYLE, OF ILLINOIS
NATHAN S. DRURY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
KENNETH MARK DUNN, OF KANSAS
STEPHEN YAWO DZISI, OF NEW YORK
PAUL ELLIOT EDWARDS, OF VIRGINIA
ALAA HAMID EL–BASHIR, OF MINNESOTA
DIJANA ELLIOTT, OF VIRGINIA
IFEOMA CARMELLE EZEH, OF TEXAS
ALI EZZATYAR, OF CALIFORNIA
PAMELA M. FOSTER, OF VIRGINIA
KATHLEEN KNIGHT FRANK, OF MAINE
MELISSA ERIN FREEMAN, OF VIRGINIA
OLIVIA CATHERINE GILMORE, OF TEXAS
MICAH ANDREW GLOBERSON, OF CALIFORNIA
ANDREW GOLDA II, OF NEW JERSEY
MARK S.R. GRAY, OF CALIFORNIA
JULIE REBECCA GRIER–VILLATTE, OF FLORIDA
GERALD WILLIAM GUGERTY, OF COLORADO
ANDREA NOEL HALVERSON, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
JOHN K.B. HARRIS, OF OREGON
TRACY R. HAWRY, OF ILLINOIS
CATHERINE H. HAYFORD, OF GEORGIA
ROCKFELER P. HERISSE, PH.D., OF NEW YORK
PLATO R. HIERONIMUS, OF MARYLAND
NATHAN R. HILGENDORF, OF WASHINGTON
DAVID JAMES ISAAK, OF FLORIDA
TANYA L. JACKSON–TYSON, OF MARYLAND
KATHERINE ELISE JOHNSON, OF WASHINGTON
JENNIFER CLAIRE KARSNER, OF FLORIDA
BRUCE H. KAY, OF MARYLAND
SASCHA KEMPER, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL C. KOFFMAN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DUSTIN A. KOHLS, OF VIRGINIA
ANTHONY A. KOLB, OF VIRGINIA
AMY KOLER, OF WASHINGTON
NATALYA KOMAROVA, OF WASHINGTON
KAREN KOPRINCE, OF NORTH DAKOTA
MURIEL MOODY KOROL, OF NEVADA
JAMES SCOTT KOVAR, OF VIRGINIA
JONA LAI, OF WASHINGTON
STEPHANE LAROCHE, OF FLORIDA
AMY HOPKINS LARSEN, OF WYOMING
MORGAN M. LIMO, OF MARYLAND
EYOLE N. LUMA, OF MARYLAND
MAUREEN CLARET MALAVE, OF NEW YORK
KATE MALONEY, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL S. MANELLA, OF VIRGINIA
NORA CHRISTINE MARESH, OF FLORIDA
TIMOTHY BRIAN MARLOWE, OF GEORGIA
DIEGO MARQUEZ, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
JOHN F. MCKAY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
MARGARET RAMALHO MCMORROW, OF CALIFORNIA
C. LANE MEARS, OF TEXAS
BRANDON EDWARD MILLER, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTOPHER ROBERT MOORE, OF CALIFORNIA
ALEJANDRO P. MORA, OF FLORIDA
JACOB BRUCE HENRY MORRIN, OF NEVADA
FERNANDO MOYLE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOSEPH NGANGA MWANGI, OF WASHINGTON
ALI NADER, OF TEXAS
KATHERINE L. NICHOLS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JAMES A. NOEL, OF VIRGINIA
JEANETTE N. NORMAND, OF OREGON
HEIDI O' BRA, OF FLORIDA
JAIME MICHELLE OBERLANDER, OF WASHINGTON
NOELLE OLIVE OJO, OF FLORIDA
FREDRICK O. ONYANGO, OF TEXAS
KRISTINA ORTIZ, OF CALIFORNIA
TANIECE BALDWIN OWUSU, OF NEW YORK
ALEXANDER PAO, OF GEORGIA
ROBERT CHARLES PARKER, OF OREGON
GARTH OWEN PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA
EDEL PEREZ–CAMPOS, OF FLORIDA
DEBORAH GAIL PERLMAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
JESSICA L. PETTIT, OF FLORIDA
ALEXIS E. POLOVINA, OF HAWAII
HEELA RASOOL–AYUB, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREW READ, OF WASHINGTON
EMILY RUDGE REVIS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SOLEDAD VANESA ROGERS, OF CALIFORNIA
COURTNEY E. ROY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LOUAY SAMOUIE, OF CALIFORNIA
PRISCILLA ASHAMU SAMPIL, OF VIRGINIA
CARTER AMES SAUNDERS, OF VIRGINIA
MICHELLE MARIAN SCHAAN, OF NEVADA
JOSHUA BRAUN SCHRAMM, OF MICHIGAN
AMY VON KEYSERLING SCOTT, OF VIRGINIA
ADMIR SERIFOVIC, OF TEXAS
RYAN SHELBY, OF MARYLAND
TIMOTHY ANDREW SIKES, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN ALAN SKOLNIK, OF MARYLAND
ANDRE–GUY SOH, OF FLORIDA
JOHN D. SPEARS, OF MARYLAND
SCOTT WILLIAM SPENCER, OF FLORIDA
FRIEDARICKA MIAN STEED, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREA C. STERNBERG, OF MINNESOTA
KAARLI KARAEN SUNDSMO, OF CALIFORNIA
ALIOU TALL, OF CALIFORNIA
TAKELE TASSEW, OF TEXAS
SHANNON J. TAYLOR, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
NATHAN TENNY, OF VIRGINIA
SAVANNAH THOMASARRIGO, OF COLORADO
KATHERINE TILOUT, OF NEW YORK
JAY MICHAEL TOTTE, OF MICHIGAN
GREGORY SAMUEL VAUGHAN, OF ILLINOIS
JOSHUA JOHN VETTER, OF OHIO
JACOB VEVERKA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ADRIANA VIECO, OF NEW YORK
SAMANTHA DENISE WAPNICK, OF NEW YORK
DIANA MARTI WEED, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RONALD O. WIETECHA, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA A. WILKINSON, OF TENNESSEE
ELIZABETH ISIMHEN WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA
ANGELA D. WILLIAMS–BOSTIC, OF VIRGINIA
IAN CHRISTOPHER WINBORNE, OF FLORIDA
HEATHER MARIE WIRICK, OF WASHINGTON
TIZETA WODAJO, OF MARYLAND
ROBERT ALLEN WORKS, OF KENTUCKY
CHARLES D. YESOLITIS, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN W. YOUNG, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY ZAHKA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ESTHER BEATRIZ ZELEDON, OF FLORIDA
KYRA TURNER ZOGBEKOR, OF CONNECTICUT

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 22, 2021:

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

KIRAN ARJANDAS AHUJA, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ALI NOURI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (CONGRESSIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS).

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

CHRISTOPHER CHARLES FONZONE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF GEORGE DALE BURT

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of George Dale Burt, a beloved husband, grandfather, and friend. He passed away peacefully at Baptist Memorial Hospital in Oxford on May 9, 2021. I join his loved ones in mourning his loss.

He was born on February 2, 1937 to Hattie Patterson Burt and George Lee Burt. He attended Oakland High School and Delta State University. He later earned his master's degree from the University of Mississippi. Mr. Burt went on to become the principal of Senatobia High School. It was there he began his thirty year coaching career in football that allowed him to impact countless students.

Dale was an outdoorsman and spent time on the family farm. For twenty-five summers, he served as a park ranger at Arkabutla Lake.

Left to cherish his memory are his wife, Elizabeth Hawkins Burt; children, Teri Lynn Burt Scoggins, David Allen Burt; Carol H. Darby, Patsy Williams; eight grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren.

Mr. Burt was a dedicated mentor, loving husband, and diligent father. I thank him for his service to the state of Mississippi and offer my deepest condolences to his family and friends.

RECOGNIZING THE FOUNDING OF VFW POST 12205 IN BULVERDE, TEXAS

HON. CHIP ROY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the founding of VFW Post 12205 in Bulverde, Texas. I wanted to take a moment to congratulate Commander McKinnon and those who helped establish Texas's 290th VFW Post. Over the past several years, the number of veterans in the Spring Branch and Bulverde area has grown tremendously and the need for a new VFW has become ever more apparent. As a member of the Veteran Affairs Committee, it is critically important to me that we have organizations like VFWs present locally to serve our veterans and communities, but also to promote patriotism and the American ideals we desperately need more of today. I have no doubt that this VFW Post will be a source of camaraderie, service, and education. I hope my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join me in congratulating these American patriots at VFW Post 12205 on their inaugural meeting and success in their future endeavors.

HONORING THE 36 YEARS OF SERVICE OF COUNCILMAN DAVID JORDAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the Honorable City Councilman of Greenwood, Mississippi, Mr. David Jordan.

Councilman Jordan served on the Greenwood City Council for 36 years representing Ward 6. During his tenure, he helped uplift the community through his superb leadership. He will continue his endeavors by representing District 24 as a member of the Mississippi State Senate. Senator Jordan has served in the State Senate for the previous 28 years assuming office in 1993.

Born on April 3, 1934, in Leflore County, Mississippi, David was the youngest of five children born to sharecropper parents. Growing up working in cotton fields, David always valued education. Through relentless effort, he received his high school diploma and went on to enroll in Mississippi Valley State University. Later, he attended the University of Wyoming.

Due to his undying love for people, he began his career as a science teacher. With a yearning to serve his community, Mr. Jordan decided to run for City Councilman in 1985 which he held until June 15, 2021. At the age of 88, he is married to the lovely Christine Bell-Jordan, and currently resides in Greenwood, MS.

Madam Speaker, I would like to acknowledge Councilman Jordan for his honorable endeavors to Mississippi communities.

IN RECOGNITION OF CAPTAIN PAUL McKEEVER'S DECADES OF SERVICE TO THE CITY OF DEARBORN

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Captain Paul McKeever on the occasion of his retirement from the Dearborn Fire Department after over 25 years of service to the City of Dearborn, Michigan, His significant service to our community is worthy of commendation.

Captain McKeever began his career in public service as a United States Marine stationed at 29 Palms, California and later was stationed across the state of Michigan. After transferring to the Marine Corps Reserve, Captain McKeever became a member of the Dearborn Fire Department in August 1995. He continued to serve in both military and civilian firefighting capacities until 2017 when he retired from the Ohio Air National Guard with the rank of Master Sergeant.

Captain McKeever joined the Dearborn Fire Department in 1995 and was promoted to Fire Lieutenant in 2007. On June 5, 2012 he was promoted to the role of Captain. A committed leader always willing to go the extra mile for his team, he is a graduate of the Eastern Michigan University School of Fire Staff and Command. Over the course of his extensive career, Captain McKeever has been the recipient of countless awards for excellence in service including the Fire Chief Life Saving Award, Fire Officer of the Year, multiple Meritorious Company Commendations, and a 2019 Certificate of Special Recognition,

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Captain Paul McKeever for his exemplary 25 years of service. He has effectively and selflessly served the City of Dearborn in his role as Chief of the Fire Department and has been steadfastly dedicated to the safety of our community. I join with Captain McKeever's family including his wife Meryl and children Paul, Ian, Liam, Grace, and Emma, friends, and colleagues in extending my best wishes to him in retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF MS. MAXINE WHITFIELD PRYOR

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and accomplishments of Ms. Maxine Whitfield Pryor who will celebrate her 100th birthday on July 25, 2021.

Ms. Pryor was born in the community of Love in Hernando, MS in Desoto County. She has lived in Hernando her entire life. She is the eldest of 8 siblings born to Nathaniel and Dinah Whilhite Whitfield. She attended Oak Hill Church School and in 1939 married Bemis Pryor. She and Bemis had nine children, all born and raised in Hernando.

Ms. Pryor is the proud grandmother of 24 grandchildren, 32 great-grandchildren, and 22 great-great-grandchildren. She is known for her love of God and her community. She has attended both Oak Hill Baptist Church and Knights Chapel C.M.E. Church in Hernando. She is a retired missionary, stewardess, and church announcer. She enjoys sewing, gardening, cooking, and voting during election season.

Ms. Pryor has been a dedicated member of the Hernando community for 100 years and I am remarkably grateful for her lifetime of service.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GENE HECKMAN

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Gene Heckman of Columbia City, Indiana. Gene was a beloved member of his community whose work shaped the lives of generations who call northeast Indiana home.

Gene entered the U.S. Air Force upon graduating high school in 1957, marking the beginning of a life of service. Upon being honorably discharged in 1963, Gene returned to civilian life. He married his sweetheart, Karen Rose, and together made the Tri-Lakes community their home.

In 1971, Gene was elected a trustee of Thorncreek Township. Additionally, Gene oversaw the township's public services; served on the Whitley County School Board; helped found the Tri-Lakes Baptist Church; was a member of Gideons International; served as president of the National Solid Waste Association Council and was a member of the Columbia City Rotary Club.

Gene's dedication to his community earned him the opportunity to meet several notable public figures, including President George W. Bush, Vice President Dan Quayle, Senator Richard Lugar, and Governor Otis Bowen. Separately, Gene operated his own sanitation business before selling it in 1991.

This is a testament to Gene's peerless devotion to service for which his community, and our country, is grateful. Though he is no longer with us, Gene's spirit endures in the hearts and minds of all those he touched.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HAROLD KELLER

HON. LLOYD SMUCKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Harold Keller of Mount Joy, who recently passed away.

Harold will be remembered for his life of service and building a stronger community in Mount Joy. He was a proud Rotarian, serving as President of the Mount Joy Rotary Club. He additionally served as a member of the Mount Joy Borough Council and Mount Joy Chamber of Commerce. Harold and his wife Helen were known as Mr. & Mrs. Santa in Mount Joy, bringing happiness to children and residents for over 35 years. Harold generously supported charitable organizations across the community and supported those in need, for instance, donating food to those impacted by Hurricane Agnes while his own home was flooded.

Harold pursued his professional dream of becoming an auctioneer, opening Keller Auctions in 1960, which is now in its third generation. Harold served during many benefit auctions to support community organizations across the region and in 2012, was inducted into the Pennsylvania Auctioneers Hall of Fame.

Harold enjoyed every moment with his family, and we offer prayers of comfort for those who grieve his passing. Harold is survived by his loving family, including Helen, his wife of 68 years, their eight children, nineteen grandchildren, and 28 great-grandchildren.

HONORING WILLIAM ''BILL'' WAGNER ON HIS RETIREMENT FOLLOWING MORE THAN FOUR DECADES OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of William ''Bill'' Wagner, a dedicated public health servant in my hometown of Louisville, Kentucky, who will soon retire after more than four decades of selfless work for our community.

For the last 40 years, Bill has helped lead Family Health Centers, a federally qualified health center that has grown in size and scope to become one of the largest non-profits in our area, providing health care to more than 45,000 individuals annually. Serving as Family Health Centers' CEO since 1998 and as Assistant Director for 17 years prior to that, Bill oversaw the growth of their brick-and-mortar footprint in our area, expanding the number of health center locations in our region. He also helped oversee their tremendous growth in services provided, in patients served, and certainly in the rise of positive health outcomes for the countless Louisvillians that walked through their doors seeking care.

During consideration and the subsequent implementation of the Affordable Care Act, Bill was at the forefront, advocating for increasing access to care while using his voice and passion for those often unheard. As we worked to expand services across our city, it was Bill's guidance I sought out in order to be sure that we could do the most good possible for the most people. And so, it was no surprise when we saw our uninsured rate plummet as people began receiving the free preventive and other health services now available to them—just like Bill said they would if we'd just work together to make it happen. Along the way, he and his staff never hesitated to go above and beyond what was needed to make sure that our community was well-served, that people received the quality care they needed, and that everyone he crossed paths with knew that Family Health Centers was there and ready to help.

Bill had previously announced his plan to retire in early 2020, but as the COVID–19 pandemic reached our borders and began to spread, he put Louisville families first and stayed at the helm of this critical public health organization in order to help lead us through this public health crisis. Bill's tremendous knowledge on public health matters, his early efforts to help ramp up testing in the communities he serves, and in his continued focus to this day on making sure that vaccines are available and accessible in every neighborhood in our city—especially those that are so often overlooked or underserved—has been invaluable.

Reflecting on his upcoming retirement, Bill said, ''I've been guided by the belief that health care is a right not a privilege. We have a long way to go to achieve this goal in our community, but we have made significant strides over the decades.''

I'm proud to share that belief, but I'm even more proud to say that those strides would not have been possible without Bill's selfless dedication to his profession, his wealth of knowledge in the public health field, and his unyielding commitment to improving the lives of our fellow Louisvillians.

Bill has not only improved lives, but has saved them and left a lasting mark on our city, our commonwealth, and this great Nation. I wish him nothin but the very best in retirement and look forward to seeing him soon. Congratulations and thanks for a job well done, my friend.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF JOSH LUCAS

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of high school senior Josh Lucas who passed away Sunday, May 16. He was an admirable young man with a bright future, and I join countless members of the Tuscaloosa community in mourning his loss.

Josh was a senior at Northside High School meant to graduate on Friday, May 21. He was a football player and enlisted in the Alabama National Guard and intended to pursue a career in the military following graduation. He was known as a hard worker, loyal friend, and a diligent athlete.

I join Josh's friends, family, fellow guardsmen, and teammates in mourning his loss. I can say with certainty Josh would have had an outstanding career in the military. I offer my most sincere condolences to those who had the opportunity to know and love Josh and continue to keep them in my prayers.

HONORING CHIEF SPECIAL WARFARE OPERATOR (SEAL) ZACKARY MILLER

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of U.S. Navy Chief Special Warfare Operator Zackary Miller, a highly decorated Navy SEAL, who was taken far too early by cancer at the age of 39. He died on June 4, 2021 in Virginia Beach, Virginia with his family, closest loved ones, and teammates by his side. He was an American hero who dedicated his life in service of our country.

Zack grew up in Columbus, Georgia and Mobile, Alabama. In 2000, he graduated from McGill-Toolen Catholic High School where he played baseball, basketball, and was captain of the football team. Zack received a scholarship to play football at Millsaps College in Jackson, Mississippi before transferring to the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa. He graduated in 2004 with a bachelor's degree in political science.

Zack's athletic prowess and leadership aptitude drove him to enlist in the U.S. Navy in 2004. He first served as an Aviation Ordnanceman onboard the USS *Nimitz* before realizing his dream of becoming a Navy SEAL. During his 16 years in the Navy, he became a highly decorated combat veteran with seven deployments and numerous awards for valor including the Bronze Star Medal with Valor, Joint Service Commendation Medal with Valor, and three Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medals with Valor, each for distinct heroic actions during combat operations worldwide.

Zack was a devoted son, partner, friend, and teammate. He was known for his unparalleled work ethic that was only matched by his endlessly positive attitude, sense of humor, and charm. Madam Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join Zack's family, friends, and teammates in celebrating a life well lived, recognizing the sacrifices he made for all of us, and extending our deepest gratitude for his service to our country.

THE SECOND AMENDMENT IS ESSENTIAL ACT OF 2021

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, The Second Amendment Is Essential Act will classify, by law, the firearms industry as a ''critical infrastructure sector'' and those it employs as ''essential workers'' by amending the Homeland Security Act of 2002 and the USA Patriot Act of 2001. The changes define any business or employees who manufacture or deal firearms and ammunition as critical infrastructure for the purposes of federal guidance to States during an emergency.

The Homeland Security Act of 2002 directed the Administrator of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to establish guidelines for States regarding who should constitute ''critical infrastructure workers'' in the event of a natural disaster, act of terrorism, or other man-made disaster. Throughout the COVID–19 pandemic, these individuals have often been referred to as ''essential workers.''

Similarly, the USA Patriot Act defined ''critical infrastructure'' as ''systems and assets, whether physical or virtual, so vital to the United States that the incapacity or destruction of such systems and assets would have a debilitating impact on security, national economic security, national public health or safety, or any combination of those matters.''

Americans' rights, including the right to keep and bear arms, are no less essential during a state of emergency. In fact, the right to defend one's self and one's home is most essential during a state of emergency. Furthermore, states of emergency merit heightened vigilance to protect against unnecessary and unconstitutional government outreach.

In 2020, gun sales increased by 64 percent as Americans sought to exercise their Second Amendment rights so they could have peace of mind during a turbulent time. Firearms manufacturers and dealers should not be forced by government to close in a time when demand for their products is through the roof. This legislation will ensure that the Second Amendment can be freely enjoyed by Americans when they need it most: in times of crisis.

THANKING CHARLENE BEST FOR HER SERVICE TO THE HOUSE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank my constituent, Charlene Best, for nineteen years of outstanding service to the United States House of Representatives. She retired on June 3 from her role as Manager with the Asset Management Department of Logistics and Support.

Charlene has had a very distinguished career prior to her House employment. In high school and into college, she worked with the Department of the Navy. After her graduation in 1995, she went to work for the National Science Foundation as an Administrative Assistant, followed by a stint with the Census Bureau from 1999 to 2000. Later, she worked as an Executive Assistant for Booz, Allen, Hamilton.

Charlene had long wished to be a House employee and began interviewing in 2002, earning a position as a Special Assistant for the Office of the CAO in the Office Systems Management. She quickly moved through the ranks and became a Supervisor and, eventually, Manager with First Call from 2007 through 2015, before moving up to her current position. Charlene also served as a Move Coordinator during the many Congressional Transitions and brought her special talents and expertise to Members of Congress and their staffs.

When asked about the highlights of her career, Charlene has said how much she appreciated the mentorship of her boss, Tom Coyne, Chief Logistics Officer, and she credits him with helping her to grow professionally. She has also cited one of her first supervisors, Carol Nichols, as someone who saw potential in her and invested time and energy to help her advance in her career.

One notable contribution that Charlene made to the House was her participation in the lying-in-state of Rosa Parks, for which she earned Congressional recognition. She remembers this event with sober reflection. In addition, one of the most cherished memories from her House career was being present in the Capitol for the first inauguration of President Barack Obama. While relaying the story to my staff, she recalled being in the hallway of the Capitol on the path leading out to the inaugural stage, when President-Elect Obama walked within ten feet of where she was standing and gave her a friendly wink prior to stepping out onto the stage. She loves to tell this story to demonstrate the great honors she has felt working for the U.S. House of Representatives.

Charlene, like so many House employees, had been teleworking during the COVID–19 pandemic, and she said that she felt lucky to have spent some 'home time' with her daughter Jordyn, a graduating senior. It was a welcome opportunity to spend quality time with Jordyn before she heads off to college in the fall. In retirement, Charlene is looking forward to enjoying more time spent with her family and pursuing other opportunities.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in extending our congratulations to Charlene Best for her many years of dedication and outstanding contributions to this House. I wish her many wonderful and fulfilling years in retirement.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF HERSHEL DEAN HOOD

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Hershel Dean Hood who passed away at North Mississippi Medical Center on May 16 of this year. I join countless others in mourning his loss.

For three decades, Hershel was a conductor for the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad. He served in the United States National Guard as a Master Sergeant and was the maintenance contractor at Tschudi Courts in Amory for 15 years. He was also an auxiliary deputy with the Monroe County Sherriff's Department for 17 years. Hershel was known and loved in his community.

At Cason Baptist Church, Hershel wore many hats. He was the choir director, a musician, deacon, and children's worker. He was passionate about music and a member of the Nite-Liters band and the Singing Prophets Quartet. His record ''Little Band of Gold'' topped charts in England and he was inducted into the Rock-A-Billy Hall of Fame. He frequently drummed for Elvis Presley.

Left to cherish his memory are wife of 56 years, Ann Oliver Hood; sons, Gregory Dean Hood and Andy Hood; sister, Judy Holman; brothers, Billy Ray Hood and Lamar Hood and multiple nieces and nephews.

I join countless Mississippians in mourning the loss of Mr. Hershel Dean Hood. He was a gifted musician, loving husband and father, and a leader in his community.

IN RECOGNITION OF OCCUPY THE CORNER DETROIT

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 8th Annual Occupy the Corner/Detroit event, an initiative hosted by Detroit City Councilwoman Mary Sheffield in Detroit for its continuous efforts and dedication to provide hope and resources to our communities within Detroit.

For eight years, Occupy the Corner Detroit has been an essential event and program to combat neighborhood crime and violence while promoting critical resources such as expungement program information, utility assistance, housing assistance and so much more. This annual event uplifts our residents and neighbors in 13th District strong and provides hope for economic opportunity for those that have been left behind or underserved.

Occupy the Corner Detroit is more than just an event. It truly signifies the importance of

community and the resilience of Detroiters. Occupy the Corner Detroit provides a space of residents to convene and feel empowered to address day to day challenges. I am truly proud to work in partnership with Council President Pro Tem Sheffield in serving the 13th Congressional District.

Please join me in recognizing the hard work of Occupy the Corner Detroit on behalf of the communities of Detroit, Wayne County, and Michigan's 13th Congressional District and congratulate this initiative on eight years of service to the community.

IN RECOGNITION OF DAVID JOHN SHAWVER

HON. MICHELLE STEEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mrs. STEEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize David John Shawver as he completes his tenure as Chairman of the Orange County Sanitation District Board of Directors. Chairman Shawver served in this capacity from December 2018 through June 2021. Throughout his tenure, Chairman Shawver has been committed to providing an affordable service to the community and understands the importance of keeping with OC San's mission of protecting the public health and the environment. Under his leadership, Chairman Shawver and the Board of Directors understood the financial hardship COVID–19 created for many of our ratepayers, ensuring the service cost for consumers was less than $1 per day. Chairman Shawver's commitment to affordable water and water reuse has allowed OC San to move in the direction of recycling 100 percent of its reclaimable flow through the Groundwater Replenishment System (GWRS), a joint project between OC San and the Orange County Water District. Upon completion of this project in 2023, GWRS will produce 130 million gallons of high-quality water every day, which will be enough water for 1 million residents in north and central Orange County. We thank Chairman Shawver for his years of service and dedication to OC San and the community he serves.

WILLIAM ''BUD'' MONAGHAN

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. NORCROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and commend Cherry Hill, New Jersey Police Chief William ''Bud'' Monaghan, Cherry Hill Police Department.

After 26 years of service, Chief of Police William ''Bud'' Monaghan is set to retire in October 2021. Chief Monaghan joined the police department in 1995 as a patrolman. He has led the police force since January 2014. During his years as Chief of Police, he worked to strengthen the community by creating close ties with the public. Chief Monaghan built relationships with cultural, religious, youth and civic groups to connect the Police Department with its area.

Chief Monaghan regularly attended community meetings to participate in the discussions about Cherry Hill's neighborhoods. He is devoted to keeping the area protected and safe. He also focuses on police transparency and up to date technology to continue to provide aid and comfort to the residents.

The Cherry Hill Police Department is committed to protecting both life and property. Cherry Hill, New Jersey is home to over seventy-thousand residents and the police department averages one-hundred twenty thousand calls for service per year. Chief Monaghan and his police department provide the highest level of police service while also enhancing the quality of life in the area.

Chief Monaghan's dedication to the police department and its 136 full-time sworn officers has resulted in a safe and thankful community that fosters growth and acceptance. Chief Monaghan describes his time and service at the Cherry Hill police department as ''the honor of a lifetime.'' His successor will be chosen in the coming months, but it is evident that Chief Monaghan's impact on the Cherry Hill Police Department will be appreciated for years to come.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring Police Chief William Monaghan in his retirement and recognizing his more than two and a half decades of service to the Township of Cherry Hill and their Police Department.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF LIEUTENANT LANE FOWLER

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Corinth Police Department Lieutenant Lane Fowler, Sr.

In 2004, Lt. Fowler joined the Corinth Police Department. His desire to help people was the reason he chose to launch a career in law enforcement. Over the course of his 17-year career, Lt. Fowler fulfilled his duties with a sense of pride.

One of his most rewarding achievements was serving as the leader of the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) Program. During his eight years working with fifth grade students, Lt. Fowler taught them about the importance of living a healthy lifestyle and making good choices with their lives. Lt. Fowler said it was his goal to teach children that law enforcement officers are not to be feared. It was his goal to build good relationships with members of the community of all ages.

On Friday, June 11, Lt. Fowler's retirement was celebrated during a ceremony hosted by his fellow police officers with the Corinth Police Department. It was my honor to thank him for his dedication to the citizens of Corinth and for his pledge to protect their safety. Lt. Fowler's service will always be remembered.

Lt. Fowler is married to Tonia Fowler. They have five children: Kacie Blakney; Johnson Fowler, Jr.; Sidney Robertson; Mikki Holmes, and Justin Holmes. The Fowlers have six grandchildren: Lainey Blakney; Corbin Blakney; Caben Robbins; Eli Robbins; Hadley Holmes, and Anna Grace Holmes.

I am grateful for Lt. Fowler's lifetime of service to North Mississippi and thank him for his commitment to the Corinth community.

COMMEMORATING LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, this June, we celebrate Pride Month in solidarity with our fellow Americans, and world citizens, who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer, also known as the LGBTQ community. We celebrate the courage it takes for LGBTQ people to openly and freely be their true selves, and we celebrate to show them compassion and understanding, even if they have not yet made the decision to affirm their identity publicly.

The struggle to attain full equality for LGBTQ Americans is far from over, but we can take solace in recent triumphs: the repeal of ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell,'' Obergefell v. Hodges, which legalized same-sex marriage in the United States, Bostock v. Clayton County, GA, which prohibited employment discrimination based on sex or sexual orientation, and President Biden's lifting of the ban on Transgender people from serving in the U.S. Armed Forces.

But also, during this Pride Month, we must not forget the struggles that lie ahead for the LGBTQ community—most notably, attaining the right to live freely, with equal protection of the laws and without fear of violence or persecution. For many LGBTQ people, especially those of color, this dream is not yet within reach. I implore those Americans that face adversity for their sex or sexual orientation not to despair; as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. paraphrased the words of the abolitionist Theodore Parker, 'the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.'

It is incumbent upon each and every one of us living in this country to extend the kindness and respect to our neighbor that we, in turn, would wish to receive. LGBTQ Americans live and work in every city and county in our nation. They live in communities that are rural, urban, suburban and everything in between. They are a diverse community that spans all races, ethnicities, nations, and creeds, but they all have one thing in common—they were created by God and in his image.

HONORING REAR ADMIRAL JOHN A. OKON

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Rear Admiral John A. Okon for his profound leadership while in command of the Naval Meteorology and Oceanography Command (CNMOC) at John C. Stennis Space Center in South Mississippi from 2017 to 2021.

Rear Adm. Okon grew up in Syracuse, New York where he married his wife, Valerie Gessner. Okon first graduated from the State University of New York Maritime College at Fort Schuyler in 1991 with a Bachelor of Science in Meteorology and Oceanography. He also earned a bachelor's degree in National Security Studies from the Naval War

College in Newport, Rhode Island and holds master's degrees in Meteorology and Physical Oceanography from the Naval Post Graduate School in Monterey, California.

While Okon's previous commands include locations such as Osaka, Japan, and Monterey, California, his tenure at CNMOC will be fondly remembered for successes such as procuring funding for a new oceanographic survey ship (T–AGS 67) built at VT Halter Marine Pascagoula, Mississippi, launching the Unmanned Systems Operations Center in the Naval Oceanographic Office, and endorsing a Memorandum of Understanding with NOAA to execute language in the Commercial Engagement for Ocean Technology (CENOTE) Act. He was also instrumental in overseeing several Naval Technology Exercises along the Mississippi Gulf Coast and Port of Gulfport

Rear Adm. Okon has played an influential role in fostering community engagement by educating organizations on the critical contributions the Navy makes to our National Security. His collection of personal awards includes the Legion of Merit, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, in addition to various campaign and service awards.

As the Congressman for the Fourth Congressional District of Mississippi, it is an honor and privilege to recognize Rear Admiral John Okon today for his selfless duty and commitment to the Navy and to the United States of America.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DEDICATION OF SPC HOLLY McGEOGH MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the dedication of the SPC Holly McGeogh Memorial Highway in Taylor, Michigan. By dedicating this highway in the name of SPC McGeogh, an American hero who paid the ultimate sacrifice, we are ensuring that generations of Michiganders and Americans will remember her name and story of selfless courage. This ceremony held today is an important reminder to us all of her dedication and love of this country. It is important that we never forget the first female soldier from Michigan to lose her life in the war in Iraq.

As a daughter of Dearborn and Taylor, SPC McGeogh wanted nothing more than to serve her country and fight for our freedom. A lifelong Michigander and a dedicated member of our military from the very beginning, she served for four years as a Cadet in the Junior ROTC program at Truman High School in Taylor, Michigan.

From Truman High in 2002, McGeogh fulfilled her dream of joining the U.S. Army and hoped to continue her education and begin a career in Army intelligence or psychology. Upon joining the Army, SPC McGeogh was assigned to Company A, 4th Forward Support Battalion, 4th Infantry Division, and stationed at Fort Hood in Texas. She was sent to Iraq at age 19 where she served as a light truck mechanic. On January 4, 2004, while deployed in combat for Operation Iraqi Freedom, SPC Holly McGeogh and two of her fellow soldiers were killed by a roadside bomb outside of Kirkuk.

During her time overseas, she was known to eagerly volunteer for every mission and patrol and taught games like duck-duck-goose to Iraqi children. In one of her final phone calls to her parents, she reminded them that "if she should die, we should remember that she died for a reason." Her family said it best, "Holly is another reminder that our freedom truly is not free."

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the legacy of SPC Holly McGeogh and her unwavering bravery and desire to serve our country. The dedication of the SPC Holly McGeogh Memorial Highway will ensure that all who pass through will recognize her service and honor the ultimate sacrifice that SPC McGeogh has made.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF DALE FORTENBERRY

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and service of Dale Fortenberry as alderman and mayor of Farmington.

Dale was elected Alderman on July 1, 2001 and served until his Election as mayor on July 1, 2005. Dale diligently served the city of Farmington for 16 years as mayor. During his time as mayor, he worked diligently to acquire $1.2 million in grants for the City of Farmington to provide wastewater collection, city hall renovation, and to build a city park. His persistence for Heritage Community Park showed when the City of Farmington received a 1st Place award for Community Development at the Mississippi Municipal League Conference in June 2019. He also served 3 terms as Chairman of the North Mississippi Mayor's Association and was a member of the Executive Board of Directors for the State of Mississippi Municipal League and Legislative Committee.

Prior to his career as mayor, Dale supported local Corinth businesses by working at Tyrone Hydraulics for 35 years and Little Brothers Construction for 10 years.

Dale Fortenberry is the youngest son of Buford and Clara Fortenberry. Dale is originally from Leake County. He has been married to Shirley Fortenberry since 1972 and has two children, Sammy and Nancy. He is passionate about the history of the Confederacy, his family, and the citizens of Farmington.

I join many Mississippians in commemorating the life of Mr. Dale Fortenberry. He was a loyal businessman, alderman, and mayor.

INTRODUCING BILL TO COMBAT TRANSNATIONAL WHITE SUPREMACIST EXTREMISTS AND STRENGTHEN INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENTS ON TRANSNATIONAL WHITE SUPREMACIST THREATS

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. CARSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill that will address intelligence gaps and sharpen our focus on transnational white supremacist extremist threats. Specifically, this bill will improve our federal intelligence agencies and prioritize the white supremacist extremist threat, including its ties to international groups. This bill builds on previous work done by a number of congressional committees, including the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's Intelligence Authorizations (IAA) over the past few years.

As the Chairman of the Counterterrorism, Counterintelligence, and Counterproliferation (C3) Subcommittee on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I am proud to strengthen our earlier provisions in the IAA and introduce this new bill. I am also extremely grateful for the collaborative efforts and support of Chairman ADAM SCHIFF—who joins me as an original cosponsor of this bill, and whose work was invaluable in developing this legislation for introduction today.

This bill mandates that the National Counterterrorism Center—alongside the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security—explore and analyze more completely the ideology and objectives driving white supremacist groups with transnational connections, including their leadership and operational structure. Currently, the United States government too often and too heavily relies on outside research organizations for detailed analysis of white supremacist extremists. It is imperative that United States government's intelligence agencies and subordinate organizations perform the high-level analysis needed to best utilize existing data, add additional data that may be missing, and ensure this is done on a national level. The new assessments required by this bill will allow lawmakers and the public to more completely understand the full scope of the transnational threat and will help foster a sustained examination of its international impact well into the future.

As a former law enforcement professional, I have warned my colleagues for a number of years that the threat of white supremacist extremist organizations has been growing worse. Today, this problem is the top terror threat to American lives, and the United States Government needs to take actions that reflect this heightened priority, especially since the January 6th insurrection and home-grown attack on the U.S. Capitol. While there has been improvement under the Biden Administration, plus increased Congressional efforts, the Intelligence Community continues to place a priority on the international terror groups and their offenses, while ignoring the domestic terror threats. While some were taken by surprise by domestic terrorists that blew up the federal building in Oklahoma City in 1995, we should never again be caught by surprise—especially when we have the ability and the duty

to prevent future attacks with stronger intelligence assessments.

I strongly believe this bill will complement and enhance the recently announced Department of Justice strategy to combat the domestic terror and domestic violent extremism threats, so I urge all my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on June 15, 2022, I voted against bills En Bloc. Had H.R. 610, H.R. 293, H.R. 587, H.R. 1144, H.R. 1921, H.R. 2008, H.R. 2332, H.R. 2545, and H.R. 3642 each received a standalone vote, I would have voted in support of each bill. I opposed the En Bloc because I oppose H.R. 1703.

RETIREMENT OF JORDAN BARAB FROM THE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the service of Jordan Barab who served as the senior health and safety advisor to the Education & Labor Committee after serving in senior positions in the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) in two different Administrations. When Jordan announced his retirement from the Committee, Members of the Committee expressed deep appreciation for the expertise he imparted to the U.S. House of Representatives, especially when we were confronted with the spread of COVID–19.

Jordan's experience working to enhance protections for healthcare workers during the H1N1 flu epidemic—when he led the Occupational Safety and Health Administration as the Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health during the Obama Administration—informed his counsel to the Committee and Congress to have OSHA develop an Emergency Temporary Standard to protect workers during the COVID–19 pandemic. That expertise was also helpful to the Commonwealth of Virginia which became the first state to develop its own emergency temporary standard to protect workers from COVID–19. As a result, other states had a model with which to follow suit.

Jordan also worked with Representative JOE COURTNEY (CT) to advance legislation requiring health care and social service employers to implement plans to prevent workplace violence in the House-passed bipartisan Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act (H.R. 1195). He made sure that public employees in states without OSHA protections received workplace violence protections through Medicare. He also worked with Representative JUDY CHU (CA) on legislation to provide OSHA protections for workers from heat stress.

Over the decades, Jordan has been at the forefront of our nation's efforts to make sure workers come home safely from their job every day. He was a key leader in efforts to seek stronger worker protections regarding bloodborne pathogens, tuberculosis, and ergonomic hazards. Jordan also worked for five years to develop safety recommendations to prevent catastrophic chemical accidents at the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigations Board (CSB), as well as nearly two decades as Assistant Director of Research for Health and Safety with the American Federation of State Municipal and County Employees (AFSCME).

In his earlier work with the Committee, under the leadership of Chairman George Miller (CA), Jordan focused on legislation to prevent combustible dust fires and explosions—an issue brought into sharp focus following the 2008 dust explosion which killed 14 and left over 40 injured at a sugar refinery in Port Wentworth, Georgia. Jordan was the lead staffer into the investigations and legislation to prevent the obliteration of workers' lungs from the inhalation of a flavoring chemical used in popcorn called diacetyl. Jordan also examined the underreporting of injuries and illnesses, a practice that undermines effective workplace safety.

Jordan's dedication to the safety of workers has spanned across the Committee, OSHA, CSB, AFSCME and the labor movement. There is no question that there are many workers who avoided injury or illness because of workplace safety improvements that came about because of Jordan's work. He remains a trusted advisor—and may not easily escape our inquiries when we have questions.

On behalf of workers, their families, and the people of the country, I thank Jordan Barab for his service to the public and lasting contribution to workplace safety.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF HENRY RANDLE

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Henry Randle who recently lost his battle with cancer. He was a brave and selfless community servant and I join countless Mississippians in mourning his loss.

Henry Randle was a graduate of Aberdeen High School class of 1989. He attended Mary Holmes College, Mississippi State University, and the Mississippi Law Enforcement Training Academy. In 2001, he joined the Mississippi National Guard.

Mr. Randle began his military career as an Army Motor Transport Operator. In 2009, he earned a second occupation as a Petroleum Supply Specialist and has served in a variety of leadership positions in Engineer and a Maneuver Unit. Over the course of his career, he has served in the Mississippi National Guard's 223rd Engineering Battalion, served in the Middle East—most recently in 2018 as an E6 staff sergeant. He aided in hurricane Katrina recovery.

Among Mr. Randle's awards include a Armed Forces Reserves Medal with M Device, Army Achievement Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Army Reserve Components Overseas TRG Ribbon, Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Combat Action Badge, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, National Defense Service Medal. He joined the Aberdeen Police Department in 1997 and served as a school resource officer. In April of 2008, Mr. Randle was elected as Aberdeen Police Chief.

It was an honor to work with Henry in the Mississippi Guard as well as in law enforcement. Henry Randle was an outstanding community leader who served his state and country well. I am grateful for his life of service to the Aberdeen community and offer my deepest condolences and most sincere prayers for all who know and love him.

JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 2021

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the importance of celebrating Juneteenth as a national holiday.

For a century after the last slaves were freed, Black Americans were denied the rights considered "unalienable" by the Constitution. Even after July 4, 1776, millions of enslaved people and their descendants would not experience independence for decades. Over the last 50 years, systemic racism has continued to hinder many who strive to live out the American Dream.

Despite the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, Black people would remain enslaved in parts of the Confederacy for nearly two and a half years. On June 19, 1865, Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, delivering news of the end of the Civil War and of slavery.

The message he conveyed that day was simple. General Order Number 3 declared that ". . . all slaves are free. This involves an absolute equality of personal rights and rights of property, between former masters and slaves . . ."

The following year, the newly liberated people of Texas began celebrating Juneteenth as a celebration of answered prayers and new opportunities.

This tradition slowly spread throughout the country, eventually becoming a holiday or day of observance in 49 states and the District of Columbia. My home state of Rhode Island has observed Juneteenth since 2012.

While Juneteenth has been widely celebrated among African American communities since the end of the Civil War, the prominence of the holiday has grown significantly in recent years.

I am proud to have supported the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act when it passed in Congress and was signed into law last week. It is my hope that June 19th will serve as a day of reflection and an annual call to recommit ourselves to the American ideals of freedom and equality.

For far too long, our society has denied the promise of these ideals to many Americans.

From the Jim Crow era until today, Black Americans have been the target of racism and bigotry, treated as second class citizens, denied opportunity, and subjected to countless violent attacks by racist mobs and individuals.

Over the last year, the United States has experienced the most intensive reckoning with slavery and its legacy since the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s.

The Black Lives Matter movement and nationwide protests following the death of George Floyd have cast a light on the disparate outcomes that persist for Black people in education, employment, interactions with the police, and numerous other aspects of everyday life.

These disparities contribute to—and are influenced by—the intergenerational racial wealth gap. Recent studies show that Black children face significantly higher rates of downward economic mobility and lower rates of upward mobility compared to white children.

For instance, a Black child born into a high-income family is as likely to end up in the bottom 20 percent of earners as an adult as they are to remain in top 20 percent. In contrast, a white child born to parents with the same income is five times more likely to remain in the top income quintile as they are to fall to the bottom of the income distribution.

The systemic racism ingrained in American society must come to an end. As Members of Congress, we need to face this challenge head on, with clear eyes, open minds, and full hearts. Making Juneteenth a national holiday is a start, but our constituents have shown us that sustained Congressional inaction is no longer an option.

This is the moment to pass comprehensive policing reform, protect and expand voting rights, and remove the vestiges of slavery from our social fabric for good.

In the last two years, the House has passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act and the Voting Rights Advancement Act. The Commission on the Social Status of Black Men and Boys Act was signed into law in December after passing both chambers with overwhelming bipartisan support.

This is the kind of legislation we need to begin unwinding the political, economic, and societal policies that have disadvantaged Black Americans since Reconstruction.

This Juneteenth, I hope my colleagues join me in reflecting on the myriad barriers to opportunity that exist for far too many Black Americans and in promoting concrete actions Congress can take to remove them.

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as our country celebrates Pride Month this June, I rise as a Senior Member of the House Judiciary Committee to affirm a basic truth: that we are all equal.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. CICILLINE, and the Congressional LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus for organizing this special order in commemoration of Pride Month.

This month serves as an opportunity to recommit ourselves to making equality in every aspect of American life real for members of the LGBTQ+ community.

It also serves as a reminder of both the shared struggle and collective joy found in the history and life experiences of queer and gender non-conforming members of our society.

Our country has come a long way in the fight for justice for all the queer and gender non-conforming members of our society.

The Stonewall Uprisings in Greenwich Village marked a watershed moment in the LGBTQ+ movement, reigniting the fight for justice and signaling a new chapter of progress in our country's quest to ensure that fair treatment is the rule, never the exception.

The Supreme Court's 2015 decision in Obergefell v. Hodges enshrined fair treatment as the rule when the court affirmed same-sex couple's right to marry the person they love, regardless of where they lived.

Our country's commitment to justice has been maintained by the tireless work of advocates and communities at the forefront of social change.

We know, however, that this work is unfinished.

As with every social movement, progress is met by resistance, and that resistance can only be overcome with unmatched persistence and fidelity to a basic truth enshrined in our belief: that all are created equal and worthy of human dignity.

In keeping with this belief, we cannot forget the great champions of this cause, many of which I am proud to claim as fellow Texans.

Sarah Fernandez, Judy Reeves, Tommy Ross, JD Doyle, Dalton DeHeart, Judge Jerry Simoneux, Judge Fran Watson—I thank them for their unwavering advocacy.

I also want to recognize a few organizations that continue to do the hard and necessary work of keeping our communities safe, making them feel seen, and pushing our country towards equality.

The Houston GLBT Political Caucus, Save Our Sisters United, Montrose Grace Place, and the Montrose Center—their work is important and valued.

Lastly, I wish to pay tribute to Monica Roberts and Ray Hill.

Monica Roberts, whose death leaves a gaping hole in the hearts of the LGBTQ+ community in Houston.

Monica worked as a trailblazing journalist and advocate, never failing to center the stories of Black trans people and shining light on the issues often ignored by the media.

Ray Hill co-organized the first gay rights organization in Houston in 1967, fiercely advocated for those living with HIV and AIDS, and always sought to advance the cause of equality, despite the hardships.

There are more than 46,000 same-sex couples in Texas, and about a third of LGBTQ+ Texans are raising children.

According to an analysis by the Williams Institute at the UCLA School of Law, approximately 930,000 Texans identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer.

If LGBTQ+ Texans were a city unto themselves, they'd be the 5th most populous municipality in the state, just behind Austin, and significantly larger than El Paso.

These families and these individuals all benefit from the incredible advocacy and sacrifice of the aforementioned organizations and individuals.

From the Ryan White Care Act to the Matthew Sheppard Act passed by Congress to the Lawrence v. Texas and Obergefell v. Hodges decisions announced by the Supreme Court, it is clear that social change cannot simply be hoped for—it must be codified, protected, and expanded to account for the real discrimination still shouldered by the LGBTQ+ community.

In particular, I want to underscore the importance of intersectionality, and recognize that queer people of color face disproportionate burdens ranging from violence against transgender people to higher rates of youth homelessness and HIV infection.

On behalf of LGBTQ+ Texans and all Americans, I call upon the Senate to follow the House's example and pass H.R. 5, the Equality Act now.

I call on my colleagues in Congress to move forward with key legislative priorities ranging from ending HIV criminalization, passing the HIV epidemic plan, and enacting criminal justice reform that puts a stop to policies, which above all harm incarcerated transgender people.

For LGBTQ+ communities to be truly seen—to be valued—in our country, they must be accounted for in our policies and actions, not simply tokenized in political rhetoric and corporate merchandise.

It is time to go beyond political rhetoric and make real the promise of equality, opportunity, and justice for every American—irrespective of who they are and who they love.

Let us be unequivocal in our support and love for the LGBTQ+ community, not just in words, but in actions.

[From the Texas Tribune, April 20, 2021
Updated: April 21, 2021]

TEXAS LAWMAKERS ADVANCE BILLS BLOCKING ACCESS TO GENDER-AFFIRMING HEALTH CARE DESPITE OPPOSITION FROM LGBTQ TEXANS, MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS

(By Megan Munce)

Equality Texas CEO Ricardo Martinez said Texas has filed more anti-LGBTQ bills this session than any other state legislature.

Before undergoing gender confirmation surgery at age 17, Indigo Giles had to get approval from a doctor, a therapist and the hospital where the surgery would be performed to ensure there were no options left besides surgery. To even get to that point, Indigo's father Neil said it took time-consuming research and several reflections as a family before going forward with the process.

The surgery's impact was immediate, said Indigo, now 19, who identifies as nonbinary. They were able to wear the clothes they wanted to, and their confidence in school and with friends significantly increased. Most significantly, the surgery helped alleviate their severe depression caused in part by gender dysphoria—discomfort related to feeling a disconnect between one's personal gender identity and the gender assigned to them at birth.

But under a slate of legislation moving in the Texas Senate and House, Indigo wouldn't have been able to make such a decision until their 18th birthday. In fact, no transgender child in Texas would be able to pursue puberty blockers, hormone treatment or surgery for the purpose of gender confirmation.

Transgender Texas children, their parents, medical groups and businesses have vocally opposed many of the bills lawmakers are pursuing. Equality Texas CEO Ricardo Martinez said Texas has filed more anti-LGBTQ bills this session than any other state legislature.

''It's insulting,'' Indigo said. ''These lawmakers think that we don't know what we

want with our own bodies and we're not able to say what we want and mean it.''

House Bill 1399 would prohibit health care providers and physicians from performing gender confirmation surgery or prescribing, administering or supplying puberty blockers or hormone treatment to anyone under the age of 18. The House Public Health Committee advanced the bill Friday.

Senate Bill 1311 by Sen. Bob Hall, R-Edgewood, would revoke the medical license of health care providers and physicians who perform such procedures or prescribe such drugs or hormones to people younger than 18. The Senate State Affairs Committee advanced that bill Monday.

The Senate last week passed Senate Bill 29, which would prevent public school students from participating in sports teams unless their sex assigned at birth aligns with the team's designation. While that bill would only affect students in K–12 schools, two similar bills in the House would include colleges and universities in that mandate.

SB 29 has been referred to the House Public Education Committee, which is slated to meet Tuesday and hear testimony on identical legislation that was introduced in the lower chamber. On Wednesday night, the chair of that committee told the Houston Chronicle that the companion legislation, House Bill 4042, is likely dead.

''That bill is probably not going to make it out of committee,'' state Rep. Harold Dutton, D-Houston, told the Chronicle. ''We just don't have the votes for it . . . But I promised the author that I'd give him a hearing, and we did.''

Last session, Dade Phelan, the Beaumont Republican who is now House Speaker, demonstrated a lack of appetite for bills restricting rights for LGBTQ Texans.

''It's completely unacceptable,'' he said at the time. ''This is 2019.''

Last week, Rep. Bryan Slaton, R-Royse City, tried to amend a bill on the House floor that would fund prescription drugs for uninsured Texans so that it would exclude hormone and puberty suppression treatments. That amendment failed after it was noted that existing bills were addressing such treatments.

MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS UNITE IN OPPOSITION TO BILLS

In public testimony this year, transgender Texans and their parents have testified in near unanimous opposition to the bills. Several parents described their experience testifying as ''terrifying,'' worrying their testimony would be used against them should the bills' penalties become law. Under Senate Bill 1646, which the Senate State Affairs Committee passed Tuesday night, they could be labeled child abusers for allowing their children to receive gender affirming treatment.

That bill comes after Jeff Younger attracted the attention of Gov. Greg Abbott and other top Texas Republicans in 2019 after a dispute between him and his ex-wife turned into a court battle over whether he could oppose his child's transition. Younger, among others testifying in support of these bills, emphasized young children's lack of brain development and claimed parents and social media pressure children into identifying as transgender.

But experts say social media and social pressure have nothing to do with it.

''There's literally zero evidence or research to suggest that that's true,'' said Megan Mooney, past president of the Texas Psychological Association.

According to Mooney, children as young as 2 or 3 can develop ideas about gender identity. By 6 or 7, she said, their sense of gender identity is relatively stable.

Lisa Stanton, a Houston mother, said her daughter Maya began expressing her gender identity as soon as she could talk. Lisa said Maya would speak about a fairy who would use magic to turn her into a girl.

Maya had no access to social media, Lisa said, and neither of them even had the language to discuss gender dysphoria or being transgender. What's more, Maya has a twin brother who Lisa said has been raised exactly the same way as his sister, but has never expressed gender dysphoria.

At 10 years old, Maya hasn't received any medical treatment yet. Lisa said in the future, she may have to use puberty blockers—a medical treatment legislators want to ban, but experts say is completely safe.

Marjan Linnell, a general pediatrician, testified on behalf of six different state and national medical associations and said in committee that ''organized medicine stands united to strongly oppose both SB 1646 and SB 1311.''

In an interview with The Texas Tribune, Linnell explained that puberty suppression treatment has been used for decades to prevent children from going through puberty too soon. Once those children reach an appropriate age, their treatment stops and natural puberty occurs. Linnell said the same is true for transgender children, for whom puberty can often exacerbate poor mental health.

''The point is to have a reversible treatment that can give them some time,'' she said. ''That not only helps to gain some time to make sure we're making an appropriate and best practice medical decision for these kids and families, but we also know it can be incredibly important for preserving the mental health of our kids that are going through gender affirming care.''

THE MENTAL HEALTH TOLL OF GENDER DYSPHORIA AND SOCIAL MARGINALIZATION

Hall, the Edgewood Republican, argued during a committee hearing that gender dysphoria would pass after puberty for many children. He claimed that children feeling like they're in the wrong body is akin to them being ''tomboys'' and ''sensitive kids'' who could later turn into the ''best looking cheerleaders'' and ''toughest football players'' by high school.

But both Mooney and Linnell said puberty can increase rates of anxiety, depression and suicidal ideation for transgender children, and delaying treatment until 18 could worsen the existing disproportionate rate of transgender children who consider suicide.

Indigo described the process of testifying alone as ''exhausting and upsetting'' after they and other transgender children were faced with legislators and protesters who opposed giving them access to gender confirmation care. The week after Texas considered a bill restricting public bathroom access for transgender Texans in 2017, the Trevor Project reported that the amount of transgender children calling or messaging their national suicide hotline dramatically increased.

Legislators voiced particular concern over whether these treatments may cause irreversible infertility for young children. Experts that lawmakers specifically invited to testify cited disputed statistics and stirred fears that procedures such as mastectomies could be performed on prepubescent children—a claim Linnell called ''disheartening,'' given that breast tissue does not develop until after puberty.

While hormone treatments may cause infertility in some cases, Linnell said it varies and is always discussed with patients prior to undergoing treatment. Surgery, she said, would rarely or never be used until after puberty, and requires several consultations with doctors and psychologists before being approved. According to Mooney, surgery is only recommended when a patient is experiencing so much psychological distress that the only way to resolve it is surgery.

While each bill would only delay treatment until age 18, Mooney said medical treatment is often necessary for transgender children just to make it to their 18th birthday.

In committee testimony, 17-year-old Charlie Apple said the combination of gender dysphoria and social marginalization made him feel uncomfortable with both his body and his own existence. Receiving gender confirmation surgery and hormone treatment, he said, has helped him start to change that.

''I've made friends, I've played in sports. I've had the kind of stupid fun you're supposed to have as a kid, but most importantly, I survived,'' Apple said. ''Without these treatments, I would have most likely been with the majority of trans children not standing here before you, but under a gravestone.''

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4661–S4705

Measures Introduced: Twenty-nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2156–2184, and S. Res. 281–282. **Pages S4697–98**

Measures Passed:

100th Anniversary of the Government Accountability Office: Senate agreed to S. Res. 282, recognizing July 1, 2021, as the 100th anniversary of the Government Accountability Office and commending the service of the Government Accountability Office to Congress and the United States. **Page S4691**

Sarbanes Oxley Act: Senate passed S. 2184, to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to institute a trading prohibition for certain issuers that retain public accounting firms that have not been subject to inspection by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. **Page S4692**

Measures Considered:

For the People Act: Senate resumed 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. **Pages S4671–91**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 246), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S4685**

Growing Climate Solutions Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, following consultation with the Republican Leader, Senate begin consideration of S. 1251, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a program to reduce barriers to entry for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in certain voluntary markets; that the only amendments in order be the following: Lee Amendment No. 2119; provided further that there be two hours for debate equally divided on the bill; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on or in relation to Lee Amendment No. 2119; and Senate vote on passage of the bill as amended, if amended. **Page S4692**

Boardman Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 2:00 p.m., on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland; if cloture is invoked on the nomination, all post-cloture time expire at 5:45 p.m. **Page S4704**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 55 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 243), Christopher Charles Fonzone, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. **Pages S4661–71**

By 51 yeas to 50 nays, Vice President voting yea (Vote No. EX. 245), Kiran Arjandas Ahuja, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years. **Page S4671**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 50 nays, Vice President voting yea (Vote No. EX. 244), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4671**

Ali Nouri, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs). **Page S4692**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Carlton Waterhouse, of Virginia, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Foreign Service. **Pages S4704–05**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4694–95**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S4695–97**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4698–S4700**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S4700–01

Additional Statements: Pages S4692–93

Amendments Submitted: Pages S4701–04

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S4704

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—246) Pages S4670–71, S4685

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:03 a.m. and adjourned at 7:40 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Wednesday, June 23, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4704.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Subcommittee on Rural Development and Energy concluded a hearing to examine renewable energy, focusing on growth and opportunities for rural economies, after receiving testimony from Shannon Schlecht, Agricultural Research Utilization Institute, Crookston, Minnesota; Katie Sieben, Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, St. Paul; Emily Skor, Growth Energy, Washington, D.C.; Bill Cherrier, Central Iowa Power Cooperative, Des Moines; and Matthew Mancuso, Iowa Western Community College, Council Bluffs.

APPROPRIATIONS: ARMY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 for the Army, after receiving testimony from Christine E. Wormuth, Secretary of the Army, and General James P. McConville, Army Chief of Staff, both of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Caroline Diane Krass, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, Gina Maria Ortiz Jones, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, Ely Stefansky Ratner, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary, Shawn Graham Skelly, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary, Meredith Berger, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and 2,932 military nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Space Force, all 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 Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2022 and the Future Years Defense Program after receiving testimony from Thomas W. Harker, Acting Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Michael M. Gilday, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, and General David H. Berger, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded a hearing to examine modernization efforts 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 Lieutenant General David S. Nahom, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs, Lieutenant General Joseph T. Guastella, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, and Lieutenant General Duke Z. Richardson, USAF, Military Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, all of the Air Force, Department of Defense.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Brian Eddie Nelson, of California, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, who was introduced by Senator Padilla, and Elizabeth Rosenberg, of Vermont, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, who was introduced by Senator Leahy, both of the Department of the Treasury, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUILDING RESILIENT NETWORKS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communication, Media, and Broadband concluded a hearing to examine building resilient networks, after receiving testimony from Jeffrey D. Johnson, Western Fire Chiefs Association, Sisters, Oregon; Jonathan Adelstein, Wireless Infrastructure Association, Arlington, Virginia; Denny Law, Golden West Telecommunications Cooperative, Inc., Wall, South Dakota; and Harold Feld, Public Knowledge, Washington, D.C.

ASIA-PACIFIC TRADE POLICY

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness concluded a hearing to examine the strategic benefits of

a multilateral approach to trade policy in the Asia-Pacific region, after receiving testimony from Wendy Cutler, Asia Society Policy Institute, Washington, D.C.; Don Allan, Stanley Black and Decker, New Britain, Connecticut; Peter A. Petri, Brandeis University, Boston, Massachusetts; and James B. Cunningham, Atlantic Council, Elizabethtown, New York.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1041, to advance the strategic alignment of United States diplomatic tools toward the realization of free, fair, and transparent elections in Nicaragua and to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to protect the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of Nicaragua, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2000, to promote the United States-Greece defense partnership, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 93, to amend the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to modify the foreign persons subject to sanctions and to remove the sunset for the imposition of sanctions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 14, to identify and combat corruption in countries, to establish a tiered system of countries with respect to levels of corruption by their governments and their efforts to combat such corruption, and to evaluate foreign persons engaged in grand corruption for inclusion as specially designated nationals under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 67, 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. 165, calling on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide evidence or to release United States citizen Paul Whelan;

S. Res. 107, expressing the sense of the Senate relating to the 10th anniversary of the March 11, 2011, earthquake and tsunami in Japan;

S. Res. 176, urging all parties in Georgia to seek prompt implementation of the agreement signed on April 19, 2021, and reaffirming the support of the Senate for Georgia, the territorial integrity of Georgia, and the aspirations of Georgians to join the Euro-Atlantic community, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

Routine lists in the Foreign Service.

D.C. STATEHOOD

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine D.C. statehood, including S. 51, to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union, after receiving testimony from former Senator Joe Lieberman, and Representative Norton; Mayor Muriel Bowser, and Roger Pilon, Cato Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; Marc Morial, National Urban League, New York, New York; Richard Primus, University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor; and Derek T. Muller, University of Iowa College of Law, Iowa City.

VACCINES

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine vaccines, focusing on America's shot at ending the COVID–19 pandemic, after receiving testimony from Susan R. Bailey, American Medical Association, Fort Worth, Texas; Jeanette Betancourt, Sesame Workshop, New York, New York; Curtis Chang, Duke Divinity School, San Jose, California; and Michelle L. Nichols, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia.

FEDERAL SENTENCING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Federal sentencing for crack and powder cocaine, after receiving testimony from Regina M. LaBelle, Acting Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Arkansas Governor Asa Hutchinson, Little Rock; Matthew Charles, FAMM, Nashville, Tennessee; Russell Coleman, Frost Brown Todd, Louisville, Kentucky; Antonio Garcia, National HIDTA Directors Association, San Antonio, Texas; and Steven B. Wasserman, National Association of Assistant U.S. Attorneys, Washington, D.C.

PROTECTING REAL INNOVATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property concluded a hearing to examine protecting real innovations by improving patent quality, after receiving testimony from Bridget Asay, Stris and Maher, Montpelier, Vermont; Julio A. Garceran, Cree, Inc., Durham, North Carolina; Troy R. Lester, Acushnet Company, Fairhaven, Massachusetts; and Jorge L. Contreras, University of Utah S.J. Quinney College of Law, Salt Lake City.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Christine Abizaid, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 48 public bills, H.R. 4026–4073; and 5 resolutions, H. Res. 485, 487–490 were introduced. **Pages H3004–06**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3007–09**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 3239, to make improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code (H. Rept. 117–67);

H.R. 3241, to make improvements in the enactment of title 54, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code (H. Rept. 117–68); H.R. 1915, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize certain water pollution control programs, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–69);

H.R. 3684, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–70); and

H. Res. 486, providing for consideration of the bill (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; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 239) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for limitations on copayments for contraception furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1443) to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to "Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures"; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 14) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review"; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 15) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to "National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders"; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–71). **Page H3004**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative McGovern to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2935**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:21 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H2937**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Enhancing State Energy Security Planning and Emergency Preparedness Act of 2021: H.R. 1374, to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide Federal financial assistance to States to implement, review, and revise State energy security plans, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 398 yeas to 21 nays, Roll No. 173; and **Pages H2938–40, H2987–88**

Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2021: H.R. 983, amended, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 416 yeas to 5 nays, Roll No. 174. **Pages H2952–54, H2988–89**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:12 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H2987**

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2021: H.R. 482, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs under part A of title XI of such Act relating to genetic diseases; **Pages H2940–42**

Pandemic Effects on Home Safety and Tourism Act: H.R. 3752, to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to study the effect of the COVID–19 pandemic on injuries and deaths associated with consumer products and to direct the Secretary of Commerce to study and report on the effects of the COVID–19 pandemic on the travel and tourism industry in the United States; **Pages H2942–44**

Consumer Safety Technology Act: H.R. 3723, to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to establish a pilot program to explore the use of artificial intelligence in support of the mission of the Commission and direct the Secretary of Commerce and the Federal Trade Commission to study and report on the use of blockchain technology and digital tokens, respectively; **Pages H2944–47**

Safe Sleep for Babies Act of 2021: H.R. 3182, to provide that inclined sleepers for infants and crib bumpers shall be considered banned hazardous products under section 8 of the Consumer Product Safety Act; **Pages H2947–48**

Stop Tip-overs of Unstable, Risky Dressers on Youth Act: H.R. 1314, to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety rule for free-standing clothing storage units to protect children from tip-over related death or injury; **Pages H2948–50**

Tribal Health Data Improvement Act of 2021: H.R. 3841, to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the collection and availability of health data with respect to Indian Tribes; **Pages H2950–52**

Criminal Judicial Administration Act of 2021: H.R. 2694, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for transportation and subsistence for criminal justice defendants; **Pages H2954–56**

Elder Abuse Protection Act of 2021: H.R. 2922, amended, to amend the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act to authorize the Elder Justice Initiative, to require that online resources of such initiative are made available in Spanish; **Pages H2956–58**

Justice for Juveniles Act: H.R. 961, amended, to exempt juveniles from the requirements for suits by prisoners; **Pages H2958–61**

Making improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code: H.R. 3239, to make improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code; **Pages H2961–77**

Making improvements in the enactment of title 54, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code: H.R. 3241, amended, to make improvements in the enactment of title 54, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code; **Pages H2977–80**

Artistic Recognition for Talented Students Act: H.R. 704, to amend section 708 of title 17, United States Code, to permit the Register of Copyrights to waive fees for filing an application for registration of a copyright claim in certain circumstances; **Pages H2980–82**

Advancing Mutual Interests and Growing Our Success Act: H.R. 2571, amended, to include Portugal in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E–1 and E–2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of Portugal and to otherwise modify the eligibility criteria for E visas; **Pages H2982–83**

Amending title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina: S. 1340, to amend title 28, United States Code, to redefine the eastern and middle judicial districts of North Carolina; **Pages H2983–84**

Foundation of the Federal Bar Association Charter Amendments Act of 2021: H.R. 2679, amended, to amend title 36, United States Code, to revise the Federal charter for the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association; and **Pages H2984–86**

Amending the Commodity Exchange Act to modify the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Customer Protection Fund: S. 409, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to modify the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Customer Protection Fund. **Pages H2986–87**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2987–88 and H2988–89.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

Committee Meetings

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 660, the "Shovel-Ready Restoration Grants for Coastlines and Fisheries Act of 2021"; H.R. 1415, the "Tribal Coastal Resiliency Act"; H.R. 1689, the "Offshore Wind for Territories Act"; H.R. 2750, the "Blue Carbon for Our Planet Act"; H.R. 3160, the "Keep America's Waterfronts Working Act"; H.R. 3228, the "National Coastal Resilience Data and Services Act"; H.R. 3692, the "Marine Mammal Climate Change Protection Act"; H.R. 3748, the "BLUE GLOBE ACT"; H.R. 3764,

the ''Ocean-Based Climate Solutions Act of 2021''; H.R. 3817, the ''Regional Ocean Partnership Act''; H.R. 3864, the ''Chesapeake Bay Oyster Research Act''; H.R. 3906, the ''Blue Carbon Protection Act''; and H.R. 3892, the ''National Oceans and Coastal Security Improvements Act''. Testimony was heard from Representatives González-Colón, Pingree, Beyer, and Huffman; Stephen Guertin, Deputy Director for Policy, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Nicole LeBoeuf, Acting Administrator, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

LESSONS LEARNED: THE FEDERAL RESERVE'S RESPONSE TO THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis held a hearing entitled ''Lessons Learned: The Federal Reserve's Response to the Coronavirus Pandemic''. Testimony was heard from Jerome H. Powell, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE RELATING TO ''UPDATE OF COMMISSION'S CONCILIATION PROCEDURES''; PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL A RULE RELATING TO ''OIL AND NATURAL GAS SECTOR: EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW, RECONSTRUCTED, AND MODIFIED SOURCES REVIEW''; PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE RELATING TO ''NATIONAL BANKS AND FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS AS LENDERS''; EQUAL ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION FOR VETERANS ACT; LGBTQ BUSINESS EQUAL CREDIT ENFORCEMENT AND INVESTMENT ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 2062, the ''Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act''; S.J. Res. 13, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to ''Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures''; S.J. Res. 14, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review''; S.J. Res. 15, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to ''National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders''; H.R. 239, the ''Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act''; and H.R. 1443, the ''LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act''. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2062, the ''Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act'', H.R. 239, the ''Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act'', H.R. 1443, the ''LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act'', S.J. Res. 13, Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to ''Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures'', S.J. Res. 14, Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review'', and S.J. Res. 15, Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to ''National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders''. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2062, the ''Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act of 2021'', under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–6, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides that following debate, each further amendment printed in part B of the Rules Committee report not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Section 3 of the rule provides that at any time after debate the chair of the Committee on

Education and Labor or his designee may offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of the resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 239, the ''Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act'', under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1443, the ''LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act'', under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–7 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 13 under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to commit. The rule provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 14 under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to commit. The rule provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 15 under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to commit. The rule provides that House Resolution 485 is hereby adopted. The rule provides that at any time through the legislative day of Friday, June 25, 2021, the Speaker may entertain motions offered by the Majority Leader or a designee that the House suspend the rules with respect to multiple measures that were the object of motions to suspend the rules on the legislative days of June 22 or 23, 2021, and on which the yeas and nays were ordered and further proceedings postponed. The Chair shall put the question on any such motion without debate or intervening motion, and the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated. Testimony was heard from Chairman Scott of Virginia, and Representatives García of Illinois, Steil, Peters, Carter of Georgia, and Foxx.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine markets, transparency, and prices from cattle producer to consumer, 2:30 p.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 for the Department of Energy, including the National Nuclear Security Agency, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 and 2023 advance appropriations requests for the Department of Veterans Affairs, 10 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2 p.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 for the Department of the Treasury, 2 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, to hold hearings to examine recent ransomware attacks, 2 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Policy, to hold hearings to examine the role of child care in an equitable post-pandemic economy, 2:30 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation Safety, Operations, and Innovation, to hold hearings to examine aviation infrastructure for the 21st century, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 31, to limit the establishment or extension of national monuments in the State of Utah, S. 172, to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, S. 192, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain river segments in the State of Oregon as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 270, to amend the Act entitled ''Act to provide for the establishment of the Brown v. Board of Education National Historic Site in the State of Kansas'' to provide for inclusion of additional related sites in the National Park System, S. 491, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain river segments in the York River watershed in the State of Maine as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 535, to authorize the location of a memorial on the National Mall to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces that served on active duty in support of the Global War on Terrorism, S. 753, to reauthorize the Highlands Conservation Act, to authorize States to use funds from that Act for administrative purposes, S. 1317, to modify the boundary of the Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument in the State of Arizona, S. 1320, to establish the Chiricahua National Park in the State of Arizona as a unit of the National Park System, S. 1321, to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, S. 1354, to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Chilkoot National Historic Trail and to provide for a study of the Alaska Long Trail, S. 1526, to authorize the use of off-highway vehicles in certain areas of the Capitol Reef National Park, Utah, S. 1527, to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide that State law shall apply to the use of motor vehicles on roads within a System unit, S. 1769, to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, and S. 1771, to authorize reference to the museum located at Blytheville/Eaker Air Force Base in Blytheville, Arkansas, as the ''National Cold War Center'', 10 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on Energy, to hold hearings to examine existing programs and future opportunities to ensure access to affordable, reliable, and clean energy for rural and low-income communities, 2 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold hearings to examine building a successful foundation for Native communities' infrastructure development, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Gustavo A. Gelpi, of Puerto Rico, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Angel Kelley, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, Christine P. O'Hearn, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, and Helaine Ann Greenfeld, of Maryland, and Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, and Border Safety, to hold hearings to examine immigration and citizenship policies for U.S. military service members, veterans, and their families, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine pending calendar business, 3 p.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, hearing entitled ''A Hearing to Review the Efficacy of the Farm Safety Net'', 1 p.m., 1300 Longworth and Zoom.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Fiscal Year 2022 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Fiscal Year 2022 Budget'', 10 a.m., 210 Cannon and Zoom.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled ''Examining Pathways to Build a Stronger, More Inclusive Retirement System'', 10:15 a.m., Zoom.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3291, the ''Assistance, Quality, and Affordability Act of 2021''; H.R. 3293, the ''Low-Income Water Customer Assistance Programs Act of 2021''; and H.R. 2467, the ''PFAS Action Act of 2021'', 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2689, the ''Minority Business Development Administration Act''; H.R. 3948, the ''Greater Supervision in Banking (G-SIB) Act''; H.R. 3958, the ''Central Liquidity Facility Enhancement Act''; and H.R. 3968, the ''Municipal IDs Acceptance Act'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism, hearing entitled ''COVID–19 in the MENA Region: Addressing the Impacts of the Pandemic and the Road to Recovery'', 11 a.m., Webex.

Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, Migration and International Economic Policy, hearing entitled ''The Biden Administration's Efforts to

Deepen U.S. Engagement in the Caribbean'', 3 p.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Building the Coast Guard America Needs: Achieving Diversity, Equity, and Accountability within the Service'', 9:30 a.m., Webex.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3843, the ''Merger Filing Fee Modernization Act of 2021''; H.R. 3460, the ''State Antitrust Enforcement Venue Act of 2021''; H.R. 3849, the ''ACCESS Act of 2021''; H.R. 3826, the ''Platform Competition and Opportunity Act of 2021''; H.R. 3816, the ''American Choice and Innovation Online Act''; and H.R. 3825, the ''Ending Platform Monopolies Act'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Examining the Department of the Interior's Spending Priorities and the President's Fiscal Year Budget 2022 Proposal'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth and Webex.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy, hearing entitled ''An Epidemic Continues: Youth Vaping in America'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''A Review of the President's Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Proposal for NASA'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Underserved, Agricultural, and Rural Development, hearing entitled ''Prioritizing Small Undeserved and Rural Businesses in the SBIR/STTR Programs'', 2 p.m., 2360 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled ''FEMA's Priorities for FY22 and Beyond: Coordinating Mission, Vision, and Budget'', 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn and Zoom.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Central Intelligence Agency Budget Hearing'', 10 a.m., HVC–304 Hearing Room.

Joint Meetings

Joint Committee on Printing: organizational business meeting to consider the selection of the Chair and Vice Chair, and committee rules of procedure for the 117th Congress, 4 p.m., Room to be announced.

Joint Committee on the Library: organizational business meeting to consider the selection of the Chair and Vice Chair, and committee rules of procedure for the 117th Congress, 4:10 p.m., Room to be announced.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Wednesday, June 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 3 p.m. If cloture is invoked on the nomination, Senate will vote on confirmation thereon at 5:45 p.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Deborah L. Boardman, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, June 23

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 2062—Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act of 2021 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Banks, Jim, Ind., E674
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E676
Carson, André, Ind., E677
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E673, E677
Granger, Kay, Tex., E674
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E675
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E679
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E673, E673, E674, E675, E676, E677, E678
Langevin, James R., R.I., E678
Newhouse, Dan, Wash., E675
Norcross, Donald, N.J., E676
Palazzo, Steven M., Miss., E676
Rodgers, Cathy McMorris, Wash., E678
Roy, Chip, Tex., E673
Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'', Va., E678
Smucker, Lloyd, Pa., E674
Steel, Michelle, Calif., E676
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E673
Tlaib, Rashida, Mich., E675
Yarmuth, John A., Ky., E674

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.